



Research Progress Note

*Material added to the research corpus since submission,
and the sharpened form of the research question*

MPhil/PhD Politics & International Studies · September 2026 entry
Applicant: M. Santhuru · hello@tlte.cloud

Version 1.0 · Aarambam · founding era
TLTE C.I.C. — Community Interest Company, England & Wales,
company number 16426152. Statutory CIC asset lock applies.

docs.tlte.cloud/research/phd-soas

1. Why this note exists

This note is filed as a voluntary addendum to an application already under consideration. Nothing in the submitted file has been withdrawn or amended. The reason for the addendum is simple: the research object described in the application is a live, continuously published archive, and it has grown materially since the file was submitted. An admissions reader assessing feasibility should be able to see the current state of the corpus rather than the state it was in at submission.

The archive is docs.tlte.cloud, operated under a UK Community Interest Company. It is a practice-based pilot of the research question, and it is already producing the kind of evidence a supervisor would want to see before committing four years to it: a documented method, a documented refusal record, and a corpus that outgrew its own initial design.

2. What has been added since submission

Each entry below is a live, permanently addressed surface. All are public and verifiable without contacting me.

Period	Output added to the corpus	Where it sits
Q4 2025	Methodology and limitations surfaces published in full, including a standing statement of what the archive cannot establish	/research/methodology, /research/limitations
Q1 2026	Thematic documentation desks established under a single tiered-source discipline: enforced disappearances, land and property, press freedom, GSP+ compliance, recorded legal memory	/unmai/desk/*
Q1 2026	Citations registry brought online, giving every load-bearing claim a resolvable source record	/cite
Q2 2026	Women's council documentation layer published with a non-removable referral block and a hard refusal of survivor intake	/magalir-avai
Q2 2026	Public evaluation suite for the retrieval assistant, including recorded failures and grounding limits	/velicham/evals
Q2 2026	Comparative and reconciliation-audit surfaces added, each pairing a minority-source claim with a majority-institution source	/unmai/desk/reconciliation-audit
Q3 2026	Reading Room: nineteen printable institutional dossiers with content hashes and stable identifiers	/reading-room
Q3 2026	Working method paper typeset for citation: source tiering, refusal recording, non-purchasable standing	/standard/method
Q3 2026	Continuity protocol published, specifying how the archive survives the withdrawal of its founder	/continuity-guard

The corpus is therefore no longer a prospectus for a research object. It is the research object, with a publication history, a version record, and an append-only changelog.

3. The research question, sharpened

The submitted proposal asked what role diaspora-built civic infrastructure can legitimately play in post-conflict accountability. Two years of operating the thing has narrowed that usefully. The question I now want to examine is:

When a non-state, diaspora-operated archive adopts the evidentiary discipline of mandated mechanisms without holding a mandate, what does that discipline actually produce - and what does it foreclose?

The second half is the part that carries the thesis. Adopting Berkeley Protocol practice, tiered sourcing, and Murad Code constraints does not simply make a diaspora archive more credible. It removes categories of material the archive would otherwise hold, and it transfers authority to the mechanisms it cites. That trade is measurable, and it has not been studied from inside an operating case.

4. One finding worth naming now

The method has already forced a refusal against my own interest. A widely circulated arrest case within the documented region would have strengthened the archive's argument considerably had it been presented as verified. It could not be: the available sourcing sat below the archive's Tier-A and Tier-B thresholds. It is published in the corpus as a lower-tier entry with the verification gap stated on the page, and the argument it would have supported is written weaker than I would like it to be.

That refusal is recorded, dated, and public. It is the single strongest piece of evidence that the archive is operating as research rather than advocacy, and the mechanism that produced it - a written refusal record - is one of the contributions the thesis would formalise.

5. What I am asking for

Nothing that changes the application. Only that this note is read alongside it, and that the archive is opened once before a decision is taken.

I am available for a conversation at any point, at short notice, in person or online. If it would help for a prospective supervisor to see the underlying method rather than the public surfaces, I can provide the method paper and the refusal record directly.