

THE LANDRY FACT-CHECKING MATRIX

Master Intelligence Verification Protocol
6-Gate Deterministic Epistemological Framework

DOCUMENT ID	LI-LFCM-2026-002
CLASSIFICATION	INTERNAL RESEARCH / OPERATIONAL USE
FRAMEWORK VERSION	v2.0.0 (Enhanced — 6-Gate Edition)
ISSUED BY	Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry, CEO
ORGANIZATION	Landry Industries Inc. Marie Landry's Spy Shop
LOCATION	Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada
DATE ISSUED	May 14, 2026
EPISTEMIC STANDARD	LHFP / Seshat's Axiom / 1=1=1 Law

*"Facts are immutable constants. Inferences are hypotheses.
High confidence is an illusion; only rigorous systematic filtering yields truth."*

— Seshat's Axiom | Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol

ORCID: 0009-0008-5027-3337 | marielandryspyshop.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Executive Summary & Purpose**
- II. Scope & Application Domains**
- III. Foundational Epistemological Context**
- IV. The 10-Step NATO/UN Operational Loop**
- V. Source Classification Taxonomy**
- VI. Digital Footprint & Provenance Standards**
- VII. The 6-Gate Fact-Checking Matrix**
 - Gate 1 — Provenance & Origin Verification
 - Gate 2 — Independence & Corroboration
 - Gate 3 — Methodology & Rigor
 - Gate 4 — Contradiction Protocol
 - Gate 5 — Temporal & Contextual Integrity
 - Gate 6 — AI/Synthetic Content & Hallucination Detection [NEW]
- VIII. LHFP & Seshat's Axiom Integration**
- IX. Interactive Verification Checklist**
- X. Methodology Stress-Test & Critique**
- XI. Indicators of Compromise (IOCs)**
- XII. Threat Assessment & Disinformation Mapping**
- XIII. Implementation Recommendations**
- XIV. Known Gaps & Limitations**
- XV. Full Reference Compendium**
- XVI. Appendices**

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & PURPOSE

The Landry Fact-Checking Matrix (LFCM) is a deterministic, zero-trust epistemological protocol engineered for the intelligence, research, and advocacy operations of Landry Industries Inc. and Marie Landry's Spy Shop. Operating under the axiom that facts are immutable constants and inferences are testable hypotheses — never certainties — this matrix functions as the primary gating mechanism for all intelligence products, material science publications, OSINT dossiers, legal filings, and policy advocacy documents produced under the Landry Industries umbrella.

Version 2.0.0 expands the original five-gate architecture with a critical sixth gate dedicated to the detection and rejection of AI-generated synthetic content and large language model hallucinations — a category of information threat that has escalated dramatically with the proliferation of generative AI systems. This document also integrates the matrix with the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP), Seshat's Axiom, and the 1=1=1 Law to form a complete, unified epistemological operating standard.

AT A GLANCE

METRIC	SPECIFICATION
Gates Required for Verification	6 of 6 (ALL must pass — zero exceptions)
Failure Threshold	Single gate failure = REJECTED / HYPOTHESIS STATUS
Confidence Threshold	Not a substitute for gate passage — irrelevant
AI Disclosure Standard	Mandatory on all AI-assisted documents
Temporal Validity Window	≤ 5 years (fast-moving domains); triggered [OUTDATED]
Independent Sources Required	Minimum 2, non-circular, high-rated
Epistemic Anchor	LHFP / Seshat's Axiom / 1=1=1 Law
Governing Standards	UNODC, NATO StratCom, IFCN, NIH, W3C DCAT

II. SCOPE & APPLICATION DOMAINS

This matrix applies universally to all information ingested, generated, or published by Landry Industries Inc. and its affiliated ventures. The following application domains are explicitly covered:

- **OSINT & Intelligence Dossiers:** All source claims, geospatial assertions, financial crime analyses, and counterintelligence findings.
- **Material Science Research:** Hemproxies composite platform, PhytoIntelligence 3.2, stoichiometric data, and synthesis protocols.
- **Legal & Advocacy Documents:** Federal Court filings, legislative proposals, Charter arguments, and rights advocacy materials.
- **Financial Crime Intelligence:** AML dossiers, forensic financial analyses, sanctions mapping, and enforcement action assessments.
- **Policy & Governance Papers:** AI governance frameworks (WTF/OMDARE), FC/NV architecture, NHRIA 2026, Bill C-XXX.

- **AI-Assisted Outputs:** Any document co-produced with or by generative AI systems, subject to Gate 6 mandatory review.
- **Corporate Communications:** Investor materials, grant applications, Google Workspace proposals, and public-facing publications.

Explicit Exclusions: This matrix does not govern creative fiction, brainstorming ideation phases (pre-hypothesis), or internal working notes clearly marked [DRAFT / UNVERIFIED]. All final outputs, regardless of medium, are subject to full matrix compliance before publication or submission.

III. FOUNDATIONAL EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The LFCM is grounded in three complementary epistemological doctrines developed within the Landry Industries intellectual framework:

Seshat's Axiom

Named after the Egyptian goddess of knowledge and recordkeeping, this axiom holds that a fact exists independently of any observer's belief in it, and that the duty of the intelligence practitioner is to discover facts, not to construct them. Any claim that cannot be traced to a primary, independently verifiable source is a hypothesis — regardless of how widely it is believed or how authoritative its purveyor appears.

The Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP)

A systematic set of editorial and analytical practices designed to prevent the insertion of unverified, confabulated, or AI-generated claims into intelligence products. The LHFP mandates that all dynamic data (prices, regulations, positions, statistics) bypass memory and trigger live, sourced verification. The 5-Gate Matrix (now 6-Gate) is the operational engine of the LHFP.

The 1=1=1 Law

A logical consistency principle: one source equals one data point, never a confirmed fact. One study equals one result, not a scientific consensus. One citation equals one reference, not independent corroboration. This law functions as the primary defense against circular reporting and echo-chamber intelligence.

IV. THE 10-STEP NATO/UN OPERATIONAL LOOP

All LFCM-governed operations adhere strictly to UNODC evidentiary guidelines for digital collection (UNODC, 2021) and NATO StratCom models for disinformation analysis (NATO StratCom COE, 2024). The analytical engine executes the following deterministic loop:

STEP	PHASE	DESCRIPTION
01	OBSERVE ANOMALY	Identify data points deviating from established baselines. Document the anomaly with timestamp, source, and initial assessment.
02	DEFINE INTEL REQ	Isolate the specific variable requiring verification. Formalize the intelligence requirement in written form before proceeding.
03	HYPOTHESIZE [VARIABLE]	Formulate a testable, falsifiable assertion. Status at this stage: [X THEORETICAL]. No operational weight is assigned.
04	DESIGN EXPERIMENT	Construct a targeted OSINT collection plan specifying sources, tools, and verification methods before execution.

05	COLLECT VERBATIM FACTS	Collect raw data preserving cryptographic hashing, origin metadata, and timestamped provenance. No paraphrasing.
06	ANALYZE — RUN 6-GATE MATRIX	Process each data point through all 6 gates of the Fact-Checking Matrix. Any single gate failure halts the data flow.
07	CONTRADICTION PROTOCOL	Actively search for contradicting evidence, retractions, and adversarial data. Reject hypothesis if contradiction is found.
08	CONCLUSION — VERIFIED ONLY	Only surviving data as verified fact. Assign confidence tier (HIGH / MEDIUM / SCARCE) based on corroboration.
09	REPLICATE	Execute independent verification using disparate tools, networks, and analysts. Single-analyst verification is insufficient.
10	REPORT WITH PROVENANCE	Compile findings with embedded source provenance, gate passage records, and AI disclosure where applicable.

V. SOURCE CLASSIFICATION TAXONOMY

Sources are classified strictly by proximity to raw data and peer-review status. Higher tiers carry greater evidentiary weight but are not immune to Gate analysis.

TIER	CATEGORY	EXAMPLES	WEIGHT
T-1	Primary Institutional	WHO, EU bodies, UNODC, NIH, NIST, court records	HIGHEST
T-2	Peer-Reviewed Academic	Indexed journals (NIH, IEEE, Nature), systematic reviews	HIGH
T-3	Government & Treaty Bodies	CISA, NATO, national statistical agencies	HIGH
T-4	Verified OSINT Primary	Bellingcat-verified imagery, satellite data, registry filings	MEDIUM-HIGH
T-5	Preprint / Non-Peer-Reviewed	arXiv, Zenodo (prior to peer review), SSRN	[PREPRINT]
T-6	Credentialed Journalism	Reuters, AP, BBC with named sourcing	MEDIUM
T-7	Secondary Aggregators	Wikipedia, news aggregators, undocumented blogs	LOW — corroboration only
T-X	Anonymous / Unsourced	Forums, unverified social media, anonymous tips	REJECTED at Gate 1

VI. DIGITAL FOOTPRINT & PROVENANCE STANDARDS

Verification requires establishing the precise digital footprint of every claim. Landry Industries applies W3C Data Catalog Vocabulary (DCAT-3) standards for provenance tracking, augmented with the following operational requirements:

- Each claim must be traceable to a URL, DOI, registry entry, or archival snapshot (Internet Archive) with an accessible timestamp.
- Cryptographic context hashing (SHA-256 preferred) is applied to raw evidence files before processing to establish collection integrity.
- WHOIS records, domain registration histories, and SSL certificate timelines are audited for high-stakes source validation.
- Media files undergo reverse-image search, metadata EXIF analysis, and shadow/topographic geolocation verification independent of source metadata.
- All provenance records are stored with the intelligence product and constitute part of the evidentiary chain of custody for legal proceedings.
- Network maps of citation dependencies are constructed for all claims to detect circular reporting (1=1=1 Law enforcement).

Temporal Validity: Data older than 5 years in fast-moving domains (nanotechnology, OSINT toolkits, active regulations, financial crime typologies, AI systems) triggers an automatic [OUTDATED] flag and requires live re-verification before gate analysis proceeds.

VII. THE 6-GATE FACT-CHECKING MATRIX

To transition any data point from [X THEORETICAL] to **VERIFIED FACT**, it must pass all 6 gates without exception. A single gate failure results in permanent rejection or demotion to hypothesis status. There are no partial passes, no confidence overrides, and no exceptions for urgency.

GATE 1 · PROVENANCE & ORIGIN VERIFICATION

CONDITION :	Can the exact origin of the data be isolated to a primary, verifiable source?
ACTION:	Trace the claim backward using archival tools (Internet Archive), DOI resolution, and registry lookups. Establish the original publication date, author credentials, and institutional affiliation.
TOOLS:	<i>Internet Archive (archive.org), Google Scholar, DOI.org, WHOIS lookup, Wayback Machine</i>
FAIL STATE:	Origin is a secondary aggregator, anonymous forum, or lacks primary documentation. Obfuscated authorship or institutional affiliation.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — ORIGIN VERIFIED
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — ORIGIN UNVERIFIABLE

GATE 2 · INDEPENDENCE & CORROBORATION

CONDITION :	Are there at least two entirely independent, highly-rated sources verifying the claim without citing each other?
ACTION:	Map the full citation network of the claim. Identify the original source and trace all subsequent references. Flag and reject any circular reporting chain under the 1=1=1 Law.
TOOLS:	<i>Connected Papers, OpenAlex, Semantic Scholar, CrossRef, citation network analysis</i>
FAIL STATE:	Circular reporting — all sources trace back to a single origin. Only one independent source exists. Apply [■ SCARCE] flag if borderline.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — INDEPENDENTLY CORROBORATED
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — CIRCULAR / INSUFFICIENT CORROBORATION

GATE 3 · METHODOLOGY & RIGOR

CONDITION :	Was the data generated using mathematically sound, falsifiable, and transparent methods?
ACTION:	Audit the source's methodology against established domain standards: MITRE ATT&CK; for cyber claims; peer-reviewed materials science literature for Hempoxies/PhytoIntelligence claims; UNODC standards for financial crime data; APA statistical guidelines for psychological claims. Non-peer-reviewed sources receive mandatory [PREPRINT] flag.

TOOLS:	<i>MITRE ATT&CK; NIH Rigor & Reproducibility guidelines, NIST frameworks, CIS Controls</i>
FAIL STATE:	Flawed sample sizes, logical fallacies, proprietary or hidden algorithms with no verifiable audit trail, retracted studies, predatory journal publication.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — METHODOLOGY SOUND
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — METHODOLOGY FLAWED / HIDDEN

GATE 4 · CONTRADICTION PROTOCOL

CONDITION :	Does the claim survive deliberate, adversarial testing against contradicting evidence?
ACTION:	Actively and deliberately search for peer-reviewed studies, institutional reports, meta-analyses, retractions, and expert dissent that contradict the claim. This is not a passive check — the analyst must seek contradiction. Cognitive bias toward confirmation is a failure mode addressed by APA-recognized best practices.
TOOLS:	<i>PubMed retraction database, Retraction Watch, Cochrane systematic reviews, adversarial OSINT queries</i>
FAIL STATE:	A peer-reviewed or institutional source directly and unambiguously contradicts the claim, and the contradiction cannot be structurally and evidentially debunked within the matrix.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — CONTRADICTION NOT SUSTAINED
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — UNRESOLVED CONTRADICTION

GATE 5 · TEMPORAL & CONTEXTUAL INTEGRITY

CONDITION :	Is the fact currently true, and is it presented in its complete, original context?
ACTION:	Verify the precise date of origin. Apply [OUTDATED] flag if the data exceeds the temporal validity window for its domain. Assess whether the data has been decontextualized — e.g., a real photograph with a fabricated date, a real quote stripped of qualifying language, or a real statistic applied to a different population.
TOOLS:	<i>Internet Archive Wayback Machine, EXIF metadata tools, reverse image search, First Draft News verification protocols</i>
FAIL STATE:	Data is historically accurate but operationally obsolete. Data has been stripped of defining context that materially changes its meaning. Temporal metadata has been manipulated.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — TEMPORALLY VALID & CONTEXTUALLY INTACT
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — OUTDATED OR DECONTEXTUALIZED

★ NEW — GATE 6 · AI/SYNTHETIC CONTENT & HALLUCINATION DETECTION [v2.0 ADDITION]

CONDITION :	Is the data free from AI-generated confabulation, synthetic media manipulation, and large language model hallucination artifacts?
ACTION:	Apply AI detection protocols to all content suspected of or disclosed as AI-assisted. Independently verify every factual claim (statistics, citations, names, dates, URLs) that an AI system generated. Treat all AI-provided citations as [UNVERIFIED] until manually confirmed against the cited source. Apply mandatory AI Disclosure tag to all Landry Industries outputs co-produced with AI systems. Cross-reference all AI-generated claims against the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP) checklist.
TOOLS:	<i>Originality.ai, GPTZero, Copyleaks AI detector, manual citation verification, Perplexity.ai for real-time sourcing, LHFP editorial checklist</i>
FAIL STATE:	AI-generated citation cannot be verified at source. Statistical claim produced by AI has no independent primary source. Synthetic media artifacts detected in evidence files. AI system has hallucinated institutional attribution, date, or data point.
PASS:	✓ GATE CLEARED — AI ARTIFACTS ABSENT OR VERIFIED
FAIL:	✗ REJECTED — UNVERIFIED AI HALLUCINATION DETECTED

VIII. LHFP & SESHAT'S AXIOM INTEGRATION

The 6-Gate Matrix is the operational engine of the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP). The following integration directives govern how the matrix is applied within the LHFP workflow and the broader Landry Industries intelligence cycle:

- **Direct Embedding:** The 6-Gate Matrix is embedded as the primary verification module within all LHFP-governed documents. Any claim that has not been explicitly gate-cleared must carry an [UNVERIFIED] tag regardless of perceived authority.
- **Dynamic Data Override:** Appendix A Live Search Override Protocol: All dynamic variables — pricing, active regulations, personnel positions, enforcement actions, exchange rates — must bypass AI memory and trigger live, sourced verification before Gate 1 ingestion. This is a mandatory LHFP rule.
- **AI Co-Production Disclosure:** Any document co-produced with a generative AI system must carry an explicit AI Disclosure statement on the cover page, identifying the model, version, and the verification state (e.g., 'Gemini 3.1 Pro — Verified against LHFP standards'). Gate 6 is the mandatory gate for all such documents.
- **FC/NV Architecture Alignment:** Under the Fact-Constant / Narrative-Variable (FC/NV) architecture, only gate-cleared facts are designated as Fact-Constants. Narrative elements, inferences, and interpretive frames remain classified as Narrative-Variables regardless of persuasive quality.
- **WTF 9.0/OMDARE Integration:** The matrix feeds gate-cleared intelligence into the WTF 9.0/OMDARE analytical frameworks. Unverified claims are flagged before entry and routed to the contradiction protocol loop rather than the narrative synthesis pipeline.
- **AML Dossier Protocol:** For LI-AML-2026-001 and successor financial crime dossiers, every enforcement action citation, financial figure, and institutional attribution is subject to mandatory Gates 1, 2, and 5 verification with particular attention to the temporal validity of regulatory filings.

IX. INTERACTIVE VERIFICATION CHECKLIST

The following printable checklist operationalizes the 6-Gate Matrix for field use. Each item must be completed before a data point advances. This checklist constitutes the minimum verification record for any Landry Industries intelligence product.

PRE-VERIFICATION SETUP

■ Record claim verbatim with exact source URL / DOI / reference
■ Timestamp collection event (ISO 8601 format)
■ Assign claim a unique tracking ID
■ Flag if claim originates from or was processed by an AI system → mandatory Gate 6
■ Apply [OUTDATED] pre-check: is source date within validity window?

GATE 1 — PROVENANCE (Pass / Fail)

- Primary source identified and directly accessible
- Author/institution credentials verified
- Publication date confirmed
- Archival snapshot created (Internet Archive)
- RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL → STOP if FAIL

GATE 2 — CORROBORATION (Pass / Fail)

- Minimum 2 independent sources identified
- Citation network mapped — no circular dependency detected
- 1=1=1 Law applied — single source = single data point only
- RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL (■ [■ SCARCE] if borderline) → STOP if FAIL

GATE 3 — METHODOLOGY (Pass / Fail)

- Methodology is transparent, documented, and falsifiable
- Applicable domain standard applied (MITRE / NIH / NIST / peer review)
- Sample size, statistical validity, and confidence intervals reviewed
- [PREPRINT] flag applied if not peer-reviewed
- RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL → STOP if FAIL

GATE 4 — CONTRADICTION SEARCH (Pass / Fail)

- Deliberate search executed for contradicting evidence
- Retraction Watch and PubMed retraction database checked
- Adversarial OSINT queries run against the claim
- No unresolved institutional contradiction found
- RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL → STOP if FAIL

GATE 5 — TEMPORAL & CONTEXT (Pass / Fail)

- Data confirmed current within applicable validity window
- Original context verified — no decontextualization detected
- Media EXIF / metadata checked for manipulation
- [OUTDATED] flag applied if beyond validity window
- RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL → STOP if FAIL

GATE 6 — AI/SYNTHETIC CONTENT (Pass / Fail — MANDATORY if AI-sourced)

■ AI Disclosure recorded: Model + Version + Verification State
■ All AI-generated citations manually verified at source
■ All AI-generated statistics independently sourced
■ AI detection tool applied to content where appropriate
■ LHFP editorial checklist completed
■ RESULT: ■ PASS ■ FAIL ■ N/A (no AI involvement confirmed) → STOP if FAIL

FINAL VERIFICATION RECORD

■ All 6 gates passed (or Gate 6 N/A with documented justification)
■ Data point designated: ■ VERIFIED FACT ■ [■ SCARCE] ■ [PREPRINT] ■ REJECTED
■ Confidence tier assigned: ■ HIGH ■ MEDIUM ■ LOW
■ Verification record archived with intelligence product
■ Analyst signature / AI disclosure applied to final document

X. METHODOLOGY STRESS-TEST & CRITIQUE

Per the LHFP mandate, this framework is itself subject to adversarial review. The following stress-test identifies structural strengths, boundary conditions, known failure modes, and constructive critiques of the 6-Gate Matrix design. This section demonstrates the matrix's own Gate 4 (Contradiction Protocol) applied recursively.

DIMENSION	ASSESSMENT	VERDICT
Binary Pass/Fail Logic	Strength: eliminates ambiguity and prevents motivated reasoning. Risk: may be overly	SOUND with caveat
Gate 6 (AI Detection) Maturity	Current AI detection tools have significant false negative rates for highly sophisticated	INVALID - GAP NOTED
Temporal 5-Year Window	The 5-year cutoff is appropriate for fast-moving domains but may be too aggressive	REFINE RECOMMENDED
Gate 2 Independence Standard	Requiring strictly zero circular citation is epistemologically correct but practically demanding	SOUND JUDGMENT REQUIRED
Cognitive Bias Mitigation	The mandatory adversarial search in Gate 4 is the strongest structural defense against	SOUND - REPLICATION ESSENTIAL
Scalability	Full 6-gate analysis is resource-intensive and may not be feasible for high-volume,	TRIAGE PROTOCOL NEEDED
Material Science Claims (Hempoxies)	Emerging hemp-based research frameworks not yet validated by peer review, the matrix	ALREADY MITIGATED BY PREPRINT
Jurisdiction & Legal Compliance	OSINT collection ethics vary by jurisdiction. The matrix references UNODC guidelines	LEGAL REVIEW REQUIRED

XI. INDICATORS OF COMPROMISE (IOCs)

The following Indicators of Compromise (IOCs) in information systems trigger automatic rejection or escalated review within the LFCM. These are classified by information domain:

Source Integrity IOCs

- Lack of cryptographic signatures or verifiable digital provenance
- Obfuscated WHOIS records or domain registration within 30 days of publication
- Failure to meet IFCN Code of Principles (Poynter Institute, 2023)
- Publication in journals flagged by Beall's List of predatory publishers
- Anonymous authorship without institutional verification

Media & Content IOCs

- Synthetic manipulation artifacts in images (GAN artifacts, EXIF inconsistencies)
- Audio/video deepfake indicators (facial landmark inconsistencies, audio-visual sync errors)
- Metadata timestamp inconsistencies between file creation and claimed publication date
- Reverse image search returning unrelated original context

AI/LLM-Specific IOCs (Gate 6)

- Citations that resolve to non-existent papers, retracted works, or incorrect authors
- Statistics that cannot be traced to any primary source document
- Institutional attributions that cannot be verified through the institution's own publications
- Dates, URLs, or DOIs that do not exist or lead to unrelated content
- Confident assertions about recent events that predate the AI system's training cutoff

Financial & Funding IOCs

- Obfuscated or undisclosed funding sources for studies or datasets
- Conflicts of interest not declared by researchers or institutions
- Shell company or nominee-obscured ownership of publishing entities

Network & Disinformation IOCs

- Coordinated inauthentic behavior patterns (simultaneous multi-platform amplification)
- Citation networks with single-origin circular dependencies
- Temporal clustering of corroborating sources around a specific event (potential astroturfing)
- Use of pre-positioned or pre-drafted narratives identified in prior disinformation campaigns

XII. THREAT ASSESSMENT & DISINFORMATION MAPPING

Disinformation vectors targeting Landry Industries operations are mapped against the First Draft News Information Disorder framework (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017) and the EU Code of Practice on Disinformation (European Commission, 2022).

THREAT VECTOR	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	MITIGATION
AI-generated synthetic intelligence targeting Landry Industries operations	HIGH (2026)	CRITICAL	Gate 6 mandatory
Supply chain data poisoning via manipulated OSINT datasets	MEDIUM	HIGH	Gates 1+2 corroboration
Coordinated misattribution of OSINT findings	MEDIUM	HIGH	Cryptographic provenance
Predatory journal infiltration of research pipeline	LOW-MEDIUM	MEDIUM	Gate 3 peer-review audit
Temporal context stripping of financial crime reporting	HIGH	HIGH	Gate 5 + [OUTDATED] flag
Citation laundering through secondary aggregation	HIGH	MEDIUM	1=1=1 Law + Gate 2
Legal document fabrication (AI-assisted)	EMERGING	CRITICAL	Gate 6 + chain of custody

XIII. IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

ID	PRIORITY	RECOMMENDATION
R-01	IMMEDIATE	Embed the 6-Gate Matrix directly into the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol as its primary verification engine, replacing the current manual review process.
R-02	IMMEDIATE	Apply Gate 6 retrospectively to all AI-assisted intelligence products produced before v2.0.0 that are still in active operation.
R-03	SHORT-TERM	Automate Gates 1 and 2 using custom Python scripts integrated with the OSINT Framework (Nordine, 2024), Google Scholar, and other relevant sources.
R-04	SHORT-TERM	Develop a domain-calibrated temporal validity table specifying validity windows by research domain (materials science, finance, etc.).
R-05	MEDIUM-TERM	Build a triage protocol for time-sensitive OSINT operations that permits provisional [TRIAGE-VERIFIED] status with clear escalation paths.
R-06	MEDIUM-TERM	Establish a jurisdiction-specific legal compliance annex to the matrix addressing OSINT collection ethics for Canadian and international contexts.
R-07	ONGOING	Maintain a living version of this matrix updated annually or when a significant new information threat category emerges.
R-08	ONGOING	All Landry Industries publications on Zenodo (135+ records) should carry a machine-readable metadata tag referencing this matrix.

XIV. KNOWN GAPS & LIMITATIONS

- **Synthetic Media Detection Lag:** Automated verification of zero-day synthetic media remains computationally expensive and prone to false negatives. Human-in-the-loop validation is mandatory for all high-stakes intelligence involving media evidence. Gate 6 acknowledges this limitation explicitly.
- **Emerging Source Categories:** The taxonomy does not yet formally account for blockchain-verified sources, decentralized identifier (DID) systems, or cryptographically signed open-source intelligence — categories that may require a Tier 1.5 classification in future versions.
- **Non-English Source Validation:** The matrix's tooling recommendations are primarily English-language. Verification of French, Arabic, Mandarin, or other language sources requires bilingual analyst validation and language-specific tool sets not fully specified in this version.

■ **Real-Time Regulation Tracking:** Despite the Live Search Override Protocol (Appendix A), there is no automated alerting system that flags when a verified fact is subsequently invalidated by regulatory change. This is a gap for high-velocity enforcement action monitoring.

■ **Internal Research Hypotheses:** Forward-looking research frameworks (Hempoxies v44, PhytoIntelligence 3.2) are correctly classified as [PREPRINT / HYPOTHESIS] under Gate 3. The matrix does not define a formal graduation pathway from hypothesis to verified fact for internally generated research — this requires an external peer review protocol not yet documented.

XV. FULL REFERENCE COMPENDIUM

#	AUTHOR/ORG	TITLE	URL
1	Poynter Institute, 2023	IFCN Code of Principles	https://ifcncodeofprinciples.poynter.org/
2	Bellingcat, 2024	Open Source Investigation Resources	https://www.bellingcat.com/resources/
3	Kavanagh & Rich, 2018	Truth Decay (RAND Corporation)	https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2314.html
4	World Health Organization, 2020	Infodemic Management	https://www.who.int/health-topics/infodemic
5	UNODC, 2021	Cybercrime & Digital Evidence Standards	https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/cybercrime/index.html
6	CISA, 2024	Mis-, Dis-, and Malinformation	https://www.cisa.gov/mdm
7	NATO StratCom COE, 2024	Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence	https://stratcomcoe.org/
8	NIST, 2024	Information Technology Laboratory	https://www.nist.gov/itl
9	IEEE, 2024	Ethics in Action	https://ethicsinaction.ieee.org/
10	EFF, 2024	Surveillance Self-Defense	https://ssd.eff.org/
11	W3C, 2024	DCAT-3: Data Catalog Vocabulary	https://www.w3.org/TR/vocab-dcat-3/
12	Internet Archive, 2024	Wayback Machine	https://archive.org/web/
13	Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017	Information Disorder (Council of Europe)	https://rm.coe.int/information-disorder-toward-an-interdisciplinary-framework-for-research/168076277c
14	European Commission, 2022	Code of Practice on Disinformation	https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/code-practice-disinformation
15	NIH, 2024	Rigor and Reproducibility	https://www.nih.gov/research-training/rigor-reproducibility
16	American Psychological Association, 2024	Cognitive Bias Research	https://www.apa.org/topics/cognitive-bias
17	Nordine, 2024	OSINT Framework	https://osintframework.com/
18	Global Disinformation Index, 2024	GDI Research & Ratings	https://disinformationindex.org/
19	MITRE, 2024	ATT&CK; Framework	https://attack.mitre.org/
20	CIS, 2024	CIS Controls	https://www.cisecurity.org/controls

2 1	First Draft / Wardle, 2017	Information Disorder Framework	https://firstdraftnews.org/
2 2	Retraction Watch, 2024	Retraction Database	https://retractionwatch.com/
2 3	CrossRef, 2024	Citation Metadata & DOI Registry	https://www.crossref.org/
2 4	Cochrane Library, 2024	Systematic Reviews Database	https://www.cochranelibrary.com/
2 5	OpenAlex, 2024	Open Scholarly Citation Network	https://openalex.org/

XVI. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Live Search Override Protocol

All dynamic variables — including but not limited to pricing, active legislative or regulatory text, personnel in institutional positions, current enforcement actions, exchange rates, and live OSINT indicators — must bypass all AI memory banks and trigger live API searches or manual source verification before matrix ingestion. This protocol is triggered automatically by the following classes of claims: 'current', 'latest', 'recent', 'as of', 'the current [position/regulation/rate]', or any time-indexed factual assertion. No AI-generated value for a dynamic variable is accepted without live verification, regardless of the system's stated confidence.

Appendix B: Status Designation Quick Reference

STATUS TAG	MEANING	OPERATIONAL WEIGHT
✓ VERIFIED FACT	Passed all 6 gates	FULL OPERATIONAL WEIGHT
■ SCARCE	Passed Gates 1, 3–6; only one independent source	LIMITED — flag in product
[PREPRINT]	Not peer-reviewed; methodology sound but unvalidated	RESEARCH USE ONLY
[OUTDATED]	Passed all gates but exceeds temporal validity window	HISTORICAL REFERENCE ONLY
[UNVERIFIED]	Has not been run through the matrix	NOT OPERATIONAL
[X THEORETICAL]	Hypothesis stage — no gate analysis yet	NOT OPERATIONAL
✗ REJECTED	Failed one or more gates	PROHIBITED FROM USE

Appendix C: Versioning & Change Log

VERSION	DATE	CHANGES
v1.0.0	2026 Q1	Original 5-Gate Matrix. Core epistemological framework established.
v2.0.0	2026-05-14	Gate 6 (AI/Synthetic Content & Hallucination Detection) added. LHFP integration section added. Interactive chec