

PROUSE FORENSIC INDEX (PFI)

*A Quantitative Diagnostic for Institutional and Private
Residual Liability (L_r)*

”This instrument is a proprietary forensic diagnostic for Fiduciaries and Business Leads. It identifies the ‘Documentation Voids’ that nullify the effectiveness of standard security and operational controls under international audit standards.”

AUDIT VERSION: 2026.Q1

ISO 31000 Alignment · Forensic Immunity Audit

Theoretical Framework: The L_r Model

”In a judicial environment, a control without a forensic audit trail is non-existent. We solve for the Documentation Coefficient (C_d)—the multiplier that validates your operational investments (C_e).”

$$L_r = (T \times V) - (C_e \times C_d)$$

The Logic:

Residual Liability (L_r) remains at maximum whenever your evidence trail (C_d) is unquantified. This diagnostic identifies the gap between perceived safety and actual defensibility. Without an audited, evidence-based C_d , the L_r variable cannot be mitigated regardless of capital expenditure. In a 2026 judicial audit, C_d is the only variable that determines institutional survival.

10-Point Master Diagnostic: Forensic Variable Analysis

Instructions: Select the appropriate status for each forensic category.

Scoring: Yes (10 pts) | Partial (5 pts) | No (0 pts).

Forensic Category / Requirement	Y	P	N
1. Standard Alignment: Is your risk framework mapped to ISO 31000:2018 and verified by an independent third party?			
2. Fiduciary Ratification: Can you produce a "Duty of Care" protocol ratified by your Board or Counsel within 12 months?			
3. Contextual Evidence: Do your logs capture the forensic logic (the why) of an action, rather than just telemetry?			
4. Evidentiary Integrity: Is critical documentation stored in a tamper-evident, chronologically audited system?			
5. Failure Simulation: Does the organization perform annual "Forensic Stress Tests" to identify nullified physical controls?			
6. Systemic Analysis: Does incident response require a formal "Forensic Post-Mortem" identifying systemic flaws?			
7. Forensic Distancing: Do vendor SLAs contain clauses that forensically distance your business from vendor negligence?			
8. Protocol Competence: Can you produce objective data proving staff are competent, rather than just "briefed"?			
9. Liability Metrics: Are Directors provided with a quarterly L_r report quantifying exposure in numerical terms?			
10. Independent Audit: Do you have an active schedule for independent audits ensuring SOPs align with daily operations?			

Analysis of Findings: The PFI Scale

Calculation:

Sum your total points (0–100) to determine your position on the Defensibility Scale.

0–40 | FORENSICALLY FRAGILE

Your Documentation Coefficient is negligible. Your assets are defended by a "Paper Shield." In a judicial audit, your controls provide zero institutional immunity.

41–75 | PROCEDURALLY DEFICIENT

"Security Theater." Your controls exist but lack the forensic weight to survive high-stakes legal scrutiny. Documentation voids nullify your technical spend.

76–100 | THE GOLD STANDARD

Defensible Position. Total alignment of physical controls and audited forensic documentation. You possess the evidence trail required for absolute institutional immunity.

Strategic Remediation

2026.Q1 Forensic Protocol

Conclusion:

A score below 76 represents a critical mathematical vulnerability. This void means your current security spend is being nullified by a lack of evidentiary weight. Under 2026 Duty of Care mandates, this state of unmitigated risk constitutes actionable negligence.

The Path Forward:

To transition to the Gold Standard, a formal remediation strategy is required. Use the link below to schedule a 15-minute Forensic Briefing to discuss your specific score and the path to a Defensible Position.

INITIATE FORENSIC REMEDIATION