Level 1 IAJ Investigator

Role Description and Operating Instructions

For distribution to incoming Level 1 volunteers

Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights (IAJ)

---

1. Purpose of the Level 1 Role

The Level 1 Investigator is the first human contact between the IAJ and a person who believes they have suffered a human rights violation by a public official, court, or government agency. Your job is not to decide whether the allegations are true. Your job is to help the person tell their story completely and accurately, locate every document that exists, identify what is missing, identify which materials appear to support, contradict, or complicate specific statements, and organize the case file so that a Supervising Investigator can do legal analysis, and a licensed clinician can do clinical evaluation, without having to start from zero.

You are a documentation collaborator, not an adjudicator. You are not a substitute for a Supervising Investigator (investigative Level 2), a lawyer, a clinician, a Private Attorney General, or a tribunal. The value you add is patience, structure, completeness, and care. Those four qualities are not trivial — most cases that fall apart at higher levels fall apart because the foundation was rushed.

Much of the information gathered at Level 1 may constitute hearsay, or present multiple layers of hearsay, depending on the nature of the statements and the purpose for which they are later offered. Accounts of conduct and out-of-court statements do not automatically constitute inadmissible hearsay. Level 1 does not determine admissibility. Level 1 preserves what was said, what was observed, and what documents were received, so that the Supervising Investigator, qualified reviewers, and counsel can later determine what use, if any, is permissible under the rules applicable to the forum.

The IAJ has found cause to investigate institutions (notably state child-protective agencies) for assigning uncertified persons to investigate families and make formal findings about them. The IAJ does not repeat that error. Level 1 investigators make no findings. You gather, organize, flag, and observe. Findings come from the Supervising Investigator (investigative Level 2) and above, applying Istanbul Protocol methodology, the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, and legal analysis to the materials you have prepared.

This manual operates under the IAJ Code of Ethics. The Code is the governing instrument for every IAJ investigator at every tier. It is binding on Level 1 investigators just as it is on all others. This manual specifies how Level 1 work is carried out under the Code; where the Code imposes a stricter duty than this manual, the Code controls. The Code recognizes tiered investigator roles (Code §1.4): Level 1 is the intake and documentation tier; analysis, credibility assessment, and findings reside with the Supervising Investigator (investigative Level 2) and above. The intake-triage classifications Level 1 may produce (strength ratings, contradiction classifications, missing-evidence priorities, issue-map flags) are preliminary and non-anchoring. Supervising Investigators conduct their analysis from the underlying preserved materials, not from any preliminary classification this manual produces.

For Level 1 work, the document hierarchy is: the Code of Ethics first; this Operating Manual second; the blank forms in Appendix B third. Where a conflict exists between any two of them, the higher instrument and the stricter duty control. Where the body of this manual conflicts with a blank form in Appendix B, the body controls; forms are operational templates that must be updated whenever the corresponding manual section changes (see Section 10).

The title "Level 1 Investigator" is an internal workflow role, not a credential. It does not signify legal, clinical, forensic, or evidentiary expertise. Level 1 investigators are intake and documentation personnel. Your work enables later investigation by qualified reviewers; it is not itself a merits investigation or an expert evaluation.

Role architecture. The IAJ uses two numbering schemes that must not be confused. Under Code of Ethics §1.4, the investigative tiers are Level 1 (intake and documentation) and "Level 2 and above" (analysis, evaluation and findings), the latter comprising Supervising Investigators, qualified reviewers, clinical and forensic experts, and counsel. In this manual, "Supervising Investigator" means the Level 2 investigator who supervises Level 1 work, reviews the primary preserved materials and routes the file; where this manual says "Level 2" without more, it means that investigator. Clinical evaluation within the Level 2 tier is performed only by licensed clinicians under the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, whose clinical Levels 1–4 are a separate scheme: there, Level 2 means a supervised clinician, and Level 3 and 4 are licensed clinicians who evaluate, diagnose and author reports. An investigative role confers no clinical authority, a clinical level confers no investigative authority, and clinical evaluation is never performed by an investigator of any tier.

Level 1 intake is not the complete IAJ investigation. It is the complainant-side intake and record-preservation phase of the process. Independent review, adverse-evidence analysis, third-party contact, official-record verification, legal analysis and findings belong to Level 2 (Supervising Investigator) and above; clinical evaluation belongs to licensed clinicians at the clinical Level 3 or 4 of the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, which is a separate scheme (see Section 1, Role architecture).

Evidentiary status of Level 1 work product. Your organizational classifications and routing judgments — Issue Map flags, corroboration strength ratings, contradiction classifications, missing-evidence priorities, and witness-register notes — are intake organization and routing tools. They are not merits findings and should not be cited as proof that a violation occurred. The underlying documents you gather, the verbatim statements of the complainant, the recordings of contemporaneous contacts (Section 5.10A), and the records of contemporaneous observation may later have evidentiary value if reviewed and relied on by Level 2 or above. Your categorizations of those materials do not, in themselves, convert intake material into proof.

2. Who May Serve as a Level 1 Investigator

The Level 1 role is open to anyone who can do the work honestly and carefully. There are no formal qualifications — no degree, license, or professional credential is required. The IAJ deliberately keeps this entry point open because (a) much of the work is patient listening and document inventory, which credentials do not improve, and (b) survivors of human rights violations often serve as Level 1 investigators for other survivors, and that peer relationship has documented therapeutic and evidentiary value.

What is required is the capacity to:

- listen without interrupting, redirecting, or correcting;
- write down what you hear without editorializing;
- read and label documents methodically;
- follow the protocol in this manual even when it feels slow;
- recognize the limits of your role and refer up promptly;
- maintain confidentiality;
- tolerate distressing content without being destabilized by it.

If at any point in your work you find that any of these capacities is failing — for example, you are becoming triggered by the case, you are forming personal opinions about the truth of the allegations, or you are tempted to "help" the complainant by rephrasing what they said — pause and contact your Supervising Investigator. Honest acknowledgement of limits is the most professional thing a Level 1 investigator can do.

Before conducting live intake, Level 1 investigators complete a short practice exercise converting clinical or conclusory phrasing into observational language. Examples: rewrite "complainant has PTSD" as "complainant reports intrusive memories and panic since the hearing"; rewrite "the agency lied" as "the agency's statement of [date] is inconsistent with L1-0019"; rewrite "she was visibly traumatized" as "she paused for approximately one minute, cried briefly, and asked to skip the question." The IAJ provides this exercise to incoming Level 1 investigators and confirms completion before assigning a case.

Periodic quality calibration. The IAJ periodically conducts quality-calibration reviews of anonymized or specifically authorized sample files. These reviews test whether Level 1 investigators consistently identify forbidden language, capture provenance, support Issue Map flags with factual bases, and observe role boundaries. They are training tools and institutional discipline checks, not merits review of any case. Results feed back into training; they do not constitute findings.

Before beginning work, every Level 1 investigator signs the IAJ Code of Ethics acknowledgment (Code §15) and completes the conflict-disclosure required by Code §8.1. The Code is binding on Level 1 investigators in the same manner as on all other IAJ investigators; where the Code imposes a stricter duty than this manual, the Code controls. Conflict-disclosure is repeated upon each new case assignment. An investigator who realizes mid-case that a previously undisclosed conflict exists triggers escalation under Section 13.

3. Foundational Principles

The following principles govern everything you do as a Level 1 investigator. They are drawn from the Istanbul Protocol (2022), the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, and the IAJ's own ethical framework.

Do no harm. The act of telling a traumatic story can re-traumatize the person telling it. Conduct interviews in a way that allows the complainant to pause, to take breaks, to skip questions, and to stop the session entirely. Never push, never insist, never react with surprise or distress to anything they say.

Neutrality of record. Record what the complainant says in their words. Do not soften it, do not strengthen it, do not "translate" it into more impressive-sounding language, and do not

summarize ambiguities away. If you are not sure what they meant, ask them to clarify. If they are not sure, record the uncertainty.

Verbatim where it matters. When the complainant describes a specific incident — what a judge said, what a caseworker did, what a clinician wrote — capture the wording as closely as you can. Quoted language matters at higher levels of analysis.

Distinction between observation, inference, and conclusion. Observation: "The complainant said the judge told her to 'stop crying or I'll have you removed.'" Inference: "This suggests the complainant experienced intimidation." Conclusion: "This was CIDT under Article 16." As a Level 1 investigator you record observations only. Leave inference and conclusion to higher levels.

Confidentiality. Case material is confidential. Do not discuss cases with friends, family, or anyone outside the IAJ assignment. Do not store case materials on personal devices unless the IAJ has issued you specific instructions. Do not share documents with the complainant's adversaries, even if asked, and even if the request looks legitimate — refer all such requests to your Supervising Investigator.

Epistemic humility. You are not in a position to know whether the complainant is telling the truth. Higher-level investigators, applying clinical and legal methodology, are sometimes in such a position. You are not. Your record should be neutral as to credibility — neither vouching nor questioning.

Contradictions are assets. When the documentary record disagrees with what the complainant remembers, that is not a problem to hide — it is information Level 2 needs. Contradictions tell the case team where the case is vulnerable, where more proof is required, and where the official record may itself be misleading.

Preserve the trajectory. A single observation about a complainant's state is data; many observations over time are a trajectory. The IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard treats current psychological complaints and behavioral observations as central evidence. Your contact-by-contact log (Section 5.10) is the mechanism for preserving that trajectory before Level 2 analyzes it.

4. What You Produce: The Required Deliverables

By the time you transfer a case to the Supervising Investigator (Level 2), the file must contain the following products. Everything else in this manual is in service of producing them.

Deliverable 1 — The Complete Statement. A single coherent narrative, in the complainant's voice and substantially in the complainant's words. It follows the required coverage scaffold (Section 5.3) and runs from pre-harm baseline to present status.

Deliverable 2 — The Timeline. A chronological list of every relevant event, cross-referenced to documents and witnesses.

Deliverable 3 — The Document Inventory. A provenance-aware register of every document that exists or is believed to exist.

Deliverable 4 — The Three Matrices. Corroboration Matrix (documents that support specific assertions, with strength rating), Contradiction Matrix (documents that contradict or complicate specific assertions, with the complainant's explanation if offered), and Missing-Evidence List (documents that should exist but are not yet obtained).

Deliverable 5 — The Witness Register. Every potential witness, what they may have seen, what documents they may hold, and contact status.

Deliverable 6 — The Issue Map. Neutral-language flags identifying which treaty and rights categories may be implicated, each grounded in a one-sentence factual basis.

Deliverable 7 — The Handoff Memo. A concise transmittal that orients Level 2 to the case, summarizes what is known and what remains open, and identifies urgency flags and recommended next steps.

Deliverable 8 — The Contact Log. A structured, contact-by-contact record of the complainant's self-reported state, observable presentation, breaks, functioning, and safety flags, kept in `inv_contacthistory`. The Contact Log is the Level 1 mechanism for preserving longitudinal information relevant to later review under the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard.

Deliverable 9 — The Session Recordings. Audio or audio-video recordings of every substantive Level 1 contact, captured with the complainant's informed consent and stored according to Section 5.10A. Recordings are a major safeguard against later claims that the L1 led, suggested, or shaped the account; they are stored, not edited, and remain available for review by Level 2 and authorized reviewers under the IAJ's data-handling rules.

Most of these deliverables are structured forms or tables. The Complete Statement (Deliverable 1) and the Handoff Memo (Deliverable 7) are narrative documents that follow required structures specified below. The Session Recordings (Deliverable 9) are stored audio or audio-video files.

5. The Process, Step by Step

5.1 Case assignment and pre-contact preparation

When a case is assigned to you, you will be given access to the complainant's existing record in the IAJ case system — at minimum, the brief complaint they filed at registration and any documents they have already uploaded. Before contacting them, read everything that is there. Make a private working list of:

- the persons and institutions named;
- the dates already provided;
- documents that exist in the file already;
- gaps and ambiguities you will need to ask about;
- topics that may be sensitive (e.g., child removal, medical events, sexual matters) and that you will approach with extra care.

Do not begin your interview with a long list of questions. Begin with an invitation to tell their story. The list you have prepared is a checklist you carry quietly, not a script you read from.

5.2 First contact: introduction, consent, and ground rules

Your first contact has three purposes: to introduce yourself and the IAJ, to confirm informed consent, and to establish ground rules. Make clear that:

- you are a volunteer documentation collaborator, not a lawyer, not a clinician, not a decision-maker;
- nothing you do creates a legal entitlement or guarantees any outcome;
- the IAJ is an independent NGO and has no enforcement power;
- their participation is voluntary and they can pause or withdraw at any time;
- materials they share become part of the IAJ case file and may be used by higher-level investigators, and — only with their separate written permission — in published findings.

Confirm or re-confirm the consents already on file in `inv_consent` / `questionnaire_consent`. If any are missing, do not proceed with substantive interviewing until they are obtained.

Set the ground rules: sessions can be paused or ended at any time; they can decline any question; if they become distressed you will stop and check in; you will write down what they say and will share that record with them so they can correct it. Ask whether they have a support person they would like present, and whether the time and setting are private and safe.

Every contact — starting with this first one — generates a Contact Log entry (see Section 5.10).

5.3 Building the complete statement

The complete statement is built in **five layers,** then assembled against the required coverage scaffold.

Layer 1 — Free narration. Ask an open question and let them talk: “Tell me what happened, in your own words and in any order you like.” Take notes. Do not interrupt. Do not start with legal theories. Do not ask leading questions such as “Did the judge torture you?” Do not feed details back to the complainant unless they are reading their own draft (Layer 5). The free narration is the cleanest and most defensible part of the record — protect it from suggestion.

Be aware of suggestibility. Memory is reconstructive. Research on memory and repeated interviewing shows that leading questions, repeated suggestion, and detail-feeding can alter later recollection in good faith. The operational line, per Code §4.6: you may ask open-ended questions inviting the complainant to clarify or complete an account (“What happened next?” “Can you tell me more about that?” “What do you remember about how the meeting ended?”). You may not propose specific explanations, sequences, or characterizations for the complainant to adopt or reject (“Did the bailiff stop you from speaking?” “So the judge was visibly angry at you?” “Was this when the retaliation began?”). Open-ended invitation is permitted; supplying the proposed content is not. The five-layer method, the read-back step, and the audio-video recording requirement (Section 5.10A) are designed to make any L1 contribution to the account visible. If you catch yourself supplying a detail, a name, a date, or a characterization the complainant has not already offered, stop, note in the Contact Log that you did so, and ask an open question that does not include the supplied content.

Layer 2 — Chronological structuring. Once they have given a free narration, gently restructure it with them in chronological order. Help them anchor a baseline (their life and circumstances before the events at issue began).

Layer 3 — Targeted clarification. For each event in the chronology, ask:

- *When* exactly (date or best estimate);
- *Where* (court, agency office, home, hospital, etc.);
- *Who* was present, named where possible;

- *What was said and done,* with quoted language where they remember it;
- *What document, if any, records this event,* and where it might be found;
- *What happened next* — physically, emotionally, legally, medically, financially, socially — after the event.

Layer 4 — Sensitive areas. Address sensitive topics last, when rapport has been established. Signal in advance. If the complainant becomes distressed, follow the IAJ distress protocol: stop the question, acknowledge the distress, offer a break or rescheduling, do not press.

Layer 5 — Read-back and corrections. Send the draft statement back to the complainant in writing and ask them to read it slowly. Their corrections are part of the record. This step is mandatory — it is the Istanbul Protocol safeguard against memory drift and investigator overreach.

Required coverage scaffold for the final statement

The final statement must address each category below. The complainant's own words control the content and phrasing; the scaffold controls completeness. Sections that do not apply, or that the complainant cannot speak to, are explicitly marked "not applicable," "unknown," or "not yet addressed" — not deleted.

These are factual life-domains, not legal categories. The scaffold organizes what happened in the complainant's life and what institutions did, in plain language. Frame scaffold questions in plain language: ask "what was your life like before this started," not "what was your psychological functioning baseline." The complainant should never feel they are being interviewed against a legal template.

- **1. Pre-harm baseline.** Who the complainant is, their life and circumstances before the events at issue — work, family, health, disability status, prior interaction (if any) with the institution involved.
- **2. First institutional contact.** How and when the complainant first encountered the court, agency, or official; what triggered that contact; what they expected.
- **3. Chronological account of institutional conduct.** Each significant act or omission by officials, in date order.
- **4. Notice given to officials.** What the institution was told and when — about disability, medical condition, danger, prior harm, or any other information that would shape later official responses.
- **5. Requests, objections, and attempts to obtain relief.** Accommodation requests, motions, complaints, appeals, grievances, public-record requests, attempts to escape harm.
- **6. Official responses or non-responses.** What was granted, denied, ignored, delayed, or weaponized.
- **7. Harm reported, by category.** Physical, psychological, family-integrity, liberty/custody, disability, medical, financial, housing, employment, reputational, procedural. Each category gets a paragraph or "not applicable."
- **8. Retaliation or escalation after complaint.** Any harm that followed the complainant's assertion of rights, filing of a complaint, contact with the IAJ, or public speech.
- **9. Present status.** Where things stand today — pending proceedings, current safety, ongoing harms, deadlines.

- **10. What the complainant wants the IAJ to understand.** In their words. Not what they want IAJ to do (which IAJ does not promise), but what they want preserved.

Statement version control

- **Preserve the first-contact raw record as v0.** Your contemporaneous notes from the first substantive interview — the raw record of what the complainant said, including verbatim quotations where captured, before any structuring, drafting, or read-back — are preserved as version 0 (v0) of the statement and never edited. v0 is your contemporaneous record. The audio or audio-video recording of the first substantive contact (Section 5.10A), where one exists, is the authoritative record of what was said and how; v0 sits alongside it as your written contemporaneous account. Both are produced together at handoff.
- Never overwrite a prior version of the statement. Save each version separately with a sequence suffix in the file name, e.g. v0, v1, v2, v3.
- Log every material correction (a change to a date, an actor, a quote, an event, or a harm) with the date of the change, who made it, and why.
- Distinguish four kinds of revision: correction (factual error), clarification (ambiguous phrasing), expansion (newly remembered content), retraction (complainant withdraws a prior statement).
- If a correction changes a material fact, flag it in the Handoff Memo and — if the case has already been transferred to Level 2 — in an Observation Note (Section 10.3).

A complete statement is typically 2,000 to 10,000 words. It is dated, signed by the complainant if they wish, and labeled “Statement of Complainant — drafted with the assistance of Level 1 Investigator [your name], [version], [date].” Both the first-contact raw record (v0) and the final structured statement are produced together at handoff so any reviewer can compare them.

5.4 Building the timeline

The timeline is a separate document, not buried inside the statement. Three rules:

- **One row per event.** Hearings, filings, removals, evaluations, medical visits, communications, and threats each get their own row.
- **Date precision flagged.** Exact dates are exact. If only a month, write “March 2022 (month only).” If only a year, “2022 (year only).” Do not invent precision.
- **Cross-reference every document.** Each row that is evidenced by a document gets the document’s control number (see Section 9). Rows with no document reference are gaps — those are items the timeline tells Level 2 to chase.

Timeline columns (example row in italics):

Date	Event	Persons / Actors	Status	Doc ref	Follow-up needed
2025-03-04	*ADA coordinator denies accommodation request submitted Feb 20*	*ADA coordinator [name]; Judge [name] copied*	*Confirmed by email*	*L1-0007*	*Obtain full email metadata*

Status values: Confirmed by document / Alleged only / Contradicted / Unclear.

5.5 Identifying every available document and building the inventory

Documents are the part of the case that does not depend on memory or credibility. They are also the part most often shortchanged at intake. Take this slowly. Ask about every category below, even those that may not seem relevant — absence of a category is itself information.

- **Court records.** Complaints, petitions, motions, oppositions, replies, declarations, exhibits, orders, minute orders, docket sheets, hearing transcripts, notices, proofs of service, sanctions orders, custody orders, protective orders, bench warrants, habeas petitions, appeals, mandamus petitions, recusal motions, judicial complaints, accommodation requests and responses.
- **Agency records.** CPS, DCFS, APS, police, sheriff, school district, juvenile probation, mental-health agency, hospital social work.
- **Medical records.** Hospital admissions, ER visits, primary care, psychiatric, psychological evaluations, IME reports, prescriptions, lab and imaging. *Do not interpret medical causation.*
- **Evaluations and assessments.** Court-ordered evaluators, custody evaluators, GAL reports, drug tests, parenting capacity evaluations.
- **Communications.** Emails, text messages, voicemails (transcribed if possible), letters, jail messages, court portal messages, agency notices, attorney correspondence.
- **Recordings.** Court audio, agency interviews, phone calls, body-camera footage, security and surveillance footage, supervised-visit recordings. Note retention windows.
- **Financial records.** Bank statements, payment records for evaluators, supervised visits, court fines, transcripts.
- **Educational records.** Where children are involved: IEPs, 504 plans, school disciplinary records.
- **Witness materials and prior IAJ uploads.** Re-inventoried, not assumed.

Provenance: how each document was received

Every document gets a provenance record. Level 1 does not authenticate documents — only Level 2 and above do that — but Level 1 captures the facts that authentication will later need. For each document record:

- **Received from** — complainant, third party, public source, court portal, agency portal, FOIA response, etc.
- **Date received** — when the IAJ obtained the document, not the date on the document.
- **Format** — PDF (native, scan, or export), screenshot, photo, certified copy, transcript, native email/.eml, native document, video, audio.
- **Original available?** — yes / no / unknown. If only a copy, note who holds the original.
- **Completeness** — complete / excerpted / redacted by source / cropped / pages missing. Note exactly what is missing if known.
- **Confidentiality** — Standard / Medical / Juvenile / Sealed / Privileged / Other (specify).
- **Provenance concern flag** — yes / no. If yes, name the concern in neutral language: screenshot only, cropped or excerpted, pages missing, unclear source, no metadata, filename appears altered, redaction by an unknown party, dates inconsistent within the

document. Flag the concern; do not resolve it. Authentication is Level 2 or above. Record the flag in the Notes column.

The inventory table

Assign each document a unique L1 control number (Section 9). Note the change from earlier versions of this manual: the inventory **does not classify documents as corroborating, contradicting, or neutral.** That work is done in the matrices (Section 5.6), statement by statement, because a single document may corroborate one assertion and contradict another. Example row in italics:

L1 ID	File name	Source / received	Format	Description	Conf.	Notes
L1-0007	*2025-03-04_Court_ADA-Denial-Email.pdf*	*Complainant, 2025-09-12*	*PDF export from email*	*Email denying accommodation request filed 2025-02-20; copies presiding judge*	*Std*	*Provenance concern: bcc list redacted by sender; header metadata needed.*

It is acceptable — and often important — for the inventory to include documents that the IAJ does not yet hold. Those entries appear with “Not yet received” in the Source field and also appear in the Missing-Evidence List (Section 5.6.3).

The omissions question

Ask, on the record, at least once during intake: “Are there any documents that exist that you do not want included in the file? Are there any people who could give a different account of these events?” Record the complainant’s answer verbatim, whatever it is — yes, no, refusal, partial, uncertain. This question is not a credibility test and should not be framed as one; it is an opportunity for the complainant to flag known gaps and competing voices. Do not press on a refusal. Record the refusal as a refusal. The honest record of the complainant’s response to this question is one of the most credibility-protective entries the file can contain at higher levels of review.

Proportionality: highly sensitive records

Collect only what is relevant or reasonably likely to become relevant. Completeness is the goal, but not at the cost of unnecessary privacy invasion. The following categories require special handling:

- Sexual history and intimate-conduct records.
- Psychotherapy process notes (distinct from summary clinical records, which may be ordinary medical records).
- Children’s records — medical, educational, psychological, juvenile-court.
- Sealed records under any court order.
- Attorney-client and other privileged communications.

For records in these categories, Level 1 may log the existence of the record (so it appears in the inventory and Missing-Evidence List), but should not solicit, request from third parties, or review

beyond what is needed for that basic logging until Level 2 has authorized further handling. If the complainant volunteers a sensitive record during intake, Level 1 may receive and store it, log its existence, mark it with the appropriate confidentiality flag, and immediately notify Level 2 — do not perform a substantive review of the content. The principle is: identify, escalate, then proceed only with Level 2 direction.

Record what was not collected, and why. When sensitive-category records are believed to exist but are not collected at Level 1, enter them in the Missing-Evidence List with the notation "Deferred to Level 2 under proportionality rule §5.5." This makes the deferred-collection decision visible on the face of the file. A reviewer at any later stage can see exactly what was not pursued and the basis for the deferral, rather than the file appearing to have been silently curated.

5.6 The three matrices: corroboration, contradiction, missing-evidence

Three short tables sit at the analytical heart of the case file. They are what Level 2 reads first. They must be honest, complete, and free of advocacy. The same document may appear in more than one matrix — once for each assertion it bears on.

5.6.1 Corroboration Matrix

Complainant statement	Date	Supporting document (L1 ID)	How it supports	Strength	Follow-up
"The court denied my disability accommodation before the hearing."	*2025-03-04*	*L1-0007 ADA denial email*	*Shows denial issued before the March 10 hearing*	*Strong*	*Obtain email metadata*
"I deteriorated after the hearing."	*2025-03-06*	*L1-0011 ER record*	*Shows acute symptoms two days after hearing*	*Moderate*	*Need pre-event baseline*
"The judge had notice that I was disabled."	*2025-02-20*	*L1-0003 Filed accommodation request*	*Shows notice was filed and served on the court*	*Strong*	*Obtain proof of service*

Strength scale. Strong = the document directly confirms the event. Moderate = the document supports part of the event but not all of it. Weak = the document is consistent but indirect. Unknown = the document may be relevant but has not yet been reviewed. Adverse documents do not belong in this matrix — they go in the Contradiction Matrix.

Strength ratings are intake triage ratings only. They describe how directly a document appears to support a specific statement, for the purpose of routing Level 2 attention. They are not findings of truth, admissibility, reliability, weight, or legal sufficiency. A document rated "Strong" at intake may later be found inadmissible, immaterial, or explained away. A document rated "Weak" may later become central. Per Code §1.4, Level 2 conducts an initial review of the primary preserved materials — statement, v0, session recordings, key documents, timeline — before relying on Level 1's ratings, and is not bound by any rating this matrix records. Level 2 uses the matrices for navigation after initial orientation, not as substitutes for primary review.

5.6.2 Contradiction Matrix

A contradiction classification means only that a document appears inconsistent with a specific statement at intake. It is not a credibility finding. Later review may determine that the contradiction is immaterial, fully explained, the product of record error, or significant. Level 1 does not adjudicate; it preserves.

Do not omit, hide, or minimize contradicting documents. This implements Code §4.6 (preservation of adverse materials), which makes the preservation, documentation, and reporting of adverse materials a methodological and ethical duty equal to the preservation of corroborating materials. The "Complainant's explanation" column is filled in **only if the complainant has voluntarily offered an explanation.** Per Code §4.6, you may ask open-ended questions inviting the complainant to clarify or complete an account when an apparent contradiction surfaces ("Can you help me understand how those two accounts fit together?" "What else do you remember about that day?"). You may not propose a specific explanation for the complainant to adopt or reject ("Could it be that the date in the order is wrong?" "Maybe the bailiff mistranscribed it?"). The complainant's explanation, where offered, is recorded as offered, without embellishment or rephrasing. If they have not offered one, leave the cell blank or write "None offered." Do not invent an explanation; do not coach one.

Complainant statement	Contradicting / complicating doc (L1 ID)	Nature of contradiction	Complainant's explanation (if offered)	Follow-up needed
"No hearing notice was served."	*L1-0015 Proof of service dated 2025-04-01*	*Court record says notice was served*	*Address on file was wrong*	*Obtain envelope, mailing log, address history*
"The judge refused to consider my medical evidence."	*L1-0019 Minute order*	*Order states evidence was reviewed*	*None offered*	*Order transcript to verify*

5.6.3 Missing-Evidence List

Missing item	Why it matters	Who may have it	How to obtain	Priority
Hearing transcript 2025-05-10	*Verify judge's statements during hearing*	*Court reporter / clerk*	*Transcript request via clerk*	*High*
Email header metadata for ADA denial	*Confirm timing and recipient list*	*Complainant / court portal*	*Export raw headers / portal log*	*High*
Pre-incident medical baseline	*Establish deterioration after event*	*Primary care provider*	*HIPAA release & request*	*Medium*

The classification across the three matrices is yours, but the complainant should see it before transfer to Level 2 and have an opportunity to challenge it. Where you and the complainant disagree, record both positions and let Level 2 decide.

5.7 The witness register

List every potential witness. **Do not contact witnesses** without explicit permission from the complainant *and* explicit authorization from your Supervising Investigator.

Name	Role	Contact	What they saw	Date range	Documents held?	Contact status
Jane Doe	*Sister; observed home visit*	*Phone (with consent)*	*Caseworker conduct on 2024-09-12*	*Sept 2024 — Nov 2024*	*Texts with complainant*	*Not contacted; complainant authorized; awaiting L2 sign-off*

5.8 The Issue Map: flagging treaty and rights categories

Flags are not findings. Naming a possible category is a routing aid for Level 2; it is not an assertion that any threshold is met. Each flag must be grounded in a one-sentence factual basis drawn from the case record. If you cannot state a factual basis, do not flag the category.

Treaty flags are routing tools, not investigative targets. Do not ask questions designed to prove a treaty category. Ask questions designed to complete the factual record. If you notice that you have started phrasing questions to confirm a category you already named, stop, return to open-ended factual inquiry, and leave the category analysis to Level 2.

Date each flag; cite contemporaneous evidence. Every flag must be dated at the time it was first entered, and its factual basis must cite specific timeline events with their L1 document IDs as of that date. If new evidence later changes the picture, add a dated note in the same row rather than rewriting the original. The Issue Map should show that each flag was disciplined to the record as it stood when the flag was raised, not retrofitted to evidence gathered afterward.

Use the table form below. Common categories include: UNCAT Article 1 (torture); UNCAT Article 16 (CIDT); disability-access; family-integrity; detention/custody; judicial-process; medical-neglect; retaliation. The IAJ has further identified 24 systemic factors across three levels; do not attempt that classification — it is Level 2 work.

Possible issue	Date flagged	Factual basis (one sentence)	Supporting docs (L1 IDs)	Missing docs	L2 priority
Possible UNCAT Article 16 (CIDT)	*2025-09-15*	*Complainant alleges judge ordered her to “stop crying or be removed” during 3/10 hearing and continued the proceeding despite documented panic onset.*	*L1-0007, L1-0019*	*Hearing transcript 2025-03-10*	*High*
Possible disability-access issue	*2025-09-15*	*ADA accommodation request filed 2025-02-20 was denied by email 2025-03-04 without alternatives offered.*	*L1-0003, L1-0007*	*Court ADA policy*	*High*

5.9 Domain-specific evidence cues

Many IAJ cases recur in a small number of institutional patterns. The cues below help you avoid missing evidence that is central to those patterns. They are cues, not exhaustive checklists — Level 2 may direct you to chase additional items.

Disability and accommodation

- Accommodation requests filed, with date and recipient.
- Medical or clinical letters supporting the request.
- Proof of submission and proof of receipt by the court or agency.
- Court or agency response, denial, delay, or silence.
- Hearings or actions held despite a pending request.
- Records showing deterioration after denial.
- Punishment or sanction for inability to comply.
- Any alternative accommodations offered, accepted, or refused.
- Whether the accommodation request itself was treated as misconduct, manipulation, non-compliance, or grounds for adverse action.
- Loss of rights traceable to the denial — custody, default judgment, sanctions, evidence exclusion, missed hearings, missed deadlines, contempt, or other concrete legal consequence.
- Whether the complainant was forced to participate in a hearing, interview, examination, visitation, detention process, or deadline while impaired, exhausted, medically unstable, cognitively unable, or without the requested accommodation. The harm in disability cases is often not the denial itself but participation compelled in its absence.

Family-integrity / child involvement

- Removal orders, safety plans, supervised-visit conditions.
- GAL appointment, reports, and complaints about the GAL.
- School and pediatric records bearing on child welfare.
- Records of the complainant's compliance with court conditions.
- Records of the agency's compliance with statute and policy.

Detention and custody

- Bond orders, contempt orders, jail-records, intake forms.
- Medical care during detention; medication continuity.
- Grievances filed inside the facility.
- Visit logs and communication restrictions.

Retaliation

- Date of the complainant's assertion of rights or filing of a complaint.
- Date and nature of the adverse action that followed.
- Records of the official's knowledge of the protected activity.
- Comparator cases or boilerplate that suggests pretext.

5.10 Contact Log: emotional and psychological state at every contact

At every substantive contact — intake, follow-up call, video meeting, in-person meeting, document-transfer session, post-handoff check-in — the Level 1 investigator must enter a

structured Contact Log record in `inv_contacthistory`. The Contact Log is not a clinical evaluation. **Level 1 does not diagnose, score, or interpret.** What the log captures is two narrow things: what the complainant *said* about their state, and what you *observed* neutrally about how they presented. Its value to Level 2 is longitudinal — the trajectory of distress, functioning, and safety over many contacts is itself potentially relevant information for review under the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard.

Label self-report and observation separately. Do not merge the two. A self-reported statement ("I haven't slept since the order") goes in the self-report field; an observation ("repeated the same sentence three times") goes in the observation field. Mixing them creates the appearance of clinical inference and makes the entry harder to defend later.

Record composure as well as distress. If the complainant is calm, composed, focused, energetic, or recovered during a contact, record that just as you would record agitation. A Contact Log that records only distress, never settling or composure, is unbalanced on its face and looks pathologizing on cross-examination. The trajectory is only meaningful if it shows the full range of the complainant's state across contacts.

Contact Log entries are not clinical findings. They are not mental-status examinations, diagnoses, or opinions on causation. They are contemporaneous intake observations and self-reports preserved for later review. Any clinical or causal use of the Contact Log requires a licensed clinician at the clinical Level 3 or 4 of the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard; Supervising Investigators route it, they do not make clinical findings.

Required fields for every contact

Field	What to enter
Date and time	Exact date and time (with timezone) of the contact.
Mode	Phone, video, in person, email, text, portal, jail call, written letter.
Duration	Length of the contact in minutes.
Participants	Whoever was present — you, the complainant, support person, interpreter, any third party.
Purpose	Intake / timeline-building / document review / Layer-5 read-back / follow-up / scheduled check-in / emergency.
Self-reported state	What the complainant says about mood, sleep, fear, pain, exhaustion, distress, panic, functioning, safety. Use their words where possible.
Observable presentation	Neutral observations: crying, long pauses, rapid speech, flat affect, difficulty concentrating, loss of chronology, shaking, needs for repetition, eye contact, change across the session.
Triggering topics	Topics that appeared to increase distress, with the topic identified.
Breaks	Offered / accepted / refused / duration / effect on the complainant after the break.
Functional capacity	Could the complainant continue safely and meaningfully? Was the session shortened, rescheduled, or escalated?
Safety flags	Self-harm, harm to others, child danger, jail danger, medical crisis, retaliation. If yes, escalate (Section 13) before completing the log entry.
Documents discussed	L1 control numbers of documents reviewed or transferred during the contact.
Material statement changes	If the complainant materially changed any prior statement during this contact, note the version number generated and the nature of the change.

Field	What to enter
Verbatim quotes	Exact wording of any phrases significant to the case, in quotation marks.
Follow-up agreed	What you and the complainant agreed comes next, by when.
Escalation	If Level 2 was notified during or after this contact, when and why.

Example entry

A worked example showing what a good Contact Log entry looks like:

```
Date/time:        2025-10-04 14:30 PDT
Mode:             Video call, 45 minutes
Participants:     Complainant and L1 investigator only
Purpose:          Statement Layer-5 read-back and corrections
Self-reported:    “I haven’t slept since the order came down on Wednesday.”
                  “I keep checking the case docket every hour.”
Observation:      Spoke rapidly; repeated the same sentence three times;
                  asked twice whether the recording was on. Lost the
                  chronology between September and October events and
                  asked to return to that section later.
Triggering:       The September 18 hearing description.
Breaks:           One break offered, accepted, 8 minutes; complainant
                  returned appearing more settled and continued.
Functional:       Continued to end of session; did not request reschedule.
Safety:           No self-harm flags. Complainant noted her sister is
                  staying with her this week.
Documents:        Reviewed L1-0019 (minute order). Complainant unable to
                  locate L1-0022; will look this weekend.
Corrections:      Material correction to Sept 18 entry — judge’s exact
                  words remembered differently than first draft. Statement
                  v3 generated; v2 retained.
Follow-up:        Re-attempt L1-0022 next Tuesday; confirm corrected v3 by
                  written response within 7 days.
Escalation:       None this contact.
```

Permitted language (observational, self-reported)

- “Complainant stated she has not slept since Tuesday.”
- “Complainant cried while describing the September 18 hearing.”
- “Complainant paused for approximately one minute and asked to stop.”
- “Complainant lost the chronology three times while reconstructing March.”
- “After a 10-minute break, complainant stated she could continue.”

- "Session ended early because complainant reported exhaustion and could not continue safely."
- "Complainant stated, 'I feel like I cannot survive another hearing.'"

Forbidden language (interpretive, conclusory, clinical)

- "Complainant has PTSD." / "Complainant is depressed."
- "Complainant was dissociating."
- "Complainant is credible / truthful." / "Complainant is malingering."
- "Complainant's affect proves torture."
- "The court caused psychological trauma."

If you find yourself reaching for clinical or evaluative vocabulary, rewrite the entry as what was said and what was seen. Level 2 supplies the meaning; Level 1 supplies the record.

5.10A Audio and audio-video recording of contacts

Recording is a major safeguard against later claims that the Level 1 investigator led, suggested, or shaped the complainant's account. It does not eliminate every reliability question — some attacks are independent of any one session — but it allows later reviewers to evaluate the interview process directly, rather than relying solely on the L1's contemporaneous notes. The IAJ requires audio or audio-video recording of every substantive Level 1 contact wherever lawful, technically feasible, and consented to by the complainant. This implements Code §4.5 (contemporaneous recording) at the Level 1 tier; the prohibition on covert recording in this section implements Code §9.2 (lawful methods).

Consent

- Recording is conducted only with the informed, voluntary, written or recorded oral consent of every person whose voice will be captured — the complainant, and any interpreter, support person, family member, advocate, or other third party present at the session. This is the operational implementation of Code §4.5. Recording proceeds only after every voice in the room has consented. Never record covertly. Never record without disclosure.
- **Risk of recording must be explained before consent.** Recording preserves what was said, but a recording is also sensitive material that may be reachable through valid legal process and that could create risk if mishandled or disclosed — particularly for complainants in family-court, custody, immigration, employment, jail, medical, or retaliation-exposed situations. The complainant must understand this before consenting. Refusal carries no negative inference, no impact on case handling, and no pressure to reconsider.
- **Disclose discovery exposure at intake.** Recordings and other materials preserved by the IAJ may become subject to discovery, subpoena, or other compulsion (Code §4.5, §4.6). This includes adverse materials preserved in the Contradiction Matrix and the Missing-Evidence List, not just recordings. The complainant must be informed of this exposure as part of their decision to participate — not after-the-fact when a subpoena arrives. Document the disclosure in the case file.
- The consent form (or scripted oral consent) explains: that the session will be recorded; that every person whose voice will be captured must consent; that the recording is

stored in the IAJ case file; who will have access to it; that it may be reviewed by Level 2 and qualified reviewers; that it may be reachable through valid legal process (see Section 12); that recording itself may create risk as well as protection; and that the complainant can withdraw consent to future recording at any time.

- The complainant may consent to audio only or to audio-video. Audio-only is acceptable when the complainant declines video; do not pressure for video. Audio-video adds value where observable presentation is part of the record (Contact Log), but audio alone preserves the words — which is the principal protection.
- If the complainant or any other person whose voice would be captured refuses recording, document the refusal in the Contact Log and proceed without recording. Do not press. A refused recording is a recorded fact that travels with the file.
- **Contingency rule when a third party present does not consent.** If an interpreter, support person, family member, advocate, or other third party present at the session does not consent to recording, you have three options: (i) conduct the session without recording and document the reason; (ii) ask the non-consenting person to step out for the recorded portion of the session, *but only if it is appropriate and safe to do so* and the complainant agrees — do not exclude a support person whose presence is necessary to the complainant's safety, comprehension, language access, or ability to participate; or (iii) reschedule with Level 2 direction. Do not pressure the non-consenting person. Document the option taken and the reason in the Contact Log.

Settings where recording is not possible

Some settings prohibit or impair recording: many jail and prison visiting areas, courthouses, juvenile facilities, certain agency offices, and one-party-consent jurisdictions where the other party in earshot has not consented. When recording is not possible:

- Document the reason in the Contact Log.
- Take more detailed contemporaneous notes than usual.
- If feasible and lawful, conduct a follow-up recorded session that revisits and confirms the unrecorded material.
- Do not attempt covert recording to work around the limitation. Covert recording, even where technically lawful, destroys the integrity of the methodology and exposes the IAJ and the complainant to legal and ethical liability.

Storage, integrity, and access

- **Storage.** Recordings are uploaded to the IAJ case system in their native format as soon as practicable after the contact, with a file name following the document-naming convention (Section 9): e.g. `2026-05-10_Recording_Intake-Session-1.m4a`. Each recording receives an L1 control number and is logged in the document inventory.
- **Integrity.** Recordings are never edited, trimmed, redacted, or re-encoded. If a portion of a recording is sensitive (e.g., reveals a third party's identity), it is preserved in original form, and Level 2 decides how to handle review and any later redacted-derivative versions. The original is sealed and unaltered.
- **Access.** Access is limited to the L1 on the case, the assigned Supervising Investigator, and qualified reviewers authorized for the case. "Authorized reviewers" means persons specifically assigned to the case (or to a documented quality-control role bearing on the case), bound by the Code of Ethics through the Code §15 acknowledgment, and granted

need-to-know access by the IAJ. Broad institutional access to recordings is not permitted. The complainant may request access to their own recordings; Level 2 processes the request consistent with consent, third-party privacy, safety concerns (including risk in ongoing proceedings), legal process, and IAJ retention rules. The IAJ does not share recordings externally without explicit written consent from the complainant or valid legal process.

- **Retention.** Recordings are retained for the life of the case plus any IAJ retention period applicable to the matter. They are not deleted to save space or because the L1 has moved on.

Withdrawal of consent

A complainant may at any time withdraw consent to future recording. Withdrawal does not retroactively delete existing recordings; it ends recording going forward. The L1 logs the withdrawal in the Contact Log with the date and any reason the complainant offered. If the complainant requests deletion of prior recordings, do not delete on your own — escalate to Level 2. Code §4.5 requires the IAJ's operating protocols to specify which of three options applies to existing recordings after withdrawal: destruction, sequestration without further use, or preservation under restricted access. The IAJ's current operating policy is **preservation under restricted access**. Withdrawal ends future recording. It does not automatically destroy or erase recordings already made. Existing recordings are preserved under restricted access unless the IAJ Director or authorized Supervising Investigator determines that sequestration without further use or destruction is required by law, safety, court order, the scope of the original consent, or other controlling obligation. Level 1 investigators must not delete, alter, move, copy, or release any recording after withdrawal; the request is escalated to Level 2 immediately. The complainant is informed of this policy at the time of consent and again at the time of withdrawal.

How recordings interact with v0 and the Contact Log

- **Where complete and technically usable, the recording is the primary source for what was said during the recorded portion of the contact.** It does not replace the Contact Log's role in documenting context, breaks, technical interruptions, observations, and follow-up. Recordings may fail, start late, drop frames, miss off-camera context, or be partially inaudible; the Contact Log fills those gaps.
- **v0 remains the L1's contemporaneous written record.** v0 is your real-time understanding and capture; the recording is the underlying source. Both go to Level 2 together.
- **The Contact Log notes that a recording was made and gives its L1 control number.** It does not transcribe the recording — Level 2 may order transcription separately if needed.

Transcription policy

If a recording is transcribed for case use, the following rules apply:

- Machine-generated transcripts must be marked machine-generated until reviewed by a human against the recording.
- **Machine and AI-assisted transcription carry known risks** of error, omission, mishearing, dialect or accent bias, and outright hallucination of words that were not spoken. Machine-generated transcripts are not reliable as a standalone record. They are

working drafts for human review against the recording only. The recording, not the transcript, controls (see below).

- Each transcript is linked to the recording's L1 control number in the document inventory.
- Transcripts are labeled as draft until reviewed; final-reviewed transcripts are labeled accordingly with reviewer name and date.
- The recording controls. Any discrepancy between transcript and recording is resolved in favor of the recording, and the discrepancy is noted in the inventory.
- Level 1 does not produce or rely on transcripts for any analytical purpose. Transcription, where needed, is requested by Level 2 and produced under Level 2 supervision.

Practical note

Recording must use IAJ-approved tools and storage paths. The IAJ provides a current list of approved tools. If an approved tool is not available for a given contact, the L1 may proceed without recording and document the reason in the Contact Log. Personal-device recording is permitted only if the IAJ has issued secure instructions for that device, including secure transfer to the IAJ case system, confirmation of successful storage, and deletion from the personal device after upload is confirmed. A careful unrecorded contact is far better than a recording produced through insecure means.

Recording failure mid-session. If a recording fails, drops out, becomes inaudible, or stops mid-session and the failure is not noticed until afterward, take more detailed contemporaneous notes than usual, document the failure in the Contact Log (when it was discovered, what portion of the session is affected, what is known about the cause), and where practicable conduct a follow-up recorded session that revisits the affected material. Do not attempt to reconstruct what was said in the recording-failed portion from memory in a way that purports to be verbatim; if anything is captured from that portion, label it as L1's contemporaneous reconstruction and not as the complainant's words.

5.11 Completeness test before handoff

Run two checks. The first is procedural; the second is outcome-based.

Procedural checklist

☐ Is consent on file and current?

☐ Is consent (or refusal) for audio/video recording documented for every contact?

☐ Does the statement follow the required coverage scaffold (Section 5.3)?

☐ Are the named officials and institutions identified in full?

☐ Are witnesses listed with role, contact status, and what they saw?

☐ Does every dated event in the statement appear on the timeline?

☐ Does every timeline row have a document reference, or is the gap explicitly flagged?

☐ Does the inventory include provenance for every document?

☐ Are corroborations and contradictions both placed statement-by-statement in the matrices?

☐ Are missing documents in the Missing-Evidence List with priority and source?

☐ Has every Issue Map flag a one-sentence factual basis?

☐ Is there a Contact Log entry for every contact since the case began?

☐ Has the complainant read and approved the statement and matrices, or has disagreement been recorded?

☐ Have I refrained from findings, diagnoses, or legal conclusions?

☐ Has a second reviewer completed the pre-handoff language check on the Contact Log and matrices?

Outcome-based test — the ten questions

A packet is not complete until a Supervising Investigator (investigative Level 2) could answer all of the following without contacting the complainant first:

- What is the complainant alleging?
- What is the exact timeline?
- Who are the alleged state or institutional actors?
- What harm is alleged — physical, mental, financial, family, liberty, medical, reputational, procedural?
- What documents support the account, and how strongly?
- What documents contradict or complicate the account, and how?
- What documents are missing, who may have them, how to obtain them, and how urgent?
- What deadlines or emergencies exist?
- What treaty or rights categories may be implicated, with a factual basis for each?
- What has the complainant's state and functioning looked like across the contacts to date?

If any of the ten cannot be answered from the file, the file is not ready.

Pre-handoff peer review of language

Before transfer to Level 2, a second reviewer reads the Contact Log and the three matrices for forbidden language. The reviewer is a second Level 1 investigator specifically assigned and authorized for quality-control review of the case, or a Supervising Investigator. Reviewers must be bound by the same confidentiality terms as the original Level 1; case access is on a need-to-know basis. The reviewer's task is narrow: scan every Contact Log entry, matrix row, and Issue Map factual basis for clinical terms, diagnostic phrasing, credibility opinions, advocacy framing, or other interpretive language that crosses the Section 7 prohibitions or the forbidden-language list in Section 10.4. Flagged passages are returned to the original Level 1 for rewording in observational terms. The reviewer does not edit the substance and does not interpret the case — the review is a language check only.

Peer review must not erase the original wording. The original entry, the reviewer's concern, and the revised wording are all preserved in the case file's correction log or version history. The purpose of peer review is to prevent interpretive language going to Level 2, not to sanitize the

record. An adversary at later stages must be able to see exactly what was originally written and what was changed.

The peer review is logged in the Handoff Memo: who reviewed, on what date, what was flagged, and whether each flag was resolved. A handoff without a documented peer review is incomplete except in the urgent-transfer case (Section 5.12), where the peer review follows transfer as soon as practicable.

5.12 Transfer and handoff to the Supervising Investigator (Level 2)

Transfer is a formal step. Compile the **Handoff Memo** (template in Section 10.2). Upload all deliverables (statement and v0 raw record, timeline, inventory, three matrices, witness register, issue map, contact log, session recordings) plus the handoff memo. Mark the case as ready for Level 2 review through the workflow stage transition. Notify your Supervising Investigator by message.

Minimum Handoff Packet for urgent transfers

If urgency requires transfer before the Level 1 file is complete — imminent hearing, deadline, custody event, jail transfer, eviction, medical or safety crisis — do not delay handoff in order to complete a full packet. The minimum acceptable packet for urgent transfer must include:

- Current contact information and consent status.
- One-paragraph neutral summary of what the complainant is alleging.
- The urgent deadline or safety issue, stated clearly and with the date.
- A preliminary timeline (rough is acceptable).
- Whatever documents have been received and inventoried so far.
- The Missing-Evidence List as it stands.
- All Contact Log entries to date.
- All session recordings to date.
- Any safety flags already identified.

Mark every incomplete deliverable as “incomplete — transferred early due to urgency,” with the urgency reason noted. Level 2 takes the case from there. Do not let perfectionism delay an urgent escalation — a partial packet on time is better than a complete packet too late.

After transfer, **you do not vanish from the case.** You become an on-call resource — see Section 5.13. The Contact Log continues.

5.13 Continuing availability after handoff

Once Level 2 takes the case, they may come back to you with specific assignments — chasing a missing document, asking the complainant a clarifying question, attending a follow-up interview, transporting materials, sitting with the complainant during a clinical evaluation in a support role (not a witness role), or noting observations from continued contact.

You take directions; you do not freelance. New investigative initiatives are decided at Level 2 and above. If you notice something during continued contact that the case team should know, write it up as an observation note (Section 10.3) and send it up.

You continue the Contact Log. Every conversation, email, and text with the complainant after handoff goes in `inv_contacthistory` with the full set of fields described in Section 5.10.

You watch for changes that should be flagged. Changes in safety, new documents, new incidents, new third parties intervening, deterioration in mental or physical health, or pressure from adversaries — all of these go up to Level 2 promptly, not at the next routine review.

Watch for adverse effects after IAJ contact begins. Record any new adverse action, threat, institutional pressure, retaliation concern, or sudden change in treatment that the complainant reports as following IAJ involvement — a new sanction, a sudden hearing, a missing record, an order with no notice, a custody change, a transfer, an evaluator switch, a new caseworker, an unexplained scheduling change. *Do not conclude causation.* Record the timing and the facts: what changed, when, and what the complainant said about it. Level 2 assesses any pattern. This monitoring matters most where the complainant has expressed fear that contacting the IAJ could worsen their situation.

5.14 Cases involving minor children

This section implements Code §11.3 (Minor Children) at the Level 1 tier. Apply it whenever a minor child's experience is itself a subject of the investigation (including but not limited to child-removal, custody, supervised-visit, foster-care, school-discipline, juvenile-justice, and pediatric-medical cases), or whenever the interests of a minor child may diverge from those of the parent complainant.

Document any apparent divergence of interests between the parent complainant and the child. Examples: the parent's litigation goal is restoration of custody, but the child has formed an attachment to the temporary placement; the parent describes the child's experience in terms that may or may not match what the child experienced; the parent has authority to consent on behalf of the child but the child has independent counsel or a guardian ad litem with a distinct view. Record the divergence; do not resolve it.

Do not characterize the child's experience without competent input. A child's account is not an adult account in smaller form. Competence, suggestibility, attachment dynamics, and the limits of parental knowledge of the child's experience all require methodology Level 1 is not trained to apply. Record what the parent reports about the child; record what documents say about the child; do not infer the child's subjective experience yourself. Where the child's experience is itself the subject of the investigation, flag for Level 2 referral to a qualified pediatric forensic evaluator.

Respect the child's separate consent and information rights, to the extent consistent with applicable law and the child's developmental capacity. **Level 1 does not interview minor children.** Where the child has independent counsel, a guardian ad litem, or court-appointed advocate, document the existence of that representation and route through Level 2 before any contact with the child. Direct contact with a minor child by a Level 1 investigator is permitted only on specific Level 2 authorization, only under a child-specific protocol developed by Level 2 with competent professional input, only with the consent of the child's legal representative (where one exists) and the child where developmentally appropriate, and only where the law permits.

Level 1 does not characterize a child's wishes, credibility, trauma, best interests, alienation, attachment, fear, or safety. Those characterizations require Supervising Investigator review and competent clinical input from a licensed clinician. Level 1 may identify child-related records (with the proportionality rule in Section 5.5 strictly applied) and may record

the parent complainant's account of the child's experience as the parent's account, labeling the source precisely. Level 1 does not infer the child's subjective experience independently of those sources.

Apply CRC interpretive standards. Code §11.3 directs investigators to apply the interpretive standards of the Convention on the Rights of the Child notwithstanding the United States' non-ratification. For Level 1 purposes, this means: best-interests-of-the-child framing in the Issue Map's factual bases, family-relations and identity preservation as harm categories in the statement scaffold, and disability-and-special-needs accommodations as a routine inquiry where the child has identified needs.

In every case involving a minor child, the Issue Map should consider — with a one-sentence factual basis as for all flags — whether possible CRC issues (best interests, arbitrary separation under Article 9, family-relations under Articles 8–9) and whether possible CRPD issues for a child with disability are implicated. Level 2 decides whether the flag survives review.

6. UNCAT and CIDT Screening Aid

This list is a memory aid for what to look for and document, not a checklist to score the case against. Level 1 does not assess whether any threshold is met. If indicators are present, that fact belongs in the Issue Map as a flag, with a one-sentence factual basis; the legal analysis is Level 2's.

This section is used after free narration and chronology have been recorded, not before. It is not an interview script. Do not ask leading questions designed to elicit treaty elements ("Did the judge intend to coerce you?"). Ask open factual questions and let the indicators emerge from what the complainant tells you, the documents reveal, and your contemporaneous observations. The same anti-confirmation rule that governs the Issue Map (Section 5.8) governs this section: treaty categories are routing aids, not targets.

Possible UNCAT Article 1 (torture) indicators

- Severe physical or mental pain or suffering reported.
- Intentional infliction, instigation, consent, or acquiescence by a public official.
- Person acting in an official capacity (judge, agency staff, law enforcement, court-appointed evaluator, jail or detention staff, contractor with delegated authority).
- Apparent purpose: punishment, coercion, intimidation, discrimination, information extraction, family control, litigation suppression, disability-based procedural pressure.

Possible UNCAT Article 16 (CIDT) indicators

- Humiliation, degradation, or coercive proceedings.
- Threats or intimidation.
- Discriminatory treatment.
- Denial of disability accommodation leading to punishment or harm.
- Isolation or sensory deprivation.
- Procedural cruelty.
- State acquiescence in private abuse connected to proceedings.

Evidence-gathering prompts for UNCAT/CIDT screening

Convert each indicator into specific evidence-gathering questions. The table below maps UNCAT analytical elements to what Level 1 should ask and the kinds of documents that bear on each.

UNCAT element	Factual questions for Level 1	Documents to look for
Severe pain or suffering	What harm is reported? How long has it lasted? What records show it?	Medical and psychiatric records, statement of complainant, Contact Log, declarations, messages
Public-official involvement	Which official, agency, court, evaluator, contractor, or delegated actor?	Orders, agency letterheads, hearing transcripts, ID and contract records
Intentionality / foreseeability	What did the official know? When did they know it? What notice was given?	Notices, motions, ADA requests, prior complaints, served filings, certified-mail receipts
Purpose	Punishment, coercion, intimidation, discrimination, information extraction, family control, litigation suppression?	Threats, sanctions, transcripts, public statements, contemporaneous communications
Acquiescence	Who had the power to stop it and failed to act?	Supervisor records, grievance records, complaints filed up the chain, agency policies
Vulnerability	Disability, detention, child custody, dependency, medical fragility, isolation?	Accommodation requests, medical records, custody orders, intake assessments
Cumulative pattern	Was this one event or repeated institutional conduct?	Timeline, docket entries, repeated denials, pattern of orders, cross-case comparators

Harm indicators to document (reported, not diagnosed)

- Trauma-type symptoms reported — such as intrusive memories, panic, fear responses, avoidance, feeling detached, inability to track time, collapse, or reported functional decline.
- Sleep loss; cognitive decline; neurological, cardiac, or immune deterioration.
- Suicidal ideation or self-harm risk — *this triggers immediate escalation, see Section 13.*
- Family-separation trauma.
- Loss of housing, employment, liberty, medical care, or functional capacity.
- Fear of court, agency, jail, or official retaliation.

Record what the complainant reports. Do not name a condition. Permitted: “Complainant reports she has not slept more than three hours per night for several weeks.” Not permitted: “Complainant has insomnia / depression / PTSD.”

7. What Level 1 Investigators May NOT Do

The prohibitions in this section operate alongside the IAJ Code of Ethics, particularly §10 (prohibited conduct), §8 (conflicts of interest), and §7 (confidentiality). Where the Code imposes

a stricter duty than this manual, the Code controls. The list below identifies the prohibitions most often encountered at intake; the Code list is binding in full.

If a complainant asks you to do any of the following, decline politely and refer them up.

- **Do not give legal advice.** Not on filing, not on appeals, not on strategy, not on what to say in court.
- **Do not provide clinical advice, conduct clinical examinations, diagnose conditions, or make clinical findings. You may note a complainant's report of symptoms, and you may document neutral, contemporaneous observations of the complainant's presentation (distress, composure, pauses, functioning), recorded separately from self-reported symptoms, as Section 5.10 requires. Such observations are not clinical assessments or conclusions, and** you may not name or diagnose a condition.
- **Do not make findings** — not of credibility, not of legal violation, not of fact.
- **Do not opine on credibility** in writing. If you have private impressions, share them only with your Supervising Investigator, marked as impression, not record.
- **Do not contact third parties** named in the case — adversaries, witnesses, officials, agencies — except as specifically authorized in writing by Level 2.
- **Do not publish, post, or share anything** about the case on social media, in conversation, or in any forum. This is true forever, not just during the active case.
- **Do not accept gifts, payment, or favors** from the complainant beyond what the IAJ authorizes.
- **Do not develop a personal relationship** with the complainant outside the IAJ assignment.
- **Do not enter sensitive personal data** — SSNs, financial account numbers, passwords, medical record numbers — into the IAJ system unless explicit instructions and a secure mechanism are provided.
- **Do not "fix" inconsistencies** in the complainant's account. Record them.
- **Do not destroy, alter, or selectively quote** documents the complainant has provided.
- **Do not authenticate documents.** Provenance is captured; authentication is Level 2 or above.
- **Do not coach** the complainant on what to say or how to frame events.

8. Mapping Level 1 Work to the IAJ Case System

The IAJ case system already has the screens you need. Use them as follows:

Section in the system	What Level 1 records there
inv_preamble	A brief framing paragraph: who the complainant is, the institutional setting (e.g., family court, CPS), and what is alleged in two or three sentences. Neutral tone.
inv_consent / questionnaire_consent	Verify and, where missing, complete consent records before substantive work.

Section in the system	What Level 1 records there
inv_contacthistory	The full Contact Log (Section 5.10): one structured entry per contact, with all required fields. Non-negotiable.
inv_initial_assessment	The complete statement (Deliverable 1) plus, separately, the timeline (Deliverable 2).
Documents module / documents table	Upload each document with L1 ID, file name (Section 9), date, source, provenance fields, confidentiality, and description.
inv_impressions	Use sparingly. Record only observations of fact — the contact log is the primary place for state observations now.
inv_scope	Do not write here. Scope is set at Level 2.
inv_findings	Do not write here. Findings are produced at Level 2 and above.
inv_publications	Do not write here.

The three matrices, witness register, and issue map are kept as separate documents attached to the case until or unless the system gains dedicated fields. File them as: `[Case ID]–Corroboration–L1.docx`, `[Case ID]–Contradiction–L1.docx`, `[Case ID]–Missing-Evidence–L1.docx`, `[Case ID]–Witness-Register–L1.docx`, and `[Case ID]–Issue-Map–L1.docx`.

System-entry discipline

- Do not upload a duplicate of an already-logged document. Link to the existing L1 ID instead.
- Do not overwrite originals. Redacted and unredacted versions are stored side by side, both linked to the same L1 ID with version suffixes.
- Set the confidentiality flag (Standard / Medical / Juvenile / Sealed / Privileged) at upload, never as an afterthought.
- Material corrections by the complainant are logged in the Contact Log, not silently incorporated.

9. File Naming and Document Control

Every document gets a Level 1 control number and a uniform file name.

Control number format: `L1-0001`, `L1-0002`, `L1-0003`, and so on, assigned sequentially in the order you log documents.

File name format: `YYYY-MM-DD_Source_Document-Type_Short-Description.pdf`

Examples:

```
2025-03-04_Court_ADA-Denial-Email.pdf
2025-03-06_Hospital_ER-Visit.pdf
2025-05-10_Court_Minute-Order.pdf
2025-05-10_Complainant_Hearing-Notes.pdf
Unknown-Date_CPS_Case-Plan.pdf
```

Use the actual document date, not the date you received it. If the document has no date or the date is unknown, prefix with “Unknown-Date.” Use hyphens within name segments, underscores between segments. Avoid spaces, slashes, and punctuation other than hyphens and underscores.

When you receive a corrected, redacted, or extended version of a document, append a version suffix: e.g., L1-0007v2 with file name ending …-v2.pdf. Never overwrite v1.

10. Templates

Blank fillable versions of every form referenced in this manual are in Appendix B. The templates in this section are concise text skeletons; the full forms in Appendix B include field-by-field structure, consent text, signature lines, and the cross-references each form implements. Use Appendix B for live cases; the skeletons below are for quick reference.

Form-control rule. If a conflict exists between a blank form in Appendix B and the body of this manual, the body of the manual controls (unless the Code imposes a stricter duty, in which case the Code controls). Forms are operational templates. They must be updated whenever the corresponding manual section changes; an outdated form must not be used to evade a current manual requirement.

10.1 Intake interview opening script

“Hello — my name is [____]. I’m a Level 1 volunteer with the Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights. Before we talk about your case, I want to make sure you know a few things about my role.

I’m here to help you tell your story completely and to gather your documents. I’m not a lawyer, I’m not a doctor, and I don’t make decisions about your case. What I do is help build a clear and complete record so the people at the IAJ who do the analysis have everything they need.

“Anything you tell me goes into the IAJ’s confidential case file. It can be used by higher-level investigators at the IAJ. It will not be published or shared outside the IAJ without your separate written permission.

There is one thing about the case file you should know up front. Once materials are in the file — your statement, documents, recordings, anything we record about contradictions or missing evidence — they may be reachable later through a subpoena or court order in some kinds of legal process. The IAJ does not claim a privilege that would shield the file from that kind of compulsion. This is true whether the materials support your account or whether they complicate it. I want you to know that before we start, so it is part of your decision to work with us.

With your permission, I would like to record our sessions — audio only, or audio and video, whichever you are comfortable with. If anyone else is in the room while we talk — an interpreter, a family member, an advocate — they have to consent too, because their voice would also be captured. The recording goes into the case file. Its purpose is to protect both of us: it means there is an exact record of what you said and what I asked, so no one later can claim I put words in your mouth or got your account wrong. You can decline recording, you can withdraw consent to future recordings at any time, and you can ask about access to the recordings of your own sessions. Is recording acceptable to you today?

You can pause at any time. You can decline to answer any question. You can stop the session and reschedule. If something we talk about becomes too hard, please tell me — we will stop or take a break.

One more thing I want to say up front: my job is to record what you remember and what the documents show, and sometimes those are different. That does not mean you are lying. It means we need to preserve both, so the people who analyze the case later have a full and honest picture.

Before we begin, do you have any questions about me, about the IAJ, or about how this will work?"

10.2 Handoff Memo — skeleton

```
HANDOFF MEMO — LEVEL 1 to LEVEL 2

Case ID:
Complainant:
Jurisdiction / court / agency:
Case numbers:
Level 1 Investigator:
Period of L1 engagement:
Total L1 contact hours:

1.  One-paragraph neutral summary.
2.  Key persons and institutions named.
3.  Status of the nine deliverables (statement, timeline, inventory,
    matrices, witness register, issue map, handoff memo,
    contact log, session recordings).
4.  Timeline highlights (critical sequence only).
5.  Evidence status (received / identified / requested / pending).
6.  Corroboration summary (strongest supporting records).
7.  Contradiction summary (most important adverse records).
8.  Missing-evidence priorities.
9.  Issue Map summary with factual bases.
10. Contact Log trajectory (any deterioration, pattern of distress,
    functional changes, safety events across the contacts).
11. Urgency flags.
12. Recommended Level 2 assignments.
13. My continuing availability and contact preferences.
14. Peer language review: reviewer name, date, items flagged,
    items resolved.

Submitted [date].
```

10.3 Observation Note — skeleton (for use after handoff)

```
OBSERVATION NOTE — L1 to L2

Case ID:
Date of observation:
Mode (call, message, in person):
Observation (one paragraph, factual):
Why I think L2 should see this:
What, if anything, I would like to do next:
```

10.4 Permitted vs. not-permitted observation language

Permitted (observational):

- "Complainant cried while describing the May 10 hearing."
- "Complainant paused repeatedly and requested a break."
- "Complainant appeared confused about the sequence between March and April."
- "Complainant stated she had not slept."
- "Complainant could identify the order but did not have a copy."

Not permitted (interpretive / conclusory):

- "Complainant was truthful."
- "Complainant was obviously tortured."
- "Judge X is corrupt."
- "The agency lied."
- "Complainant has PTSD."
- "The court committed torture."

11. Trauma-Informed Conduct in Brief

The IAJ follows the Istanbul Protocol (2022), the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, and IRCT survivor-engagement principles. The Level 1 implementation is:

- **Pace the interview to the complainant, not your schedule.** Ninety minutes allotted, three sessions of thirty needed — do three sessions.
- **Predict and signal.** Tell them what you are about to ask before you ask it, especially for sensitive material.
- **Watch for distress signs.** Long pauses, flat affect, rapid speech, becoming silent, seeming disconnected from the question, reporting feeling detached, losing the thread, tearfulness, physiological signs (shaking, hyperventilation). When you see any of these, stop and check in.
- **Offer breaks before they are needed,** not only after distress has appeared. Document breaks in the Contact Log (Section 5.10) — they are part of the forensic record under the Standard.
- **Avoid disbelief language and "why didn't you" questions.** Ask for documents without implying distrust.

- **Separate memory from documentation.** “What you remember” and “what documents show” are distinct categories; record both, label both, and explain the distinction to the complainant.
- **Record uncertainty honestly.** “Complainant believes” and “Complainant is unsure” are valuable phrasings.
- **Know your distress protocol.** If a complainant indicates risk of self-harm or harm to others, follow the IAJ’s distress protocol — do not improvise. If you do not know what the protocol says, ask before you have a case in which you need it.

12. Confidentiality and Data Handling

The duties in this section implement Code §7 (Confidentiality and Data Protection) at the Level 1 tier. Code §7.4 makes the duty of confidentiality continuing after the conclusion of any particular investigation and after the cessation of the investigator’s role with the IAJ. The Code controls where it imposes a stricter duty than this manual.

Use only the IAJ-issued systems for storing case material. Do not put case documents on personal cloud storage, personal email, or personal devices unless the IAJ has provided you with secure instructions. Do not photograph case documents with a personal phone. Do not discuss cases with anyone outside the IAJ assignment, including spouses, friends, and other volunteers not on the case.

If you receive an inbound request from anyone — adversary, journalist, third party, court — for information about a case you are working on, **do not respond.** Forward the request to your Supervising Investigator immediately.

If you lose a device that has had any case material on it, or you suspect any breach, notify your supervisor the same day.

Before publishing or sharing anything externally about a case (even quoting it in training), confirm with Level 2 what the complainant has authorized. The default is: do not publish; do not share externally; preserve for internal review only unless authorized.

Discoverability of Level 1 files

The IAJ does not represent that Level 1 records are privileged or protected from disclosure. You are not an attorney; your communications with the complainant do not create attorney-client privilege, and Level 1 work product is not work product of a lawyer. Depending on the jurisdiction and the legal process involved, the case file (including session recordings) may be reachable through subpoena, discovery order, or court compulsion. Conduct your work as if every word, every Contact Log entry, every matrix row, and every recording may someday be reviewed by an adversary or read aloud in cross-examination. Do not write or record anything in the file that you would not be willing to defend in that setting. If you receive any legal process touching a case, do not respond directly — see Section 13 (Tiered Escalation): subpoenas trigger same-day escalation.

13. Tiered Escalation

Not all urgent matters are equally urgent. The tiers below distinguish what interrupts everything, what interrupts routine, and what is recorded for the next normal review. Examples are illustrative, not exhaustive.

Tier	Examples	Action
Same day — interrupt everything	Suicidal ideation or recent self-harm. Child in current danger. Ongoing criminal conduct by a public official. Credible threat of physical harm. Subpoena or legal compulsion to produce case materials. Complainant in acute medical or psychiatric crisis. Legal deadline within 48 hours — hearing, filing, custody, jail transport, eviction, or appeal — that may affect liberty, custody, housing, medical care, or preservation of rights. Suspected Code of Ethics violation by any IAJ investigator, staff member, or affiliate (Code §12.1 duty to report). (These escalation categories set the order and speed of notification; they are not time limits on documentation, investigation or referral, none of which is ever barred by the passage of time.)	Contact Supervising Investigator immediately by phone or designated emergency channel. Do not wait for routine reply. Record the escalation in the Contact Log. For Code violations, report in writing to the IAJ Director per Code §12.1; where the Director is implicated, to the alternative reviewer the IAJ designates.
Within 48 hours — interrupt routine	Third party contacts you directly about the case. Suspected device loss or data breach. Conflict of interest realized after assignment. Complainant detained or hospitalized. Evidence-retention deadline pending (bodycam, transcript, surveillance, portal records). Material correction to the statement. Legal deadline between 48 hours and seven days out — hearing, filing, custody, jail transport, eviction, or appeal — that may affect liberty, custody, housing, medical care, or preservation of rights.	Send a flagged message to your Supervising Investigator. Do not wait until the next scheduled review.
Routine — flag in handoff or next review	New document surfaces. New witness identified. Complainant requests reassignment. Scheduled court date 7+ days out. Non-material clarification of prior statement. Complainant pauses or extends a session.	Note in the Contact Log. Flag for Level 2 in the Handoff Memo or the next scheduled review.

When in doubt about tier, default upward. A misclassified routine item that turned out to need same-day action is the costlier error.

14. Self-Care for the Level 1 Investigator

Listening to accounts of serious harm has a cost. The IAJ takes that cost seriously and expects you to take it seriously too.

- Build pauses into your schedule between sessions. Do not stack three intake interviews in a day.
- Notice changes in your own sleep, mood, irritability, or appetite. Vicarious trauma is real and treatable.
- Use the IAJ peer-support channels if you need to debrief — without identifying case details outside what the channel permits.
- If you find yourself preoccupied with a case outside working time, tell your supervisor.
- If a case is the wrong case for you — too close to your own experience, too triggering, too anything — say so and ask to be reassigned. That is a professional act, not a failure.

15. The Level 1 Investigator's Central Rule

Read this aloud before every case, and again before every handoff:

"My job is to preserve the record, not to decide it.

I record what is, not what should be.

I record by recording — audio or video where consent permits — so the record is not just my notes.

I organize the whole record, not one side of it.

I name contradictions; I do not bury them.

I flag categories; I do not declare them.

I record both distress and composure so the trajectory is complete and balanced.

I prepare the facts so qualified investigators can determine what the record supports."

The Level 1 investigator does the foundational work on which every later stage of the IAJ's process depends. Most of it is unglamorous: listening, writing, labeling, filing, double-checking. None of it is unimportant. The IAJ has found cause to investigate governments and institutions for sloppy, hostile, or self-interested investigation of human rights complaints. We hold ourselves to a higher standard, and that standard begins with how a complainant is received in their first hour of contact with us, by you.

Welcome to the work.

This document is issued by the Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights as internal operating guidance. It is not legal advice and creates no entitlement for any person.

Appendix A — Glossary

Plain-language definitions of terms used in this manual. These are working definitions for Level 1 use, not authoritative legal definitions.

Term	Working definition
IAJ Code of Ethics	The governing instrument for all IAJ investigators at every tier. Binding on Level 1 investigators in the same manner as on all others. Establishes duties of independence, impartiality, methodological rigor, epistemic precision, truthfulness, confidentiality, conflicts disclosure, contemporaneous recording, preservation of adverse materials, and accurate representation of work product. The Code controls where it imposes a stricter duty than this manual.
UNCAT	United Nations Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. A human rights treaty the United States has signed and ratified.
Article 1 (UNCAT)	The treaty article defining torture: severe physical or mental pain or suffering, intentionally inflicted, by or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official, for an enumerated purpose. Level 1 flags; Level 2 applies.
Article 16 (UNCAT)	The treaty article covering cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment that does not rise to the level of torture under Article 1 (CIDT). Level 1 flags; Level 2 applies.
CIDT	Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment. Conduct prohibited by Article 16 of UNCAT. Level 1 flags; Level 2 applies.

Term	Working definition
Istanbul Protocol	The United Nations manual (2022 revision) on effective investigation and documentation of torture and ill-treatment. The methodological benchmark the IAJ uses.
IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard	The IAJ procedural and forensic standard for psychological evidence, trauma-sensitive interviewing, evaluator ethics, and documentation. The basis for the Contact Log requirement (Section 5.10).
Acquiescence	An official knew enough about the harm and had the power to stop it, but failed to act. A form of state involvement short of direct infliction. Level 1 flags; Level 2 applies.
Public official	A person acting in an official state capacity — judge, agency staff, law enforcement officer, jail or detention staff, court-appointed evaluator, or a contractor exercising delegated authority.
Corroboration	A document supports something the complainant said — confirming the event, the actor, the date, the harm, or the notice. Documented in the Corroboration Matrix.
Contradiction	A document is inconsistent with something the complainant said. Documented in the Contradiction Matrix, with the complainant's explanation if voluntarily offered.
Neutral document	A document that neither supports nor contradicts the complainant's account but provides context, identification, jurisdictional information, or technical background.
Provenance	The factual record of how a document came to be in the file: who provided it, when, in what format, whether the original is available, whether anything is redacted or missing.
Authentication	The formal determination that a document is what it purports to be. Done at Level 2 or above; not by Level 1.
Accommodation	A modification to an institutional process — a court procedure, an agency meeting, a hearing — to enable participation by a person with a disability. The denial, delay, or weaponization of accommodation is one of the IAJ's recurring case patterns.
Retaliation	An adverse action taken against a person because of their assertion of rights, filing of a complaint, or other protected activity.
Handoff Memo	The formal transmittal from Level 1 to Level 2 that summarizes the case, the status of the deliverables, and the open work.
Contact Log	The structured contact-by-contact record of the complainant's self-reported state and observable presentation, kept in inv_contacthistory. Deliverable 8.
L1 ID	The Level 1 control number assigned to a document, e.g. L1-0001, used to cross-reference the document across the timeline, inventory, matrices, and issue map.
L1 / L2	Level 1 and Level 2 investigator roles. L1 is intake and documentation; L2 is investigation and analysis. Under Code §1.4, L2 and above is the analysis tier (Supervising Investigators, qualified reviewers, clinical and forensic experts, counsel); legal analysis and publication sit there. Clinical evaluation is done by licensed clinicians under the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, whose clinical Levels 1–4 are a different scheme from the investigative tiers: a clinical Level 2 is a supervised clinician, not a Supervising Investigator.

Appendix B — Blank Forms

The forms in this appendix are the printable / fillable versions of every required Level 1 deliverable and consent referenced in this manual. Use them as templates: copy each into a

new case file, fill in the fields, and store as part of the case. Where a form references a Code section, that section is the binding source; the form is the operating implementation.

Forms in this appendix:

- B-1. Code of Ethics Acknowledgment (Code §15)
- B-2. Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure (Code §8.1)
- B-3. Recording Consent Form (Section 5.10A; Code §4.5)
- B-4. Witness Contact Consent Form (Section 5.7)
- B-5. Complainant Statement v0 (first-contact raw record)
- B-6. Complete Statement — required coverage scaffold
- B-7. Timeline (Deliverable 2)
- B-8. Document Inventory (Deliverable 3)
- B-9. Corroboration Matrix (Deliverable 4, part 1)
- B-10. Contradiction Matrix (Deliverable 4, part 2)
- B-11. Missing-Evidence List (Deliverable 4, part 3)
- B-12. Witness Register (Deliverable 5)
- B-13. Issue Map (Deliverable 6)
- B-14. Contact Log Entry (Deliverable 8; one per contact)
- B-15. Handoff Memo (Deliverable 7)
- B-16. Observation Note (post-handoff)
- B-17. Peer Language Review Log (Section 5.11)
- B-18. Minor-Child Intake Notes (Section 5.14; Code §11.3)

B-1. Code of Ethics Acknowledgment

Required before beginning any Level 1 work. Implements Code §15.

I acknowledge that I have read, understood, and agree to be bound by the IAJ Code of Ethics in the version most recently in force. I will conduct myself in accordance with the Code, the Istanbul Protocol (2022), the Paris Principles, the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard, this Level 1 Investigator Operating Manual, and the human rights treaty obligations applicable to the conduct under investigation. I understand that my designation as a Level 1 investigator is conditioned on continued adherence to the Code and that material amendments to the Code will require renewed acknowledgment.

Investigator name (printed)

_____

Code of Ethics version acknowledged

_____

B-2. Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure

Required before each case assignment. Implements Code §8.1. Disclosure duty is continuing (Code §8.3).

Disclose any relationship, financial interest, prior representation, personal acquaintance, public statement, or other circumstance that could reasonably be perceived as compromising independence or impartiality with respect to the complainant, any named accused official, or the matter under investigation. Disclosure is not by itself disqualifying; failure to disclose may be.

Case ID

_____

Complainant

_____

Named accused official(s) / institution(s)

_____

Disclosable relationships, interests, or circumstances (write “None known” if none)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Public statements I have previously made about this matter or these institutions (write “None” if none)

_____

_____

_____

Any other circumstance the IAJ should know

_____

_____

B-3. Recording Consent Form

Implements Section 5.10A and Code §4.5. To be completed before any recorded session. Recording requires consent from every person whose voice will be captured. Refusal carries no negative inference.

I, the complainant, and each other person whose voice will be captured during sessions with the Level 1 investigator, have been told the following, in language we understand:

- Our session(s) with the Level 1 investigator will be recorded, in the format we authorize below.
- Recording requires consent from every person whose voice will be captured (the complainant, and any interpreter, family member, support person, advocate, or other third party present).
- The recording will be stored in the IAJ case file and may be reviewed by Supervising Investigators and qualified reviewers authorized for this case.
- The recording is sensitive material. It may be reachable through valid legal process such as a subpoena or court order. The IAJ does not claim a privilege that would shield the

file from such compulsion. This is true whether the recording supports the complainant's account or whether it complicates it. The same exposure applies to other materials preserved by the IAJ, including statements, documents, and the Contradiction Matrix (Code §§4.5, 4.6).

- Any person whose voice would be captured may decline recording entirely. Declining will not affect how the complainant's case is handled and carries no negative inference against anyone.
- Consent to future recording may be withdrawn at any time. Withdrawal does not delete recordings already made; the IAJ's policy on recordings made before withdrawal is preservation under restricted access (recordings remain in the case file under restricted access for retention, complainant access, and legal-process purposes; Level 1 investigators may not delete, alter, move, or release them; Level 2 determines any further handling).
- The complainant may request access to recordings of their own sessions. The IAJ will process the request consistent with third-party privacy, safety concerns, ongoing proceedings, and applicable law.
- Recordings are preserved unaltered. Covert recording is prohibited.

Please mark the option that reflects your decision:

( ) I consent to **audio-only** recording of substantive sessions.

( ) I consent to **audio and video** recording of substantive sessions.

( ) I **decline** recording. I understand this decision will not affect case handling.

Comments or limitations (optional):

_____

_____

_____

Complainant

Name (printed)	
Decision	( ) consents to audio-only ( ) consents to audio and video ( ) declines
Limitations on consent (if any)	
Signature, or reference to recorded oral consent (L1 recording ID)	
Date	

Consent verified by the Level 1 investigator

Investigator name (printed)	
Signature	
Date	

Other person present whose voice will be captured — Person 1

Name (printed)	
Role	( ) interpreter ( ) family member ( ) support person ( ) advocate ( ) other: _____
Decision	( ) consents to audio-only ( ) consents to audio and video ( ) declines
Limitations on consent (if any)	
Signature, or reference to recorded oral consent (L1 recording ID)	
Date	

Other person present whose voice will be captured — Person 2

Name (printed)	
Role	( ) interpreter ( ) family member ( ) support person ( ) advocate ( ) other: _____
Decision	( ) consents to audio-only ( ) consents to audio and video ( ) declines
Limitations on consent (if any)	
Signature, or reference to recorded oral consent (L1 recording ID)	
Date	

Other person present whose voice will be captured — Person 3

Name (printed)	
Role	( ) interpreter ( ) family member ( ) support person ( ) advocate ( ) other: _____
Decision	( ) consents to audio-only ( ) consents to audio and video ( ) declines
Limitations on consent (if any)	
Signature, or reference to recorded oral consent (L1 recording ID)	
Date	

Attach a continuation sheet for additional persons. Where any person present declines, recording does not proceed with that person's voice captured (Section 5.10A); record the option taken and the reason in the Contact Log.

B-4. Witness Contact Consent Form

Required before any Level 1 contact with a witness. Implements Section 5.7 and Section 7 (do-not-contact-third-parties prohibition). Level 2 authorization is also required separately.

I, the complainant, authorize the Level 1 investigator to contact the witness identified below for the limited purpose specified. This authorization may be withdrawn at any time.

Case ID

_____

Complainant

_____

Witness name

_____

Witness relationship to me

_____

Witness contact information

_____

Purpose of contact (one or two sentences)

_____

_____

Authorized methods of contact (mark all that apply):

( ) Phone call

( ) Email

( ) Text message

( ) In person, with my prior knowledge of date and time

B-5. Complainant Statement v0 — First-Contact Raw Record

Created during the first substantive interview. v0 is preserved as is, never edited. Where a recording exists, the recording is the authoritative record of what was said; v0 is the L1's contemporaneous written capture, including verbatim quotations where captured.

Case ID

_____

Complainant

_____

Date and time of first substantive contact

_____

Mode (phone / video / in person)

_____

Location and others present

_____

Recording made? (audio / audio-video / no — reason)

Recording L1 ID (if any)

Layer 1 — Free narration. Use this space (continue on additional pages as needed) to capture what the complainant said in their own words. Mark verbatim quotations with quotation marks. Use ellipses where you could not capture the exact words. Do not paraphrase into more impressive language.

Notes on L1 contributions (if any). If during the interview you supplied any detail, name, date, or characterization the complainant had not already offered, note it here.

B-6. Complete Statement — Required Coverage Scaffold

Final structured statement. The complainant's words drive the content; the scaffold drives completeness. Sections that do not apply are marked "not applicable," "unknown," or "not yet addressed." Never delete a section.

Case ID

Complainant

Statement version (v1, v2, v3...)

Date

Level 1 investigator

1. Pre-harm baseline. Who the complainant is; their life and circumstances before the events at issue.

2. First institutional contact. How and when the complainant first encountered the court, agency, or official.

3. Chronological account of institutional conduct. Each significant act or omission by officials, in date order.

4. Notice given to officials. What the institution was told and when.

5. Requests, objections, and attempts to obtain relief.

6. Official responses or non-responses.

7. Harm reported, by category. Physical, psychological, family-integrity, liberty/custody, disability, medical, financial, housing, employment, reputational, procedural. Each category gets a paragraph or “not applicable.”

8. Retaliation or escalation after complaint.

9. Present status.

10. What the complainant wants the IAJ to understand.

B-7. Timeline (Deliverable 2)

One row per event. Date precision flagged. Cross-reference every document. Copy the table below as many times as needed; remove blank rows before handoff.

Date	Event	Persons / Actors	Status	Doc ref (L1 ID)	Follow-up needed

Date	Event	Persons / Actors	Status	Doc ref (L1 ID)	Follow-up needed

B-8. Document Inventory (Deliverable 3)

Every document, with provenance. Assign each a sequential L1 control number (L1-0001, L1-0002...). The inventory does not classify documents — the matrices do.

L1 ID	File name	Source / received	Format	Description	Conf.	Notes (incl. provenance concerns)

B-9. Corroboration Matrix (Deliverable 4, part 1)

Strength: Strong / Moderate / Weak / Unknown. Adverse documents go in the Contradiction Matrix, not here.

Complainant statement	Date	Supporting doc (L1 ID)	How it supports	Strength	Follow-up

Complainant statement	Date	Supporting doc (L1 ID)	How it supports	Strength	Follow-up

B-10. Contradiction Matrix (Deliverable 4, part 2)

"Complainant's explanation" is filled only if the complainant voluntarily offered one. Do not invent or coach. "None offered" is a permitted entry.

Complainant statement	Contradicting / complicating doc (L1 ID)	Nature of contradiction	Complainant's explanation (if offered)	Follow-up needed

B-11. Missing-Evidence List (Deliverable 4, part 3)

Documents that should exist but are not yet obtained. Priority: High / Medium / Low. Items deferred under the proportionality rule (Section 5.5) are noted as such.

Missing item	Why it matters	Who may have it	How to obtain	Priority

Missing item	Why it matters	Who may have it	How to obtain	Priority

B-12. Witness Register (Deliverable 5)

Every potential witness. Do not contact without complainant authorization (Form B-4) and Level 2 authorization.

Name	Role	Contact	What they saw	Date range	Documents held?	Contact status

B-13. Issue Map (Deliverable 6)

Flags are not findings. Each flag must be grounded in a one-sentence factual basis drawn from the case record and dated as of when first entered. Categories are routing aids, not investigative targets.

Possible issue	Date flagged	Factual basis (one sentence)	Supporting docs (L1 IDs)	Missing docs	L2 priority

Possible issue	Date flagged	Factual basis (one sentence)	Supporting docs (L1 IDs)	Missing docs	L2 priority

B-14. Contact Log Entry (Deliverable 8 — one per contact)

Complete one entry per substantive contact and enter into `inv_contacthistory`. Label self-report and observation separately. Record composure as well as distress.

Self-reported state (what the complainant said — in their words where captured):

_____
_____
_____
_____

Observable presentation (neutral observations — include composure as well as distress):

_____
_____
_____
_____

Verbatim quotes (any significant phrases, in quotation marks):

_____
_____
_____

B-15. Handoff Memo (Deliverable 7)

Complete and transmit with all deliverables when transferring the case to Level 2. For urgent transfers, see the Minimum Handoff Packet in Section 5.12.

1. One-paragraph neutral summary.

2. Key persons and institutions named.

3. Status of the nine deliverables (statement, timeline, inventory, matrices, witness register, issue map, handoff memo, contact log, session recordings).

4. Timeline highlights (critical sequence only).

5. Evidence status (received / identified / requested / pending).

6. Corroboration summary (strongest supporting records).

7. Contradiction summary (most important adverse records).

8. Missing-evidence priorities.

9. Issue Map summary with factual bases.

10. Contact Log trajectory (any deterioration, pattern of distress or composure, functional changes, safety events across the contacts).

11. Urgency flags.

12. Recommended Level 2 assignments.

13. My continuing availability and contact preferences.

14. Peer language review: reviewer name, date, items flagged, items resolved.

B-16. Observation Note (post-handoff)

Use after handoff to send Level 2 a discrete observation arising from continued contact with the complainant. Do not freelance investigation; record and transmit.

Observation (one paragraph, factual):

Why I think L2 should see this:

What, if anything, I would like to do next:

B-17. Peer Language Review Log

Completed by the peer reviewer before handoff (Section 5.11). The reviewer's task is narrow: scan for clinical terms, diagnostic phrasing, credibility opinions, advocacy framing, and other interpretive language. Original wording is preserved; the audit trail records what was flagged and what was changed.

For each flagged passage, record original wording, the concern, and the revised wording. Copy this block as many times as needed.

Document / section / location

Original wording:

Concern (clinical term / credibility opinion / advocacy framing / other):

Revised wording (after Level 1 rewrites in observational terms):

B-18. Minor-Child Intake Notes

Required whenever a minor child's experience is itself a subject of the investigation, or where the interests of a minor child may diverge from those of the parent complainant. Implements Section 5.14 and Code §11.3.

Apparent divergence of interests (record observations; do not resolve):

_____

_____

_____

_____

Independent representation of the child (GAL, court-appointed counsel, child welfare advocate; name, contact, role):

_____

_____

_____

Documents about the child held or referenced (L1 IDs; do not collect sensitive children's records without Level 2 authorization — proportionality rule, Section 5.5):

_____

_____

_____

Possible treaty/rights flags involving the child (with one-sentence factual basis each — these go in the Issue Map, not here, but draft them here first):

Possible CRC Article 9 (arbitrary family separation)

_____

_____

Possible CRC Article 3 (best interests of the child)

_____

_____

Possible CRC Articles 8–9 (family relations and identity preservation)

_____

_____

Possible CRPD issues (if child has disability)

_____

_____

Other

_____

_____

Recommended Level 2 referrals (pediatric forensic evaluator, child psychologist, child welfare counsel, etc.):

_____

_____

_____

Items I am not investigating further at Level 1 (escalate to Level 2 before any contact with the child; do not interview the child without specific Level 2 authorization):

_____

_____

_____

Level 1 IAJ Investigator: Role Description and Operating Instructions
DATE November 11, 2026
IAJ Document Version Control Log

Document ID: IAJ-STD-20261111-003-PUB
Release Date: 2026-11-11

Version History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
v1.6	2026-11-11	IAJ	harmonizes the Level 1 Operating Instructions with the IAJ Psychological Investigation Standard v1.6 and the Code of Ethics v1.3: the investigative tiers (Level 1 Intake Investigator; Level 2 Supervising Investigator, within the Code's "Level 2 and above" analysis tier) are distinguished from the Standard's clinical Levels 1–4, clinical evaluation is assigned to licensed clinicians under the Standard, and the escalation categories are stated as prioritization rather than time bars. It reconciles the Section 7 clinical-observation rule with Section 5.10 (neutral contemporaneous observations permitted; clinical findings and diagnosis prohibited), corrects the Section 1 hearsay description to the evidentiary rule, and completes the Appendix B-3 Recording Consent Form with per-participant consent, limitation, signature and date fields.
v1.0	2026-05-18	IAJ	Initial release

Classification: IAJ Standard
Access Level: Public
