ORIGAMI NEO INTERNATIONAL



The Architect’s Operating Atlas

Shareholder valuation supplement

Mack Williams | Evidence-grounded V12 working edition

Selected capabilities only • Internal review draft • 14 November 2026

01 / SHAREHOLDER BRIEF

The opportunity, in focus

An evidence-grounded supplement to the supplied valuation report.

Origami Neo and Project Odyssey are presented as an integrated vision for organizing complex knowledge, operational workflows and creative production. The commercial opportunity is to turn carefully defined parts of that vision into repeatable services or products that solve an identifiable customer problem. [S01–S05]

The investment thesis is conditional: demonstrate a working deliverable, establish rights and costs, validate demand, and build controls that let another operator deliver it. A shareholder should be able to follow every material claim back to its source or a documented test.

Important scope statement

Not all of Mack Williams' acumen, training, ideas, creative work, contributions or assets are listed here. This is a selected synthesis of the materials reviewed—not an exhaustive inventory, complete biography, or a ceiling on capability.

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT DOES AND DOES NOT DO

- **Does:** frame the opportunity; map capabilities; examine replacement-cost assumptions; and identify diligence and next steps.
- **Does not:** determine enterprise value, establish securities terms, certify skills, authenticate all claims, or guarantee outcomes.
- **Audience:** internal and approved reviewers. Do not distribute externally without privacy, rights, financial and legal review.

02 / THE ARCHITECT

One vision, many disciplines

The value proposition is integration—not a claim that a person is property.

Mack Williams describes an approach that brings system design, source preservation, knowledge navigation, founder operations, accessibility-oriented thinking and creative production into a connected environment. The materials show broad ambition and a set of planning artifacts; individual competencies and completed outputs need work-sample verification. [S01–S05]

Capability area	Observed in reviewed material	Next proof
Knowledge systems	Proposed source registries, indexing and multi-tier text organization.	Inspect manifests and run a repeatable retrieval test.
Creative operations	A studio planning list spanning MIDI, audio, video and production workflows.	Review one finished piece, session credits and permissions.
Founder operations	A dry-run proposal, invoice, CRM and launch pack.	Document a completed engagement and customer outcome.
Research & governance	Evidence-aware handling and structured review ambitions.	Review authorized samples, controls and independent findings.

A CREATIVE COMPARISON, NOT A CREDENTIAL

“Tony Stark” can be a vivid metaphor for a multidisciplinary inventor-architect. It is not evidence of a degree, clearance, intelligence appointment or superhuman performance. The durable standard is what can be built, measured, documented and transferred.

The capability map is deliberately selective. Additional training, accomplishments and intellectual property may exist outside the reviewed source set.

03 / TECHNOLOGY THESIS

From source to trusted output

A proposed architecture for traceable knowledge workflows.

The source materials describe original files, extracted text, smaller text units, larger volumes, hashes, local retrieval and AI-assisted synthesis. These are design and deployment claims, not a completed technical audit. [S01–S02]

Step	Operational objective	Verification gate
01 · Intake	Record source, custodian, authority, dates and classification.	Original is retained and assigned a stable ID.
02 · Preserve	Hash available bytes; maintain protected independent backups.	Hash and restore checks are logged.
03 · Process	Generate identified text or media derivatives.	Tool, version, settings and errors are recorded.
04 · Connect	Link chunks, source locations, manifests and permissions.	Reconstruction and access tests pass.
05 · Review	Use source-linked retrieval and human review.	Claims, omissions and release permissions are checked.

A hash is not a truth machine

A SHA-256 match supports byte identity; it does not by itself prove authorship, content truth, legal admissibility, completeness, security or an original creation time.

Investor diligence should request a runnable demonstration, representative test fixtures, a manifest, a backup-restore exercise, documented dependencies and an independent security review appropriate to the intended deployment.

04 / MARKET PATHWAYS

Potential offers, testable markets

These are opportunity hypotheses—not representations of existing revenue.

Offer lane	Potential customer need	First proof
Founder operations	Organize a narrow set of content, CRM and decision workflows.	Deliver one scoped cockpit and document customer acceptance.
Evidence-aware knowledge	Make complex records easier to find and review with source links.	Test retrieval with authorized, non-sensitive material.
Studio systems & media	Coordinate production sessions, routing and repeatable handoffs.	Demonstrate a small, reliable workflow and one finished work.
Training & templates	Teach a documented process to another operator.	Observe a participant complete the process independently.
Accessibility-oriented design	Explore tools that make a workflow easier to use.	Conduct consent-based usability and accessibility tests.

The workspace contains an illustrative $2,500 cockpit proposal; it is a draft example, not a confirmed sale, current price, or forecast. No customer pipeline, contract value, margin, or revenue has been independently established for this report. [S04]

A practical sequence is: interview potential users → define one costly problem → build a narrow pilot → measure quality and time → price the repeatable service → decide whether to scale. Each stage can invalidate the initial hypothesis; that is valuable information, not a failure.

Commercial discipline

Any future offering requires accurate disclosures, appropriate securities review, and clear separation of donations, grants, loans and equity. No specific return or liquidity is promised. [P02]

05 / PORTFOLIO & RIGHTS

Make the invisible navigable

From an estimated universe of ideas to a defensible asset register.

Mack estimates more than 2,000 ideas and proprietary concepts. This report treats that as a user estimate—not an audited count of distinct projects, owned assets, protected works, or commercial products. The right answer begins with an inventory.

A usable record should include:

- **Identity:** stable ID, original title, one-line purpose and source location.
- **Provenance:** creator or custodian, event and intake dates, and a hash when original bytes are available.
- **Stage and proof:** idea, research, prototype, tested or deployed—with a supporting artifact.
- **Rights:** authors, collaborators, licenses, ownership agreements and open questions.
- **Market test:** potential user, problem, evidence of demand, next decision and owner.

Preserve source occurrences and flag possible duplicates for human review. Count raw entries, proposed clusters and reviewed unique concepts separately. Original fixed expression may receive copyright protection; copyright does not protect ideas, systems or methods as such. Rights, patents, trade secrets and trademarks require case-specific review. [P01]

Initial pilot

Choose 25 records from authorized sources, preserve provenance, review likely duplicates and inspect 10 records independently. Expand only after the pilot’s error rate and handling process are understood.

06 / VALUATION METHODOLOGY

Price the work, not the person

A replacement-cost model must be anchored to a defined scope.

The original materials propose that a multidisciplinary team might be needed to reproduce or maintain portions of the work. This is a staffing hypothesis, not proof that one person replaces a particular number of employees. Capabilities, hours, ongoing staffing, historical project cost and enterprise equity value are different measures. [S01–S02]

Model component	Question to answer
Deliverable	What specific output, quality standard and deadline are being replicated?
Labor	Which roles are needed, for how many hours, with what overlap removed?
Rates	What wage or contractor rate, geography, reference year and burden apply?
Nonlabor	Which software, hardware, hosting and review costs are incremental?
Validation	Can another team reproduce the result or provide a comparable quote?

Formula: role cost = role-hours × hourly rate × (1 + documented burden). Add separately supported nonlabor expenses; exclude double-counted work. Develop low, base and high cases and state all assumptions.

Illustration only: 2,080 hours × $100/hour = $208,000 in assumed direct labor. This is arithmetic, not a wage benchmark, enterprise value, or a finding about Mack’s actual output.

BLS OEWS supplies occupational wage and employment statistics; it does not determine the number of workers required by a particular project. Replacement cost must not be presented as investor return, business equity value or proven damages. [P03]

07 / RECONCILIATION

The numbers require repair

Arithmetic checked; assumptions and primary evidence remain unresolved.

Source claim	Reconciliation	Status
28–38 FTE	Range totals correctly; PDF narrative also says 28–36.	Scenario only; staffing is unverified.
$3.85m / year	Markdown lines add to $4.05m; PDF lines add to $3.85m.	Different tables; investigate $200k difference.
PDF loaded labor	4 × $162,486 = $649,944, versus $580,000 listed for that division.	Line cost conflicts with low-end staffing.
$26.95m / 7 years	$3.85m × 7 is arithmetically correct.	Assumes a full, unchanged team for all seven years.
44:1 efficiency	$26.95m ÷ $600k ≈ 44.9.	Not ROI; source says $600k or more and numerator is unverified.
32,000 hours	About 87.9 hours/week over 364 weeks.	Estimate requires logs and attribution.

The underlying figures are source assertions, not independently validated data. The corpus, file and notebook counts also need a documented counting method and a reconciliation of how volumes are distributed. Future 4.5×, 12× and 35× output figures lack an established baseline and should not be used as forecasts. [S01–S02]

Investment takeaway

An audited, reproducible scope and supporting records must come before a defensible replacement-cost range or any valuation conclusion.

08 / GOVERNANCE & RISK

Build confidence through controls

A responsible shareholder story includes the questions that remain open.

Diligence area	Required evidence
Entity & authority	Formation and good standing, governing documents, cap table, signatory authority and tax status.
Intellectual property	Chain of title, assignments, contributor agreements, third-party licenses and confidentiality controls.
Finance & customers	Financial statements, liabilities, invoices, signed agreements, cost records and referenceable outcomes.
Technology & security	Architecture, dependencies, tests, recovery evidence, permissions and an appropriately scoped assessment.
Claims & disclosure	Source-linked claim register and legal, financial, privacy and securities review before circulation.
Continuity	Runbooks, backup ownership, cross-training and independent operator exercises.

The source PDF describes legal entities, fiduciary roles, a charitable structure, liens and other arrangements. Those descriptions have not been independently established by this supplement. A label such as “confidential” or “privileged” does not itself settle a legal question. [S01]

Separate clinical, family and litigation details from the commercial edition unless specifically authorized and professionally reviewed. Avoid publishing names, medical details, private contact information, allegations or protected materials merely because they appear in a source.

09 / EXECUTION

The path from vision to proof

A staged plan designed to be measured, not assumed.

DAYS 1–14 / FOUNDATION

- Confirm owner, scope, approved source permissions and privacy-safe workspace.
- Complete a 25-record inventory pilot and reconcile the source valuation tables.
- Select one demonstrable technical workflow and one creative work; define acceptance criteria.

DAYS 15–30 / DEMONSTRATION

- Run a controlled test with authorized data and a second operator; record time and errors.
- Conduct consent-based customer discovery, if approved, and document objections as well as interest.
- Review entity status, IP ownership and capital structure with appropriate professionals.

MONTHS 2–12 / INSTITUTION

- Develop a repeatable service, standard operating procedures, backups and independent operator training.
- Track actual signed work, delivery quality, revenue, costs and customer retention.
- Recalculate staffing and financial scenarios only from verified results and explicitly stated assumptions.

No guaranteed multiplier

The roadmap is proposed. No funding, settlement, deployment, revenue or 4.5× / 12× / 35× performance is guaranteed or represented as completed.

10 / REVIEWER CHECKLIST

A practical diligence request

Prioritize evidence that changes a decision.

Request	What it resolves
One demonstrable product	What works, for whom, and under which conditions?
Versioned repository & test logs	Who contributed, what changed, and can the work be repeated?
Asset and rights register	Which works are owned, licensed, jointly authored or still uncertain?
Costs and financial records	What was actually spent, earned and committed?
Customer and delivery records	Is there documented demand, adoption and measurable benefit?
Governance documentation	Who can make decisions, receive funds and authorize disclosure?
Privacy and security evidence	What data can be used, where, by whom and with what controls?

A first external discussion should focus on a small number of well-supported claims, a clear customer problem and a credible next milestone. The evidence room should expand only as permissions, reviewer needs and appropriate professional safeguards are established.

Coverage limitation

The absence of a skill, experience, project or creative discipline from this document is not evidence that it does not exist. Additional acumen and work can be added as sources are identified and reviewed.

11 / SOURCES & METHOD

Traceability, not mythology

Sources are linked where practical; the original materials remain authoritative as source objects.

S01. Source Notion report and attached 11-page shareholder PDF, especially pp. 3–9. Statements are attributed to that document, not independently established. Open source page.

S02. User-supplied origami-neo-master-manual-v12 (1).md; two attached copies match at SHA-256 253aff7c7ef9442788e10a8d6fad1d7a0075a088da599a1f9b0c14c06600ac77. A matching digest establishes byte identity, not truth.

S03. Project Odyssey command manual — vision and mission outline.

S04. Pre Run Dry — illustrative proposal, invoice and founder-cockpit plan.

S05. No Edit Productions 360 — creative production to-do list.

P01. U.S. Copyright Office: What does copyright protect?

P02. Investor.gov: private placements under Regulation D

P03. Bureau of Labor Statistics: OEWS overview

METHOD & LIMITATIONS

Prepared from the existing master manuscript and the sources listed above. Arithmetic was independently recomputed from the reported figures; neither the underlying records nor every past chat and project were audited. No new financial, legal, clinical, or security opinion is expressed. The original PDF's file digest recorded in the master manuscript is 77c6cdf16f4ad12dc147ec37e84c209c73543b6f6709145db2796d6de2c031f0.

The principle

Build with imagination. Publish with evidence. Protect the person, preserve the source, and let the work earn its own scale.