Receipt Brief

Methodology Fact Sheet

Evidence-led, independent analysis of public claims, policy, and outcomes.

- Evidence over assertion
- Original sources first
- No social-media evidence
- Context is part of accuracy
- Independent

1. Scope

We examine public claims, government commitments, policy, legislation, statistics, official statements, organisational claims, media claims, public-service performance, and information disorder.

2. Selection

Topics are selected for public significance, potential impact, evidence availability, relevance, reader suggestions, repeated circulation, and public-body claims. Selection is independent.

3. Evidence hierarchy

Original datasets outweigh all other evidence. Next: official records and documents, legislation, parliamentary material, FOI material, court judgments, academic studies, recognised research, credible specialist reporting, and Receipt Brief managed surveys.

4. Source rules

We preserve the evidence used, record source details, check dates and definitions, and return to original sources. AI may support publication design, source-finding, grammar, and accuracy review, but AI output is never evidence.

5. Context test

Context is part of the finding. We examine what is omitted, whether definitions changed, whether figures need denominators, whether access rules matter, and whether accurate information is framed in a way that can mislead.

6. Findings and review

We explain what the public evidence supports, what remains unclear, and where no evidence was found. Public bodies may request review under the corrections process and any additional evidence requested to be incorporated must be made public, clear, and accessible.

When a body is invited to comment on an upcoming publication the invitation, with a deadline, and the response, or lack of response, is identified and published.

The Claim Tracker

Defining the status selections

Significant Information Gap	Insufficient or nill evidence found to confidently determine if the claim is correct or realised.
Within Timeframe	The specified deadline of the claim is in the future and insufficient or nill evidence found to confidently determine if the claim is expected to be achieved.
Partially Met	Evidence found can confidently determine that part of the claim is achieved.
Met	Evidence found can confidently determine that the claim is correct or achieved.
Not Met	Evidence found can confidently determine that the claim is incorrect or not achieved.