OUBAS

THE OUBAS DOCUMENTARY SERIES

EPISODE 0

FOUNDER INTERVIEW

Institutional Memory, Accountability & Legacy

A foundational interview across Volumes I-XII

EPHRAIM MBUSO DLAMINI

Professional Engineer | Founder of the OUBAS Institute

LOCKED MASTER v1.1

11 August 2026 | Production Script

EDITORIAL & EVIDENTIAL NOTE

Episode 0 is an oral-history and institutional-memory interview. The answers below are drafted in the Founder's first person from the supplied OUBAS source material. They are not intended to convert recollection, interpretation or disputed allegations into adjudicated fact.

The governing documentary principle is that memory introduces the record; evidence must test it. Where a matter remains disputed, under investigation or subject to judicial, regulatory or other review, the interview should say so expressly. The documentary record, source documents, court record and later verified evidence remain authoritative for factual verification.

Source boundary for this locked version: substantive source files supplied in this conversation cover Volumes I-VI and IX-XII. Volumes VII and VIII were not supplied as standalone source files. This Episode therefore does not invent substantive facts for those missing volumes. It speaks to the overall I-XII architecture only where the supplied materials themselves establish that architecture.

PRODUCTION PROFILE

Format	Founder seated interview with documentary inserts
Target duration	Approx. 55-75 minutes, depending on delivery and archive inserts
Interview style	Measured, reflective, evidence-conscious; not adversarial
Core arc	Builder -> Questions -> Reconstruction -> Consequences -> Institution -> Legacy
Editorial rule	Distinguish fact, recollection, inference, allegation and judicial finding
Lock status	LOCKED MASTER v1.1 - wording may only change by deliberate versioned revision

OPENING NARRATION

Before the transactions, before the missing records, before the litigation and before the insolvency process, there was a builder. Episode 0 begins with the Founder because the OUBAS record is not only a collection of court papers, bank records, financial reconstructions and manuals. It is also an institutional memory: how an engineering and entrepreneurial career moved through investment, unanswered questions, reconstruction, lost opportunity, litigation, sequestration, trustee administration and, ultimately, the creation of a framework intended to preserve evidence and improve accountability. The interview does not ask the audience to accept memory as proof. It asks the Founder to place his account on record - and then invites the documentary series to test that account.

ACT I - BEFORE OUBAS: THE BUILDER

Q1. Before the audience hears about banks, courts or sequestration, who were you?

FOUNDER: I was, first and foremost, an engineer and a builder of enterprises. My career developed across engineering, technology, infrastructure, property development and industrial investment. I did not begin this journey intending to become a litigant or a documentary researcher. I believed I was entering a period in which decades of technical and entrepreneurial work could be converted into long-term enterprise value and opportunities for the next generation.

Q2. Why is that beginning important to the twelve-volume story?

FOUNDER: Because without understanding what existed, it is impossible to understand what was later placed at risk. The story is not only about a disputed account or a court case. It is about a wider ecosystem of businesses, projects, relationships, skills, land, investment and future opportunities. Volume I begins there deliberately: with creation before dispute.

Q3. What was the crossroads?

FOUNDER: The crossroads was the point at which opportunity and uncertainty began to coexist. Around the ACTOM restructuring and the transactions that followed, I believed substantial value and future possibilities were being created. Over time, however, questions emerged about records, transactions, balances and accountability. What had looked like a commercial journey increasingly became a search for explanations.

Q4. What do you want the viewer to understand about your own responsibility at that stage?

FOUNDER: I made decisions. I entered transactions. I trusted professional structures and institutions. I pursued ambitious projects. Institutional memory must include those choices, not only the conduct I later questioned. With hindsight, I would insist much earlier on complete transaction-level records, independent reconciliation and a permanent evidence archive. One lesson of the series is that a founder cannot outsource understanding of the documentary trail.

ACT II - WHEN QUESTIONS BECAME A DOCUMENTARY PROBLEM

Q5. What changed the story from a commercial dispute into a documentary investigation?

FOUNDER: The records. Or, more precisely, the difficulty of obtaining records that should ordinarily have explained transactions of substantial value. Loan accounts, bank statements, dividend records, accounting schedules, corporate records and supporting documents should have allowed the financial history to be followed. When that did not happen readily, the absence itself became important and reconstruction became necessary.

Q6. Why did you not simply accept the balances and certificates that existed?

FOUNDER: Because a balance is a stated result, not the complete account history. A Certificate of Balance is an evidentiary tool intended to facilitate proof of the amount claimed; it does not, by itself, establish the underlying liability. Its effect depends on the agreement, the evidence and whether the amount has been

properly disputed. Payments, property proceeds, dividends, capital movements and loan amortisation all leave a trail. My position became that the certified figure had to be tested against that trail and the supporting records rather than accepted merely because it appeared in a formal document.

Q7. What was the reconstruction trying to do?

FOUNDER: Not to invent missing facts. It was trying to rebuild a chronology from surviving agreements, correspondence, payment records, property transactions, dividend declarations, accounting schedules and other available documents. The purpose was to ask whether the available evidence produced a coherent financial history and whether that history could be reconciled with balances and claims that followed.

Q8. What did you learn about missing documents?

FOUNDER: A missing document is not automatically proof of wrongdoing. But in a reconstruction, its absence can still matter. You record what was requested, what was produced, what remains unavailable and what evidential gap that creates. Then you work from the surviving material without pretending that the gap has disappeared. That distinction became central to the OUBAS approach.

Q9. What is the most important evidential discipline that came out of Volume II?

FOUNDER: Separate what you know from what you infer. Identify the source. Preserve the original. Show the calculation. Identify the missing material. Allow another person to repeat the exercise. If the reconstruction cannot be independently checked, it is not strong enough.

ACT III - VALUE IS MORE THAN A BALANCE SHEET

Q10. Volume III asks what opportunities were lost. Why does that matter to institutional memory?

FOUNDER: Because a business can lose more than a physical asset. It can lose development pathways, recurring income, strategic relationships, management time, financing capacity and future enterprise value. The projects documented in Volume III were not presented as guaranteed outcomes. They were documented as real proposals, real land, real commercial relationships and real opportunities whose economic significance could be analysed.

Q11. How should the audience treat large opportunity or enterprise-value figures?

FOUNDER: With discipline. Future value is inherently dependent on assumptions. Reasonable experts can disagree about probabilities, discount rates, margins and timing. The correct approach is not to turn an estimate into a certainty. It is to identify the underlying opportunity, disclose the assumptions and show the analytical framework. The existence of uncertainty does not mean the opportunity had no value, but the value must remain open to expert testing.

Q12. What did those lost opportunities represent to you personally?

FOUNDER: They represented a shift from building to defending. Management time that might have gone into engineering, property, technology and infrastructure increasingly went into reconstruction, correspondence and litigation. That is part of the human and entrepreneurial cost. But Volume III also makes an important correction: the story cannot end with loss.

Q13. What is the correction?

FOUNDER: Resilience. Resilience is not pretending that setbacks did not occur. It begins with recognising loss and uncertainty honestly, and then continuing to build. The future remains capable of producing value that cannot be measured today. That is why the legacy of Volume III is not regret. It is the continuing capacity to create.

ACT IV - WHEN THE RECORD ENTERED THE COURTS

Q14. What changes when a documentary dispute becomes litigation?

FOUNDER: The stakes change. A court must decide the case that is properly before it on admissible evidence and applicable law. A financial reconstruction may raise factual questions, but those questions still have to enter the legal process through the correct procedure and evidence. Volume IV is about that tension between legal process and factual verification.

Q15. Why does the series repeatedly distinguish legal finality from factual certainty?

FOUNDER: Because they are not always the same concept. A court order has legal effect unless and until altered through lawful process. At the same time, later documents or analysis may raise questions that still require investigation. The responsible response is not to ignore the order and not to suppress the questions. It is to distinguish the two and use the lawful mechanisms available for review, appeal, rescission, investigation or other relief.

Q16. What did sequestration change?

FOUNDER: It changed control, administration and risk. The consequences extend beyond a single debt. Property, claims, litigation, recoveries and other estate interests may be affected. That made preservation and verification even more important to me, because irreversible decisions could affect value before every disputed question had been resolved.

Q17. How should Episode 0 speak about allegations that remain contested?

FOUNDER: Carefully. My recollection and interpretation should be identified as mine. A disputed allegation should be called disputed. A court finding should be described accurately as a court finding. If a matter remains under appeal, review, investigation or other process, that status should be stated. The purpose of OUBAS is not strengthened by overstating what the evidence can prove.

ACT V - THE CONVERGENCE AND THE BIRTH OF OUBAS

Q18. What does "The Convergence" mean?

FOUNDER: It is the point where the strands that had developed separately began to meet: creditors, trustees, recoveries, pending litigation, disputed records, financial reconstruction and asset-preservation questions. The documentary work was no longer only historical. It became material that could be considered within formal insolvency administration.

Q19. Why was that moment important institutionally?

FOUNDER: Because it exposed a broader problem. Complex disputes cannot be resolved responsibly if the record is incomplete, the wrong expertise is used or decision-makers cannot trace the evidence. The experience began to produce principles that went beyond my own matter. That is where OUBAS moved from a personal search for answers toward an institutional framework.

Q20. What are those principles?

FOUNDER: Three are stated clearly in Volume V: verify before deciding; use the right expertise for the problem; and maintain accountability. Those principles sound simple, but they become powerful when applied systematically. They require decision-makers to identify the evidence, understand what specialist knowledge is required and remain answerable for how power is exercised.

Q21. Is OUBAS intended to be anti-bank, anti-court or anti-institution?

FOUNDER: No. The institutional purpose described in the series is accountability through informed questions, evidence and verification. The objective is not hostility for its own sake. Strong institutions benefit from accurate records, transparent processes and decisions that can be explained and independently tested.

Q22. What does "verification before adjudication" mean in practical terms?

FOUNDER: It means that where a decision depends on a factual proposition, the decision-maker should know what evidence supports it, what is missing, what is disputed and what requires specialist interpretation. It does not mean every question must be resolved before any court can act. It means factual verification should be treated as an essential component of responsible decision-making.

ACT VI - THE TEST: ACCOUNTABILITY BEFORE THE COURTS

Q23. What is the purpose of Volume VI, The Test?

FOUNDER: The supplied Volume VI source is intentionally prospective. It says the volume should be written after the major hearings and identifies the rescission hearing, SCA outcome, vexatious proceedings, trustee decisions, preservation attempts and recovery decisions as matters to be addressed. In other words, the principles developed earlier must eventually be tested against real institutional outcomes.

Q24. Why is it important not to write the ending before the hearings and decisions occur?

FOUNDER: Because documentary integrity requires restraint. A serious record cannot predetermine outcomes. The stronger approach is to preserve the evidence, record the questions, identify the issues and then update the history when the institutions responsible for deciding them have acted. That discipline is part of accountability too.

ACT VII - FROM LIVED EXPERIENCE TO A PRACTITIONER'S MANUAL

Q25. By Volumes IX-XII the series has changed form. What happened?

FOUNDER: The experience was converted into a practical educational framework. Volume IX addresses the lived legal position of a sequestrated person: rights, duties, income, banking, business activity, family life, litigation capacity and rehabilitation. Volume X moves into litigation and court practice. Volume XI addresses trustees, creditors and estate administration. Volume XII provides the evidence and document-management backbone.

Q26. Why move from memoir and investigation into manuals?

FOUNDER: Because institutional memory has limited value if the lessons cannot be applied by others. The manuals aim to bridge law and everyday practice. They are designed for sequestrated persons, practitioners, trustees, creditors, researchers and others who need a structured way to understand process, evidence and decision-making.

Q27. What did the personal sequestration experience teach you that a statute alone may not teach?

FOUNDER: That the practical questions are immediate and human. Can I earn income? How should banking work? What happens to business activities? What must be disclosed to trustees? How are family life and dependants affected? How does one continue lawful economic activity while complying with the insolvency regime? Volume IX is built around those practical questions.

Q28. What is the central litigation lesson in Volume X?

FOUNDER: Do not begin with rhetoric. Begin with what must be proved. Identify the legal issue, the statutory requirements, the evidence, the missing documents, the correct procedure, the relief sought and the risks. Litigation quality depends not only on doctrine but on evidence organisation, procedural compliance and the ability to connect facts, law and relief.

Q29. What is the central governance lesson in Volume XI?

FOUNDER: A trustee occupies a statutory and fiduciary office. Estate administration requires independence, proper purpose, investigation, preservation of assets, accurate records, communication and accountability to the statutory framework. The trustee is not simply the agent of one participant. That institutional role is essential to confidence in insolvency administration.

Q30. What is the core of Volume XII?

FOUNDER: Traceability. Every material factual proposition should be capable of being traced to reliable source material, and every material document should be locatable, authenticatable and explainable. The OEDMS framework is built around authenticity, integrity, traceability, accessibility and reliability, with a life cycle of identifying, collecting, preserving, classifying, verifying, analysing, presenting and archiving evidence.

Q31. Why does evidence management become part of legacy?

FOUNDER: Because memories fade, people leave institutions and disputes outlive their original participants. If the record is not preserved properly, the next generation inherits conclusions without the means to test them. Evidence management turns institutional memory from a personal recollection into something that can be independently examined.

ACT VIII - ACCOUNTABILITY, LEGACY AND THE RECORD THAT REMAINS

Q32. After everything documented in the series, what does accountability mean to you?

FOUNDER: Accountability means that power should be capable of explanation. A bank, trustee, professional adviser, litigant, regulator, court officer, director or founder should be able to identify the basis for a material decision and the evidence on which it rests. Accountability also applies to me. If the evidence ultimately disproves something I believed, the record must be capable of saying so.

Q33. What is the distinction between accountability and blame?

FOUNDER: Blame starts with a conclusion about who is at fault. Accountability should start earlier. It asks: what happened, what evidence exists, what was the decision-maker required to do, what was actually done, and can the decision be independently explained? Sometimes that process may establish wrongdoing. Sometimes it may establish error. Sometimes it may establish that an allegation was not supported. The process must be open to all three outcomes.

Q34. What would you tell another founder who believes records can be sorted out later?

FOUNDER: Do not wait. Preserve the native records. Maintain transaction-level schedules. Keep board and trustee resolutions. Separate company, trust and personal funds. Record assumptions. Reconcile accounts independently. Keep a master chronology. Make sure important decisions can still be understood ten or twenty years later by somebody who was not in the room.

Q35. What do you want your children and future generations to take from the series?

FOUNDER: Not that litigation should define a life. I want them to understand the values behind the journey: integrity, perseverance, courage, building, the willingness to ask difficult questions and the discipline to test those questions against evidence. Wealth is not only what is accumulated. It is also what is learned, preserved and passed forward responsibly.

Q36. Is this series ultimately about what was lost?

FOUNDER: No. Loss is part of the record, but it is not the final identity of the record. The series moves from building, to questions, to reconstruction, to consequences, to institutional learning. Its final value should be measured by whether it helps preserve evidence, improve understanding and enable others to make better decisions.

Q37. If the documentary record ultimately reaches conclusions different from some of your present beliefs, what should happen?

FOUNDER: The record should change. A documentary institution cannot demand accountability from others while refusing correction itself. Version control, source disclosure and transparent correction are part of integrity. The objective is not to preserve my preferred conclusion. It is to preserve a record capable of surviving scrutiny.

Q38. What is the legacy you want OUBAS to leave?

FOUNDER: A culture of verification. A place where people can distinguish memory from evidence, allegation from proof, a balance from its underlying ledger, legal effect from unresolved factual questions, and power from accountability. If OUBAS can help future founders, practitioners, trustees, litigants and institutions ask better questions and preserve better records, then the difficult history will have produced something constructive.

Q39. Was the journey worth recording?

FOUNDER: Yes, because an unpreserved experience disappears with the people who lived it. Recording the journey does not guarantee that my interpretation will prevail. It guarantees that the evidence, questions, methods and lessons can be examined after me. That is the difference between a grievance and institutional memory.

Q40. What is your final statement to the audience before Volume I begins?

FOUNDER: Do not accept this interview as proof. Treat it as the Founder's account of why the record exists. Then examine the documents. Follow the chronology. Test the calculations. Read the court record. Distinguish what is established from what remains disputed. If the evidence supports me, let it support me. If it does not, let the record say so. The purpose of this series is larger than winning an argument. It is to leave behind a record that can be tested.

CLOSING NARRATION

Episode 0 establishes the memory. The volumes that follow establish the record. The viewer is invited to move from recollection to documents, from documents to reconstruction, from reconstruction to legal and institutional process, and from lived experience to a practical framework for evidence, insolvency administration and accountability.

MEMORY INTRODUCES THE RECORD. EVIDENCE MUST TEST IT.

SOURCE-GROUNDING MAP

The following source map identifies the supplied materials used to ground this locked script. It is not a bibliography of every proposition; it records the principal textual foundations used to draft the interview.

Source	Episode 0 use	Principal location
Volume I - The Crossroads	Opening identity, engineering/entrepreneurship, ACTOM crossroads, questions, documentary integrity, broader business ecosystem.	Synopsis pp. 4-5; Copyright/qualification p. 6; Preface pp. 8-9; Series statement p. 10; Chs. 1, 20-21.
Volume II - The Records They Never Produced	Missing records, forensic reconstruction, evidence rather than speculation, six-stage reconstruction, independent verification.	Synopsis p. 4; Preface pp. 7-8; Documentary Integrity p. 10; Six Stages p. 15; missing-statements/reconstruction chapters.
Volume III - The Opportunities That Were Lost	Opportunity cost, enterprise value, real projects vs certainty, resilience and future capacity to build.	Synopsis p. 4; Preface pp. 7-8; Contents pp. 11-12; enterprise-value and closing resilience chapters.
Volume IV - The Consequences	Litigation, certificate/balance issues, sequestration, legal finality vs factual certainty, preservation and recovery questions.	Synopsis pp. 4; Preface pp. 7-8; Contents p. 10; Certificate and sequestration/appeal chapters.
Volume V - The Convergence	Creditors/trustees/recoveries converge; documentary reconstruction enters insolvency administration; birth and principles of OUBAS.	Synopsis p. 4; Preface pp. 7-8; Contents pp. 9-10; accountability and convergence chapters.
Volume VI - The Test	Prospective legal volume to be completed after major hearings; identified hearing/outcome categories.	Single supplied source page, lines 3-15.
Volumes VII-VIII	No standalone source files were supplied in this conversation. No new substantive factual narrative for these volumes has been invented in Episode 0.	Source boundary note in this locked version.
Volume IX - Personal Sequestration in Practice	Practical rights, duties, income, banking, business, trustees, litigation capacity and rehabilitation.	Mission Statement and series architecture, pp. 2-3; practical chapters throughout.
Volume X - Insolvency Litigation and Court Practice	Structured case assessment, evidence, procedure, remedies, litigation management, fact-law-relief connection.	Series architecture p. 2; Ch. 41, pp. 4-9.

Volume XI - Trustees, Creditors and Estate Administration	Trustee office, statutory/fiduciary duties, creditor participation, Master supervision, records, transparency.	Series architecture p. 2; Ch. 51, pp. 4-10; later estate-administration chapters.
Volume XII - Evidence and Document Management	OEDMS, authenticity, integrity, traceability, accessibility, reliability; evidence life cycle and source-to-proposition discipline.	Mission Statement and Five Principles pp. 2-3; master contents and evidence-control chapters.

LOCK CONTROL

Document: Episode 0 - Founder Interview - Institutional Memory, Accountability & Legacy

Version: 1.1

Status: LOCKED MASTER

Lock date: 11 August 2026

Revision record: v1.1 updates Q6 to reflect the legal characterisation of a Certificate of Balance as an evidentiary tool that does not, by itself, establish liability. The remaining interview structure and substantive answers are unchanged.

Revision rule: any future substantive change should create a new numbered version; do not overwrite v1.1 silently.

Source rule: later inclusion of standalone Volumes VII-VIII should be treated as a source update and should trigger a controlled v1.2 or later revision if Episode 0 wording changes.