

Fragmented Market Truth and Retrospective Data Dependency.

A Cross-Sector Research Assessment of UK Residential Property,
Adult Social Care and Temporary Labour Markets.

2026

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document control and research position.

Document no.	AMTF-001
Prepared date	14 Aug 2025
Project Link	AUG_P126 / Episodic ICCE
Document type	Foundational research paper
Classification	Open research / strategic foundation
Status	v1.1
Primary purpose	To assess whether large UK service markets structurally underperform where no agreed live source of market-operating truth exists.
Case study markets	Residential property / conveyancing; adult social care provider markets; temporary labour / recruitment

CENTRAL THESIS

Large multi-party markets become structurally inefficient where there is no agreed, timely and authoritative source of operating truth for the material facts on which the market depends.

DOCUMENT INDEX

NO.	ASSESSMENT AREA	SHORT DESCRIPTION	POSITION	PAGE
1	Section 1 - Executive Summary	Opening thesis, cross-sector framing and core market-truth proposition.	Foundation	4
2	Section 2 - Research Purpose	Research purpose, comparative method and sector-neutral question.	Foundation	5
3	Section 3 - The Concept of Market Truth	Definition of market truth and retrospective data dependency.	Foundation	6
4	Section 4 - How Mature Markets Use Shared Truth	How mature markets use shared records, standards and infrastructure.	Foundation	7
5	Section 5 - Case Study Selection	Rationale for selecting residential property, adult social care and temporary labour.	Foundation	9
6	Section 6 - Case Study 1 - Residential Property and Conveyancing	Residential property as a case study in transaction-readiness uncertainty.	Case study	11
7	Section 7 - Residential Property Source Matrix	Source matrix for residential property evidence and reform references.	Case study	14
8	Section 8 - Residential Property Findings	Residential property findings on formal records, late certainty and reusable truth.	Case study	15
9	Section 9 - Case Study 2 - Adult Social Care Provider Markets	Adult social care as a case study in public-interest operating truth.	Case study	16
10	Section 10 - Adult Social Care Source Matrix	Source matrix for adult social care data, funding, capacity and reform references.	Case study	19
11	Section 11 - Adult Social Care Findings	Adult social care findings on need, capacity, delivery and public accountability.	Case study	20
12	Section 12 - Case Study 3 - Temporary Labour and Recruitment	Temporary labour as a case study in worker-level, payroll and compliance truth.	Case study	21
13	Section 13 - Temporary Labour Source Matrix	Source matrix for temporary labour evidence, payroll, funding and assurance references.	Case study	26
14	Section 14 - Temporary Labour Findings	Temporary labour findings on route visibility, worker-level evidence and reconstruction.	Case study	27
15	Section 15 - Cross-Market Comparison	Cross-market comparison of fragmented truth patterns.	Synthesis	28
16	Section 16 - Market Truth Failure Model	General model of market-truth failure across multi-party service markets.	Synthesis	31
17	Section 17 - Requirements for Market-Truth Infrastructure	Requirements for market-truth infrastructure and controlled operating records.	Synthesis	34
18	Section 18 - Implications for Augscape Research and Spin-Off Formation	Implications for Augscape research and future spin-off formation.	Synthesis	40
19	Section 19 - Temporary Labour as a Candidate for Further Sector Research	Temporary labour as a candidate for deeper sector-specific research.	Synthesis	44
20	Section 20 - Conclusion	Final research conclusion and strategic interpretation.	Conclusion	47
PN	Footer / Publication Notice	Publication notice, research status and interpretation boundaries.	Publication	50
A	Appendix A - Research Source and Evidence Base	Research source base and supporting reference material.	Appendix	51

SECTION 1

Executive Summary

Large, economically important markets can continue operating for long periods while relying on fragmented records, duplicated checks, late-stage discovery, manual reconciliation and retrospective reconstruction. Their continued operation should not be mistaken for structural health.

This paper examines that problem through the concept of **market truth**: the agreed factual position on which market participants rely when deciding transaction readiness, service capacity, legal obligation, financial exposure, regulatory compliance, audit evidence and public accountability.

The central finding of this paper is that several large UK service markets do not fail merely because of poor behaviour, underfunding, slow administration or legacy process. They often fail because the relevant parties do not share a sufficiently reliable, timely and authoritative view of the facts on which the market depends.

The paper considers this problem across three case study markets:

Residential property and conveyancing, where buyers, sellers, conveyancers, estate agents, surveyors, lenders, local authorities and HM Land Registry interact around high-value transactions, but critical information may still emerge late in the process. The UK Government's 2025 consultation describes the current home buying and selling process as long, complicated and frustrating, with an average of 120 days from accepted offer to completion and around one in three transactions failing.

Adult social care provider markets, where individuals, families, providers, local authorities, NHS bodies, regulators and workforce bodies interact across need, funding, capacity, quality, staffing and delivery. The Department of Health and Social Care has published a roadmap specifically aimed at improving how adult social care data is collected, shared and analysed in England.

Temporary labour and recruitment, where workers, agencies, end clients, payroll intermediaries, funders, insurers, auditors and regulators interact across worker identity, engagement route, work performed, payroll treatment, statutory obligations, invoice evidence, funding confidence and compliance assurance.

The paper does not argue that these markets are identical. They are legally, commercially and operationally distinct. Residential property is transaction-led. Adult social care is need-led and public-interest sensitive. Temporary labour is workforce, payroll and compliance-led.

However, each market displays a similar structural pattern: material facts are held across multiple parties; those facts are not always captured at the point they become important; reliance often forms before certainty exists; and market participants must later reconstruct, reconcile or dispute what should ideally have been clear earlier.

The research therefore advances a general proposition:

Large multi-party markets become structurally inefficient where there is no agreed, timely and authoritative source of operating truth for the material facts on which the market depends.

This does not mean every market needs one central database. It means that each material fact should have an identifiable authoritative source, clear event timing, reliable attribution, controlled visibility, correction lineage and auditability.

The purpose of this paper is therefore not to propose a single product, platform or intervention. Its purpose is to establish a research foundation. If market-truth failure is a repeatable structural problem, then it may also be a legitimate basis for forming new infrastructure projects, standards, controlled operating models or spin-off ventures where the evidence supports intervention.

SECTION 2

Research Purpose

The purpose of this document is to assess whether fragmented information and retrospective data dependency create structural weakness in large UK service markets.

The paper begins from a sector-neutral question:

What happens when a market depends on facts that no participant can see, verify, rely upon or reconcile at the moment those facts become commercially, legally or operationally important?

This question is deliberately broader than any single industry. It is not a temporary labour paper disguised as a general research paper. It is a general research paper that later uses temporary labour as one case study alongside residential property and adult social care.

That distinction matters.

If the analysis began with temporary labour, the conclusion could appear predetermined. The paper would risk being read as an argument constructed around a later commercial model. By beginning with the wider market-truth problem, the research instead asks whether temporary labour belongs to a broader class of fragmented markets.

This allows the paper to examine three different sectors in equal form:

- a high-value private transaction market;
- a public-interest care and provider-capacity market;
- a labour-linked workforce, payroll and compliance market.

The research method is comparative. It asks whether each market shows evidence of:

- fragmented operating records;
- late discovery of material facts;
- duplicated verification or assurance;
- reliance before certainty;
- retrospective reconstruction;
- weak cross-party visibility;
- risk transfer based on incomplete data;
- reform pressure toward earlier, more reliable or more shareable data.

The paper does not claim that data alone solves market failure. Adult social care, for example, has funding, workforce, demographic, commissioning and provider-market pressures. Residential property has legal, behavioural, capacity and lender-driven constraints. Temporary labour has legal, tax, employment, commercial and worker-facing dimensions.

The paper's narrower claim is that where these markets already suffer from wider pressures, fragmented truth often makes those pressures more expensive, less visible, harder to govern and harder to reform.

SECTION 3

The Concept of Market Truth

For the purposes of this paper, **market truth** means the agreed factual position on which market participants rely to determine rights, obligations, readiness, risk, payment, compliance, capacity or accountability.

Market truth is not the same thing as data volume. A market may generate large amounts of data and still lack market truth. It may have emails, portals, spreadsheets, reports, registers, invoices, case notes, searches, certificates, payslips, forms and audit trails, yet still lack a clear answer to the question:

What is the authoritative state of this transaction, person, service, obligation or exposure right now?

Market truth is also not the same thing as a public register. Residential property, for example, has formal land registration. HM Land Registry's Strategy 2025+ expressly seeks to unlock a better, faster and less stressful property market through improved digital services, expertise and accessible property information. But a title register does not, by itself, create full live transaction truth for a buyer, seller, lender, estate agent, conveyancer and surveyor during a moving transaction.

Similarly, adult social care has regulators, commissioners, providers and multiple datasets. But the existence of datasets does not automatically create a live shared picture of care need, provider capacity, workforce availability, funding status, safeguarding concern, quality risk and delivery reality. The Government's adult social care data roadmap exists precisely because collection, sharing and analysis of adult social care data require improvement.

The same distinction applies across temporary labour. Payroll records, timesheets, invoices, right-to-work checks, contracts, agency records, umbrella records, RTI submissions and audit documents may all exist. But the market may still lack a single agreed view of who worked, when they worked, under which engagement route, for which end client, through which counterparty, on what payroll basis, with what funding support and with what downstream compliance evidence.

The market-truth problem therefore arises where several conditions exist together:

- multiple parties depend on the same facts;
- those facts are created or held in different systems;
- no party can rely on a single authoritative state;
- key facts become clear only after reliance has formed;
- downstream parties must reconstruct events retrospectively;
- risk, payment, audit or accountability depends on incomplete visibility.

Where those conditions exist, a market may continue functioning, but it does so with hidden friction. The cost appears as delay, failed transactions, duplicated checks, additional insurance, defensive compliance, disputed liability, poor user experience, weak reporting, and avoidable operational risk.

This paper uses the term **retrospective data dependency** to describe the resulting condition: a market state in which participants repeatedly depend on after-the-event reconstruction to establish facts that should ideally have been captured, validated and made available when the relevant event occurred.

That distinction is central to the rest of the paper. Retrospective analysis can be useful. Retrospective reconstruction can support audit, investigation and learning. But a market that depends on retrospective reconstruction for normal operation is structurally weaker than a market that captures material facts at source.

SECTION 4

How Mature Markets Use Shared Truth

The market-truth problem is easiest to see by comparing fragmented markets with markets that have already developed shared operating records, common identifiers or authoritative transaction infrastructure.

Mature markets rarely scale on the basis of trust alone. They usually develop mechanisms that allow different parties to rely on the same factual position without having to renegotiate or reconstruct that position each time. These mechanisms may take different forms: standards, registers, clearing systems, event records, verified identifiers, common data models, payment rails, audit trails or controlled reporting environments.

The important point is not that every mature market has one central database. The point is that mature markets tend to reduce ambiguity around the facts that matter most.

A retail supply chain, for example, cannot efficiently operate if every manufacturer, distributor, retailer and logistics provider uses a different identity for the same product. A payment network cannot efficiently operate if authorisation, settlement and reconciliation depend on each participant later reconstructing what happened. A regulated financial market cannot safely operate if trade, settlement, exposure and reporting data are too fragmented to support risk monitoring.

This is why standards and infrastructure emerge.

GS1 describes its standards as a common language for identifying, capturing and sharing supply-chain data, helping make information accessible, accurate and easy to understand. ([gs1.org](https://www.gs1.org)) That is a market-truth function. It allows different parties to refer to the same product, location, shipment or trading relationship without each building a separate interpretation from scratch.

Financial market infrastructure provides another example. The BIS and IOSCO Principles for Financial Market Infrastructures identify payment systems, central securities depositories, securities settlement systems, central counterparties and trade repositories as infrastructures with important roles in clearing, settlement and recording. Trade repositories, in particular, exist because market participants and authorities require timely and accurate data about transactions and exposures. ([bis.org](https://www.bis.org))

In both examples, the lesson is not merely technological. It is structural.

Markets become more governable when material facts are:

- identified consistently;
- captured close to the point of origin;
- attributed to the party or event that created them;
- made available to relevant parties in controlled form;
- preserved for audit, reconciliation and later accountability.

A market can be highly digitised and still lack those qualities. Digitisation alone may simply convert paper fragmentation into digital fragmentation. The important question is not whether data exists, but whether the market has an agreed structure for determining which facts are authoritative, when those facts became true, who created them, who may rely on them, and how they may be corrected without erasing history.

This distinction is important for the case studies that follow.

Residential property is not paperless chaos. It contains formal title records, local authority searches, lender requirements, survey reports, identity checks, contracts and professional obligations. Yet transaction-critical facts may still emerge late or sit across too many disconnected parties.

Adult social care is not data-free. It contains local authority records, provider records, CQC inspection data, NHS information, workforce datasets, financial assessments and safeguarding information. Yet the system may still struggle to create a live shared view of need, capacity, workforce availability, funding status and care delivery.

SECTION 4 CONTINUED

Temporary labour is not record-free either. It contains contracts, timesheets, agency systems, payroll files, umbrella records, invoices, RTI submissions, right-to-work checks and audit documents. Yet those records may not produce a reliable worker-level operating truth at the moment work, payroll, funding and compliance consequences arise.

The research question is therefore not:

Does the market have data?

The better question is:

Does the market have agreed operating truth when parties need to rely on it?

SECTION 5

Case Study Selection

This paper examines three UK markets because each one is large, multi-party, economically important and already subject to reform pressure around information, transparency or accountability.

The selected markets are deliberately different.

Residential property and conveyancing represent a high-value private transaction market. Adult social care represents a public-interest service and provider-capacity market. Temporary labour and recruitment represent a workforce, payroll, compliance and commercial-risk market.

Their differences make the comparison more useful. If the same structural pattern appears across markets with different legal frameworks, commercial incentives and public-policy pressures, then the pattern is unlikely to be sector-specific.

5.1 Residential property and conveyancing

Residential property was selected because it is a mature, high-value market with formal legal records, professional intermediaries and regulated processes, yet it remains widely recognised as slow, stressful and vulnerable to transaction failure.

The property market is useful because it demonstrates that the existence of formal records does not, by itself, create live transaction truth.

HM Land Registry provides formal land registration, but the live conveyancing transaction depends on many other facts: searches, title issues, leasehold information, planning matters, building safety concerns, lender requirements, survey findings, chain status, identity checks, source of funds, enquiries and completion readiness.

The UK Government's home buying and selling reform consultation identifies the current process as long, complicated and frustrating, with substantial transaction fall-through. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk)) This makes residential property a strong case study in late-emerging truth, duplicated checks and transaction-readiness uncertainty.

5.2 Adult social care provider markets

Adult social care was selected because it is a large public-interest market where fragmented information affects commissioning, capacity, care delivery, workforce planning, safeguarding and public accountability.

This market is especially useful because its truth problem is not purely commercial. It affects people, families, councils, providers, NHS bodies, regulators and public spending.

The Department of Health and Social Care's *Care data matters* roadmap sets out a programme for improving how adult social care data is collected, shared and analysed in England. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk)) That policy direction is highly relevant to this paper because it confirms that social care reform is partly a data and visibility challenge.

Adult social care therefore provides a case study in fragmented operating truth across need, eligibility, funding, care-package status, provider capacity, workforce availability, quality and delivery.

5.3 Temporary labour and recruitment

Temporary labour was selected because it is a large, fast-moving market where engagement, payroll, tax, funding, insurance, audit and worker-facing consequences can all depend on facts held by different parties.

The temporary labour market involves workers, recruitment agencies, umbrella companies, payroll intermediaries, end clients, contractors, managed service providers, funders, insurers, auditors and regulators. Each may hold a partial record of the same labour event.

SECTION 5 CONTINUED

HMRC's labour supply-chain assurance guidance recommends that businesses understand who is in their supply chain, how workers are engaged and how they are paid. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk)) That guidance is directly relevant because it recognises that labour supply-chain risk is tied to visibility of parties, engagement routes and payment arrangements.

Temporary labour is therefore a case study in worker-level market truth: who worked, when, under what terms, through which route, with what payroll treatment, with what funding support, and with what evidence for later audit.

5.4 Why these three markets belong together

These markets are not being compared because they perform the same social function. They do not.

They are being compared because each market depends on distributed facts that must be trusted by multiple parties.

In residential property, the key issue is whether a transaction is ready and safe to complete.

In adult social care, the key issue is whether need, capacity, funding and delivery are visible enough to support timely and appropriate care.

In temporary labour, the key issue is whether work, payroll, compliance and financial exposure are visible enough to support lawful, fair and financeable workforce deployment.

Each market therefore asks a version of the same question:

Can parties make reliable decisions where the facts they depend on are fragmented, late or retrospectively reconstructed?

That question frames the case studies that follow.

Case Studies

Residential Property and Conveyancing

Adult Social Care Provider Markets

Temporary Labour and Recruitment

CASE

SECTION 6

Case Study 1 – Residential Property and Conveyancing

Residential property is one of the clearest examples of a market that contains formal records but still struggles with live transaction truth.

The UK property market is not informal. It has land registration, conveyancers, estate agents, surveyors, lenders, local authority searches, anti-money laundering checks, contracts, professional duties and completion mechanics. It is surrounded by process, documentation and professional responsibility.

Yet the existence of process does not mean the transaction has a clear shared state.

A buyer may believe the purchase is progressing. A seller may believe completion is likely. An estate agent may believe the chain is stable. A lender may still be waiting on valuation or underwriting conditions. A conveyancer may be waiting on replies to enquiries. A local authority search may reveal an issue late. A survey may alter the buyer's appetite. A leasehold information pack may expose cost, consent or management concerns. A building safety issue may change lender willingness or buyer confidence.

Each of these facts may be true within one party's workflow before it becomes visible to the others.

That is the essence of the residential property truth problem. The market does not lack documents; it lacks a sufficiently early, shared and reliable view of transaction readiness.

6.1 The formal record is not the full transaction truth

HM Land Registry provides the formal legal record of registered land. That record is essential. But it is not the same as a live transaction state.

A registered title can identify ownership and legal interests, but it does not necessarily answer whether a specific sale is ready to proceed. It does not by itself confirm whether mortgage conditions are satisfied, whether searches are acceptable, whether leasehold enquiries are complete, whether a buyer's funding is ready, whether a chain remains intact, or whether all completion preconditions have been met.

This distinction matters because it shows that "single source of truth" cannot be reduced to "there is a register somewhere".

A market may have an official register and still lack transaction-level truth. The transaction depends on a wider set of facts than the register alone contains.

HM Land Registry's Strategy 2025+ is useful evidence of this distinction. Its stated ambition is to use digital services, expertise and accessible property information to unlock a better, faster and less stressful property market. That objective recognises that property-market performance depends not only on maintaining title records, but on improving how property information is accessed and used within the market. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk))

6.2 Transaction-critical facts emerge across many parties

A residential property transaction depends on many participants. The buyer and seller are central, but the transaction also commonly involves estate agents, conveyancers, lenders, surveyors, local authorities, freeholders, managing agents, mortgage brokers, insurers and sometimes developers, management companies or building safety professionals.

Each participant may hold one part of the transaction truth.

The buyer may know affordability and appetite. The lender may know mortgage conditions. The surveyor may know physical condition. The local authority may know planning or local search matters. The seller may know historic works or disputes. The managing agent may know service charges, reserve funds, consents or building management issues. The conveyancer may know legal defects, enquiries and completion readiness.

The problem is not merely that many parties exist. Complex markets often require many parties. The problem is that those parties may not be operating from an agreed transaction state.

SECTION 6 CONTINUED

This creates a market where progress can be assumed before it is evidenced.

6.3 Late information creates reliance risk

Residential property transactions often involve emotional, financial and practical reliance before the transaction is legally complete.

A buyer may spend money on surveys, mortgage fees and legal work. A seller may make onward plans. A family may arrange schools, removals or employment changes. A chain may form in which several transactions depend on each other completing in sequence.

Where material facts emerge late, the impact is not limited to delay. It can create sunk cost, broken chains, renegotiation, stress, wasted professional time and failed transactions.

The Government's home buying and selling reform consultation describes the process as long, complicated and frustrating, with around one in three transactions failing. (gov.uk)

That failure rate is not simply an inconvenience. It is evidence that a high-value market permits significant reliance to form before transaction certainty exists.

From a market-truth perspective, the issue is clear:

Transaction readiness is discovered progressively, not established authoritatively at the point parties begin to rely.

6.4 Sequential workflows compound the problem

The property transaction process often operates sequentially rather than simultaneously.

One party waits for another. A conveyancer waits for a search. A buyer waits for a mortgage offer. A seller waits for enquiries. A lender waits for valuation. An estate agent waits for updates from both sides. A chain waits for the slowest transaction.

Sequential dependency can be manageable where all parties can see the same readiness state. It becomes more fragile where each party sees only part of the position.

In that environment, delay is not always caused by inactivity. It may arise because the transaction does not have a shared operating dashboard showing which material facts are complete, incomplete, disputed, expired, blocked or dependent on another party.

The absence of shared readiness truth means that parties often ask each other for updates rather than relying on a trusted transaction state.

That is a costly way for a mature market to operate.

6.5 Duplicated checks reflect low trust in upstream information

Another symptom of weak market truth is duplicated verification.

Where parties cannot rely on information already gathered by others, they repeat checks. Conveyancers request information already held elsewhere. Lenders maintain separate requirements. Buyers commission further review. Agents chase updates. Sellers provide documents more than once. Managing agents produce packs that may then generate further enquiries.

Some duplication is necessary because parties have different duties and risk positions. A lender, for example, should not blindly rely on a buyer's assumptions. A conveyancer should not ignore legal risk because an estate agent considers the matter straightforward.

However, excessive duplication often indicates a deeper problem: the market does not have a trusted data layer through which material facts can be captured once, validated properly and reused by authorised parties.

SECTION 6 CONTINUED

The reform direction in residential property increasingly reflects this. Industry discussion around upfront information, material information and digital property data is essentially a move toward earlier transaction truth.

6.6 Residential property finding

Residential property shows that formal records and professional process are not enough.

The market has title records, legal documents, searches, surveys, lender conditions and professional participants. But transaction-critical truth is still distributed across parties, revealed over time and often reconciled late.

The core finding is therefore:

Residential property demonstrates market-truth failure where transaction readiness depends on facts held across multiple parties, surfaced at different times, and reconciled only after reliance has already formed.

This makes residential property a strong first case study for the wider paper. It proves that even a legally formal, high-value and professionally intermediated market can remain structurally inefficient where there is no agreed live transaction truth.

SECTION 7

Residential Property Source Matrix

Source area	Source	Finding	Use in paper
Government reform recognition	GOV.UK home buying and selling reform consultation	The Government has consulted on improving the home buying and selling process in England and Wales, recognising structural issues in the current process. (gov.uk)	Establishes that residential transaction inefficiency is an active policy concern.
Process delay and failure	GOV.UK consultation material	Government consultation material describes the current process as long, complicated and frustrating, with average completion around 120 days and around one in three transactions failing. (gov.uk)	Supports the argument that late certainty creates market-wide cost and failed reliance.
Digital property-market direction	HM Land Registry Strategy 2025+	HMLR's strategy is to use digital services, expertise and accessible property information to unlock a better, faster and less stressful property market. (gov.uk)	Shows reform direction toward better information infrastructure, not just more manual process.
Earlier data validation	HMLR digital conveyancing vision	HMLR has discussed providing and validating data earlier in conveyancing so applications can be completed correctly first time. (hmlandregistry.blog.gov.uk)	Supports the paper's thesis that source capture and early validation are stronger than late correction.
Material information	RICS response to reform consultation	RICS has engaged with reform proposals around home buying, selling and material information for consumers. (rics.org)	Useful for framing material information as transaction-critical truth.
Market delay commentary	Propertymark	Propertymark has linked home-moving delays to conveyancing capacity, mortgage approvals and sequential rather than parallel workflows. (propertymark.co.uk)	Supports the multi-party sequential dependency analysis.
Dataset complexity	Propertymark / Conveyancing Association	Propertymark cites the Conveyancing Association's view that residential transactions may require many datasets. (propertymark.co.uk)	Supports the claim that conveyancing is not document-light; it is data-heavy and coordination-heavy.

SECTION 8

Residential Property Findings

8.1 Finding RP-F1 – Official records do not equal transaction truth

Residential property has formal legal records, but a formal title record does not answer all transaction-readiness questions.

The live transaction depends on legal, financial, physical, planning, leasehold, lender, identity and chain-related facts. Those facts are created and held across different parties and systems.

8.2 Finding RP-F2 – Critical facts can surface after reliance has formed

The property process allows significant reliance before full certainty exists.

Buyers spend money. Sellers make onward plans. Chains form. Professionals begin work. Yet material facts may emerge later through searches, surveys, enquiries, leasehold packs, mortgage conditions or chain developments.

This creates a structural timing gap between reliance and certainty.

8.3 Finding RP-F3 – Duplicated enquiries indicate weak reusable truth

Repeated requests, duplicated checks and manual chasing are not merely administrative inconvenience. They indicate that parties cannot always rely on a shared, validated transaction record.

Where a fact must be re-requested, reformatted, rechecked or reinterpreted by each party, the market lacks reusable truth.

8.4 Finding RP-F4 – Reform direction points toward earlier, digital property information

The direction of reform is toward earlier information, better digital services, improved accessibility and more reliable transaction data.

That direction supports the central argument of this paper: fragmented markets do not only need more effort; they need better truth architecture.

8.5 Finding RP-F5 – Residential property is a market-truth failure case

Residential property demonstrates that a market can be legally formal, professionally intermediated and economically mature while still suffering from fragmented live truth.

Its structural weakness is not the absence of records. Its weakness is the absence of an agreed, early and transaction-ready operating truth layer across the parties who need to rely on the transaction state.

SECTION 9

Case Study 2 – Adult Social Care Provider Markets

Adult social care is a different kind of market from residential property. It is not built around a single transaction between buyer and seller. It is a public-interest service market involving care need, eligibility, funding, provider capacity, workforce availability, quality oversight, safeguarding, family involvement and public expenditure.

Yet it shows the same underlying market-truth pattern.

The problem is not that adult social care has no data. The sector has local authority records, provider records, CQC inspection information, NHS data, workforce datasets, financial assessments, safeguarding records and government reporting. The problem is that those records do not always combine into a live, shared operating picture of who needs care, what care is approved, who is funding it, which providers have capacity, whether staff are available, whether care is being delivered, and whether risks are emerging.

This matters because adult social care decisions are time-sensitive. A person waiting for care cannot always wait for slow reconciliation between separate systems. A family trying to arrange support needs clarity. A local authority commissioning care needs an accurate view of available provision. A hospital discharge team needs to know whether care can safely begin. A provider needs workforce capacity. A regulator needs quality visibility. Public bodies need confidence that money is being spent against real need and real delivery.

Adult social care therefore illustrates market-truth failure in a public-interest setting.

9.1 The market is large, fragmented and publicly significant

Adult social care is economically and socially significant. Skills for Care reported that the adult social care sector contributed **£77.8 billion** to England's economy in 2024/25. (skillsforcare.org.uk)

The public spending dimension is also substantial. GOV.UK's adult social care finance report records **£34.5 billion** of expenditure in England in 2024/25. (gov.uk)

This scale matters because market-truth failure in adult social care does not only affect administrative convenience. It affects service delivery, commissioning, workforce planning, quality oversight, public expenditure and personal outcomes.

The market is also heavily fragmented. The Institute for Government has described the adult social care provider market as heavily fragmented, with more than **18,000 providers** across England. (instituteforgovernment.org.uk)

Fragmentation is not inherently bad. A diverse provider market may support local choice, specialisation and responsiveness. But fragmentation becomes a structural problem where the facts required to coordinate care are not joined in a reliable operating layer.

9.2 Social care truth is distributed across many parties

A single care situation may involve:

SECTION 9 CONTINUED

the person needing care;
 family members or unpaid carers;
 a local authority assessment team;
 a finance or means-testing team;
 a care provider;
 care workers;
 an NHS discharge team;
 a GP or community health service;
 safeguarding teams;
 CQC as regulator;
 voluntary-sector support;
 advocates or deputies;
 the person's own private funding arrangements.

Each party may hold a different piece of the truth.

The person and family may know lived need. The local authority may know eligibility and funding position. The provider may know staffing and service capacity. The NHS may know discharge pressure or medical need. The regulator may know inspection history. Workforce data may show broader sector capacity but not necessarily whether a specific provider can start a specific package tomorrow.

The result is a market where important decisions can depend on partial visibility.

9.3 Need, funding, capacity and delivery are separate truths

Adult social care depends on several distinct but connected states.

A person may have a need. That need may or may not have been assessed. The assessed need may or may not meet eligibility thresholds. Eligible care may or may not have funding approved. Funding may or may not match a provider's price. A provider may or may not have capacity. Capacity may depend on workforce availability. Care may be scheduled but not yet delivered. Delivered care may or may not match the care plan. Quality or safeguarding issues may change whether provision remains appropriate.

These states are not interchangeable.

A need is not the same as an assessment. An assessment is not the same as funding. Funding is not the same as provider capacity. Capacity is not the same as workforce availability. Scheduled care is not the same as delivered care. Delivered care is not the same as safe or suitable care.

Where these states are blurred, the market becomes difficult to govern. A local authority may know a package is needed but not have a provider. A provider may technically exist but lack staff. A hospital may identify a discharge requirement but not have confidence that community care is ready. A family may believe support is arranged but not know whether staffing is stable.

From a market-truth perspective, the problem is not merely whether data exists. The problem is whether each material state is visible, current and attributable.

9.4 Demand pressure makes weak truth more damaging

Adult social care demand is rising. CQC's State of Care reporting states that new requests for local authority-funded adult social care were **4% higher in 2023/24** than the previous year and **8% higher than 2019/20**. ([cqc.org.uk](https://www.cqc.org.uk))

When demand rises, weak operating truth becomes more costly.

SECTION 9 CONTINUED

If capacity information is incomplete, people may wait unnecessarily. If workforce availability is unclear, providers may accept or decline packages on imperfect information. If quality concerns are not visible at the point of commissioning, risk may be transferred to vulnerable people. If funding status is unclear, care arrangements may be delayed or disputed.

In a low-pressure system, fragmented truth may produce inconvenience. In a high-pressure care system, it can produce harm.

9.5 Existing datasets are valuable but not sufficient

Adult social care has important datasets. Skills for Care's Adult Social Care Workforce Data Set covered around **21,100 providers** and over **728,000 staff** as at May 2025. (skillsforcare.org.uk)

This is valuable sector intelligence. But workforce datasets are not the same as live care-market truth.

A workforce dataset may show sector structure, roles, vacancies, turnover or employment patterns. It does not necessarily tell a commissioner, family or discharge team whether a particular care package can start safely, whether the provider has available staff in the right location, whether the worker continuity is stable, or whether delivery is occurring as planned.

This distinction matters throughout the paper.

The question is not whether datasets exist. The question is whether the market has an agreed operating truth layer at the point decisions must be made.

9.6 Government reform direction confirms the data problem

The Department of Health and Social Care's *Care data matters* roadmap is direct evidence that adult social care has a recognised data challenge. The roadmap is specifically concerned with improving how adult social care data is collected, shared and analysed in England. (gov.uk)

That reform direction is important because it confirms that data is not a peripheral administrative issue. Data is part of the operating infrastructure of care.

Better social care data can support planning, commissioning, oversight and delivery. But the deeper market-truth question remains: which facts should be authoritative, when should they be captured, who should be able to rely on them, and how should they be updated when care need, funding, capacity or delivery changes?

Those questions are not merely technical. They are governance questions.

9.7 Adult social care finding

Adult social care shows market-truth failure in a public-interest service market.

The sector has data, but critical operating truth is distributed across many parties and many states: need, assessment, eligibility, funding, capacity, workforce, delivery, quality and safeguarding.

The core finding is therefore:

Adult social care demonstrates market-truth failure where care decisions depend on live facts that are fragmented across individuals, families, providers, commissioners, health bodies, regulators and workforce systems.

This does not mean data reform alone can solve adult social care. Funding, workforce supply, provider economics and demographic pressure remain central. But fragmented operating truth makes each of those problems harder to see, harder to manage and harder to reform.

SECTION 10

Adult Social Care Source Matrix

Source area	Source	Finding	Use in paper
Structural market fragility	Nuffield Trust, <i>Fractured and forgotten?</i>	Nuffield describes systemic problems in the social care provider market and argues that funding reforms alone will not deliver sustainable change unless those problems are addressed. (nuffieldtrust.org.uk)	Establishes that social care problems are structural, not only financial.
Provider fragmentation	Institute for Government Performance Tracker	IfG describes the adult social care provider market as heavily fragmented, with more than 18,000 providers across England. (instituteforgovernment.org.uk)	Supports the fragmented-market framing.
Care-data reform	DHSC, <i>Care data matters</i>	Government sets out a roadmap to improve how adult social care data is collected, shared and analysed in England. (gov.uk)	Direct evidence that the sector has a recognised data and visibility problem.
Demand pressure	CQC State of Care	New requests for local authority-funded adult social care were 4% higher in 2023/24 than the previous year and 8% higher than 2019/20. (cqc.org.uk)	Shows increasing pressure on a fragmented operating environment.
System strain	CQC press release	CQC warned that the health and social care system remains fragmented and under severe strain. (cqc.org.uk)	Provides direct language supporting the fragmentation thesis.
Economic scale	Skills for Care	Skills for Care reported that adult social care contributed £77.8bn to England's economy in 2024/25. (skillsforcare.org.uk)	Establishes scale and public/economic importance.
Public expenditure scale	GOV.UK adult social care finance report	Adult social care expenditure in England totalled £34.5bn in 2024/25. (gov.uk)	Supports taxpayer-value and public accountability analysis.
Workforce data	Skills for Care ASC-WDS	The ASC-WDS covered around 21,100 providers and over 728,000 staff as at May 2025. (skillsforcare.org.uk)	Shows useful data exists, while allowing the paper to distinguish datasets from live operating truth.

SECTION 11

Adult Social Care Findings

11.1 Finding ASC-F1 – The provider market is structurally fragmented

Adult social care is delivered through a large and fragmented provider market. Fragmentation may support diversity and local provision, but it also creates coordination difficulty where there is no shared live view of capacity, workforce and delivery.

11.2 Finding ASC-F2 – Demand pressure increases the cost of weak visibility

As care requests rise, incomplete visibility becomes more damaging. Weak information about need, funding, provider capacity or workforce availability can delay care, weaken commissioning and increase pressure on hospitals, families and providers.

11.3 Finding ASC-F3 – Existing datasets are valuable but partial

Social care has important datasets, including workforce data, financial reporting and regulatory information. These are valuable for planning and oversight, but they do not automatically create a live operating view of individual need, package status, provider availability and care delivery.

11.4 Finding ASC-F4 – Care-market truth spans multiple distinct states

Adult social care depends on separate but connected truths: need, assessment, eligibility, funding, provider capacity, workforce availability, scheduled care, delivered care, quality and safeguarding.

A market-truth approach requires those states to remain distinct, current and attributable.

11.5 Finding ASC-F5 – Adult social care is a market-truth failure case

Adult social care demonstrates that a public-interest market can hold extensive data yet still suffer from fragmented operating truth.

Its weakness is not simply the absence of information. Its weakness is the absence of a sufficiently joined, timely and authoritative view of the facts needed to match care need, funding, capacity, workforce and delivery.

SECTION 12

Case Study 3 – Temporary Labour and Recruitment

Temporary labour is the third case study because it brings the market-truth problem into a fast-moving commercial environment where worker treatment, tax compliance, payroll accuracy, funding confidence, insurance visibility and audit evidence can all depend on the same underlying labour event.

A temporary labour engagement may appear simple at the point of use. A client needs workers. An agency supplies them. The workers attend site or assignment. Hours are approved. Payroll is processed. An invoice is issued. Payment is made.

In practice, each of those steps may involve separate parties, separate records and separate incentives.

The worker may have one understanding of the engagement. The agency may hold another record. The end client may see only the supply-chain output. A payroll intermediary or umbrella company may hold employment and deduction information. A funder may see invoice and debtor data but not the full labour event. An insurer may see declared risk assumptions but not the underlying activity. HMRC or an auditor may later need to reconstruct what happened from contracts, payroll files, invoices, timesheets and correspondence.

Temporary labour therefore illustrates market-truth failure where economic activity becomes real before all relevant parties share a reliable view of the facts that govern that activity.

12.1 Temporary labour is economically significant and operationally embedded

Temporary labour is not a marginal feature of the UK economy. It is a structural labour mechanism used by construction, logistics, healthcare, industrial services, manufacturing, infrastructure, facilities management and project-based delivery.

The Recruitment & Employment Confederation reported that the UK recruitment industry contributed **£40.6 billion** to the UK economy in 2025. (rec.uk.com)

Temporary and contract labour supports:

- short-term workforce expansion;
- project mobilisation;
- absence cover;
- seasonal work;
- specialist skills access;
- regional labour flexibility;
- operational continuity;
- fast-response delivery.

The same flexibility that makes temporary labour valuable also makes it difficult to govern. Engagements can be short, frequent, local, urgent and dependent on several intermediaries. Records can be created quickly, changed late and reconciled after the work has already happened.

This creates a natural market-truth problem.

12.2 The labour event is shared, but the records are separated

A single labour episode can create several different records:

SECTION 12 CONTINUED

- a client requirement;
- an agency booking;
- a worker acceptance;
- right-to-work evidence;
- onboarding records;
- site or assignment attendance;
- timesheet or hours approval;
- payroll calculation;
- statutory deductions;
- umbrella or payroll artefacts;
- invoice data;
- funding or receivables data;
- payment status;
- audit records;
- regulator-facing evidence.

These records may not sit in one place. They may be held by the worker, agency, end client, umbrella company, payroll provider, funder, insurer, auditor or regulator.

The practical consequence is that no single party may have complete visibility of the live labour truth.

The end client may know that labour attended but not fully understand payroll route or deduction treatment. The worker may know the pay received but not understand the full charge chain or employer-cost treatment. The funder may know that an invoice exists but not have complete worker-level evidence behind it. The insurer may know declared exposure but not the real-time behaviour of the chain. The agency may know supply and margin but not all downstream risk consequences.

The labour event is economically shared, but the evidence is operationally fragmented.

12.3 Engagement route and payroll route can diverge

Temporary labour is especially vulnerable to truth failure because the commercial supply route and the payroll route may not be the same.

A contractor may believe it is buying labour from an agency. The agency may source a worker through a secondary agency. The worker may be paid through an umbrella company. A payroll company may sit behind that umbrella. A purported umbrella may operate in a way that does not match the expected PAYE model. A CIS route may be used for labour-only work. A personal service company or offshore payroll chain may appear in the structure.

Where the visible commercial relationship does not match the underlying worker-payment route, market truth becomes difficult to establish.

HMRC's labour supply-chain assurance guidance is highly relevant here. It recommends that businesses understand the businesses in their supply chains, understand how workers are engaged and paid, review labour supply chains regularly and simplify future contracts to reduce risk. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/labour-supply-chain-assurance-guidance))

That guidance reflects a fundamental point: in labour supply, the identity of the parties and the route by which workers are engaged and paid are themselves material market facts.

12.4 Retrospective reconstruction creates compliance weakness

Temporary labour markets often rely on after-the-event reconciliation.

SECTION 12 CONTINUED

Hours are approved after work. Payroll is calculated after hours. Invoices are raised after payroll or supply. Funding may be advanced against receivables after invoices exist. Audit or compliance review may occur after the whole sequence has already happened.

That sequence is not inherently wrong. Many markets settle after performance. The issue is whether the material facts were controlled when the obligation arose or reconstructed later when risk had already been created.

In temporary labour, the key moment is not merely invoice issue. It is the point at which work is accepted, commenced, performed and converted into payroll obligation.

If the market only achieves clarity at invoice stage, the truth is too late.

By that point:

- the worker has already performed labour;
- wage expectations have arisen;
- statutory obligations may have been triggered;
- tax treatment may have been applied;
- funding assumptions may have formed;
- the end client may have relied on the labour;
- the agency may have incurred cost;
- any misclassification or payroll-chain issue may already exist.

This is the labour-market equivalent of a property buyer discovering a material issue after committing cost, or a care commissioner discovering capacity weakness after a discharge plan has relied on the package.

12.5 Government reform direction shows accountability pressure

The UK Government has already recognised that umbrella and labour supply-chain arrangements create accountability issues.

From **6 April 2026**, responsibility for accounting for PAYE on payments made to workers supplied via umbrella companies shifts to the recruitment agency that has the contract with the end client, or to the end client where there is no agency. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk))

This reform is important for the market-truth argument.

It shows that where payroll-chain truth is weak, government may respond by pushing responsibility upstream toward parties with greater commercial control or closer end-client relationships.

The policy logic is not only that some umbrella companies may be non-compliant. It is that the wider chain must be made accountable for the payroll truth on which worker pay and tax compliance depend.

HMRC's mini umbrella company fraud guidance reinforces the same point. Mini umbrella company fraud involves the misuse of fragmented employment structures and requires supply-chain checks by businesses using labour. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk))

In market-truth terms, opaque structures create enforcement difficulty. Where no single agreed operating truth exists, regulators may need to impose broader liability rules, stronger due diligence expectations or upstream accountability.

12.6 Worker-facing truth is also fragmented

Temporary labour truth failure is not only a funder, insurer, client or regulator problem. It is also a worker problem.

Workers may need to understand:

SECTION 12 CONTINUED

- who employs them;
- who pays them;
- what deductions apply;
- whether holiday pay is included, accrued or paid separately;
- what pension treatment applies;
- who to contact about pay errors;
- whether the stated rate is gross, net, umbrella rate or assignment rate;
- what rights they have;
- what evidence they can rely on.

Where the market does not provide clear worker-level truth, the worker experience becomes dependent on explanation, trust and after-the-event correction.

That can weaken fairness, confidence and social value. It can also create reputational risk for end clients and contractors, particularly where work is public, prominent, infrastructure-linked or social-value-sensitive.

The worker-facing issue is therefore not limited to whether a payment route is technically lawful. It is whether the worker can understand and evidence the basic facts of the engagement: who is responsible for them, how they are paid, what deductions apply, what rights attach to the work, and where they can raise issues if the record is wrong.

12.7 Funding and insurance visibility depend on labour truth

Temporary labour also creates financial truth problems.

Funders may finance invoices or payroll-linked receivables. Insurers may assess labour-chain risk, employer obligations, residual loss, credit-related exposures or professional / operational liability. Auditors may test whether the records support the position represented.

In each case, the quality of the decision depends on the quality of the underlying labour truth.

If a funder sees an invoice but not the worker-level evidence behind it, funding confidence is weaker. If an insurer sees a declared exposure but not the conditions under which labour was admitted, paid and evidenced, risk classification is weaker. If an auditor sees payroll outputs but cannot trace them back to reliable engagement and hours records, assurance is weaker.

This does not mean that every funder, insurer or auditor needs access to all worker-level information. It means that the market needs a more reliable way to evidence that the labour event underlying the invoice, exposure or audit sample was real, authorised, correctly attributed and capable of later verification.

The research question is therefore whether temporary labour requires a more reliable operating record before finance, insurance and audit can fully rely on the market's outputs.

12.8 Temporary labour finding

Temporary labour demonstrates market-truth failure in a workforce, payroll and compliance market.

The market contains many records, but those records are often separated across parties and reconciled after the event. The key facts – who worked, when, under which route, with what payroll treatment, with what funding support and with what audit evidence – may not be captured as a single authoritative labour event when obligations arise.

The core finding is therefore:

SECTION 12 CONTINUED

Temporary labour demonstrates market-truth failure where worker-level engagement, payroll, funding and compliance facts are fragmented across multiple parties and often reconstructed after work has already created economic, statutory and evidential consequences.

SECTION 13

Temporary Labour Source Matrix

Source area	Source	Finding	Use in paper
Market scale	Recruitment & Employment Confederation - <i>Recruitment Industry Status Report 2024/25</i>	REC reported that the UK recruitment industry contributed £40.6bn to the UK economy in 2025. (rec.uk.com)	Establishes economic significance.
Labour supply-chain assurance	HMRC - <i>GfC12: Recommended approach to assurance</i>	HMRC recommends knowing the businesses in labour supply chains, understanding how workers are engaged and paid, reviewing supply chains regularly and simplifying future contracts to reduce risk. (gov.uk)	Direct support for route visibility and supply-chain truth.
Labour-chain tax risk	HMRC - <i>GfC12: Tax risks</i>	HMRC identifies tax risks in labour supply chains, including PAYE, CIS, offshore intermediaries, umbrella companies, mini umbrella companies and labour fraud. (gov.uk)	Supports the need for clear route, party and payroll truth.
Umbrella accountability reform	GOV.UK - <i>Umbrella companies: tackling non-compliance in the umbrella company market</i>	From 6 April 2026, PAYE responsibility in umbrella supply chains shifts to the recruitment agency contracting with the end client, or the end client where no agency exists. (gov.uk)	Shows policy movement toward upstream accountability where payroll-chain truth is weak.
Mini umbrella fraud	HMRC - <i>Mini umbrella company fraud</i>	HMRC provides guidance on mini umbrella company fraud and supply-chain checks. (gov.uk)	Shows how fragmented payroll structures can enable avoidance and enforcement difficulty.
Worker pay transparency	GOV.UK - key information document and umbrella-company worker guidance	Government guidance requires clearer information about pay, deductions, employment business identity, umbrella involvement and assignment terms.	Supports the worker-facing need for clearer information about pay, deductions, employment business identity, umbrella involvement and assignment terms.
Labour supply-chain due diligence	GOV.UK - labour provider and supply-chain assurance guidance	Government guidance encourages organisations using labour providers to understand who is in the chain and how workers are engaged and paid.	Supports the finding that organisations using labour providers should understand who is in the chain and how workers are engaged, paid and protected.
Public procurement and social value	GOV.UK - Social Value Model / PPN 002	The Social Value Model supports fair work, fair pay, responsible procurement and monitored delivery commitments in relevant public procurement.	Supports the relevance of fair work, fair pay, responsible procurement and supply-chain accountability in public or prominent works.

SECTION 14

Temporary Labour Findings

14.1 Finding TL-F1 – Temporary labour is economically significant

Temporary labour and recruitment form a major part of the UK economy and support essential workforce flexibility across multiple sectors.

The market is therefore large enough for its structural weaknesses to matter beyond individual disputes.

14.2 Finding TL-F2 – Labour records are distributed across many parties

A single labour event can generate records across workers, agencies, end clients, payroll intermediaries, funders, insurers, auditors and regulators.

Where no party holds or can rely on a complete worker-level truth state, the market becomes dependent on partial visibility and later reconciliation.

14.3 Finding TL-F3 – Engagement route, payroll route and commercial route may diverge

Temporary labour is vulnerable to route opacity because the visible commercial chain may not match the underlying payment or employment chain.

This creates risk for workers, agencies, end clients, funders, insurers and HMRC.

14.4 Finding TL-F4 – Government reform confirms accountability pressure

HMRC guidance and umbrella reforms show that labour supply-chain assurance is an active policy concern.

Where payroll-chain truth is fragmented, responsibility is increasingly pushed toward agencies or end clients that are better placed to control or verify the chain.

14.5 Finding TL-F5 – Temporary labour is a market-truth failure case

Temporary labour demonstrates that a market can hold many records yet still lack agreed operating truth.

Its weakness is the absence of a sufficiently authoritative, real-time and worker-level record of engagement, work, payroll, funding, compliance and evidence at the point those facts create obligations.

Cross-Market Synthesis

Cross-Market Comparison

Market Truth Failure Model

Infrastructure Requirements

SYNTH

SECTION 15

Cross-Market Comparison

The three case studies are different in subject matter, legal structure and market purpose. Residential property concerns high-value private transactions. Adult social care concerns public-interest care delivery and provider capacity. Temporary labour concerns workforce engagement, payroll, compliance and labour-linked financial exposure.

However, the evidence suggests that all three markets share a common structural weakness: material facts are distributed across multiple parties, surfaced at different times, and often reconciled after reliance has already formed.

This does not mean the markets are identical. It means they display a repeatable market-truth failure pattern.

15.1 Shared structural pattern

Criterion	Residential property	Adult social care	Temporary labour
Core market activity	Buying and selling residential property	Assessing, commissioning and delivering care	Supplying, engaging, paying and evidencing temporary labour
Key operating truth	Transaction readiness	Care need, capacity and delivery	Worker engagement, route, payroll and funding truth
Main timing problem	Critical information may emerge late in conveyancing	Need, capacity and delivery status may not be visible in real time	Work and payroll obligations may arise before all parties share reliable route and funding truth
Fragmented parties	Buyer, seller, estate agent, conveyancer, lender, surveyor, local authority, HMLR, managing agent	Individual, family, local authority, provider, NHS, CQC, care workers, workforce bodies, finance teams	Worker, agency, end client, contractor, umbrella, payroll provider, funder, insurer, auditor, HMRC
Typical records	Title, searches, enquiries, survey, mortgage offer, chain updates, contracts	Assessment, care plan, funding approval, provider capacity, workforce data, delivery records, quality records	Booking, contract, onboarding, right-to-work, timesheet, payroll, RTI, payslip, invoice, funding record
Fragmentation symptom	Parties chase updates and discover issues sequentially	Commissioners, providers and families lack a joined live picture	Parties hold partial records of the same labour event
Consequence	Delay, fall-through, sunk cost, renegotiation, chain collapse	Delayed care, unmet need, poor capacity matching, pressure on hospitals and families	Compliance exposure, worker confusion, funding uncertainty, audit weakness
Reform direction	Upfront information, digital property data, HMLR digitisation	Care data roadmap, data sharing, better analytics	HMRC supply-chain assurance, umbrella reform, payroll-chain accountability
Market-truth requirement	Earlier verified transaction facts	Live need, funding, capacity, workforce and delivery view	Worker-level engagement, payroll, route, funding and evidence truth

The comparison shows that each market has records, but records alone are not enough.

The missing layer is the ability for relevant parties to rely on a current, authoritative and appropriately shared state of the facts that matter.

15.2 The difference between data existence and market truth

A central lesson across the three case studies is that data existence does not equal market truth.

Residential property contains title data, searches, surveys, contracts and lender information. Yet the transaction can still fail because the relevant transaction facts are not surfaced and reconciled early enough.

Adult social care contains local authority records, provider records, CQC information, NHS data and workforce datasets. Yet the care system may still lack a live joined view of need, funding, capacity, workforce and delivery.

SECTION 15 CONTINUED

Temporary labour contains contracts, agency records, payroll files, RTI submissions, invoices and audit documents. Yet the market may still lack agreed worker-level truth at the moment work creates economic and statutory obligations.

The recurring issue is therefore not the absence of records. It is the absence of governed operating truth.

15.3 The shared timing gap

All three markets suffer from a timing gap between reliance and certainty.

In residential property, a buyer, seller or chain may rely on progress before transaction readiness is fully known.

In adult social care, a person, family, hospital or local authority may rely on a care plan before capacity, workforce availability or delivery readiness is fully visible.

In temporary labour, a worker may perform work and a supply chain may incur obligations before payroll route, funding certainty and compliance evidence are fully aligned.

This timing gap is the practical heart of market-truth failure.

Where certainty arrives too late, the market becomes dependent on correction, renegotiation, escalation or loss allocation. That is more expensive and less reliable than capturing the relevant truth before reliance hardens.

15.4 The shared accountability gap

Fragmented truth also creates an accountability gap.

Where facts are distributed across many parties, it becomes harder to identify:

- who knew the relevant fact;
- when they knew it;
- whether another party could see it;
- whether reliance was reasonable;
- whether a delay was avoidable;
- whether a failure was caused by conduct, capacity, funding, system design or missing information.

This is visible in each market.

In residential property, transaction failure may be attributed to a buyer, seller, lender, conveyancer, chain issue, search result or late discovery.

In adult social care, delivery failure may be attributed to funding pressure, provider shortage, workforce shortage, assessment delay, NHS discharge pressure, commissioning weakness or quality risk.

In temporary labour, compliance or payment failure may be attributed to the agency, umbrella company, payroll provider, end client, worker, funder, insurer or wider chain.

Where the authoritative event record is unclear, accountability becomes contestable.

15.5 The shared assurance burden

All three markets respond to low shared truth by increasing assurance activity.

Residential property produces repeated enquiries, duplicate checks, updated searches, lender-specific requirements and manual chasing.

Adult social care produces commissioning reviews, provider monitoring, inspection data, workforce surveys, financial assessments and safeguarding checks.

SECTION 15 CONTINUED

Temporary labour produces supply-chain due diligence, payroll audits, umbrella checks, worker onboarding checks, invoice verification, funder reviews and insurer diligence.

Some assurance is necessary. The problem arises when assurance becomes a substitute for trusted operating truth.

Where each party performs its own assurance because it cannot rely on a shared authoritative state, the market becomes slower, more expensive and less consistent.

15.6 The shared risk-transfer problem

Weak market truth also affects risk transfer.

In residential property, transaction failure creates wasted cost and may shift risk informally through renegotiation, delay or chain collapse.

In adult social care, weak visibility can shift practical risk to individuals, families, hospitals, providers or local authorities.

In temporary labour, weak engagement and payroll truth can shift risk between agencies, end clients, workers, funders, insurers and regulators.

Risk transfer becomes problematic where the party bearing risk did not have adequate visibility of the facts creating that risk.

This is one reason market-truth infrastructure matters. It does not remove all risk, but it can make risk more visible, attributable and governable.

15.7 Cross-market conclusion

The cross-market evidence supports the central thesis of this paper:

Large multi-party markets become structurally inefficient where material facts are fragmented, late, duplicated or retrospectively reconstructed.

Residential property shows the problem in transaction readiness.

Adult social care shows the problem in need, capacity and delivery.

Temporary labour shows the problem in worker engagement, payroll, funding and compliance evidence.

The common issue is not simply bad behaviour, inadequate funding or slow process. Those may all be present, but they are not the whole explanation.

The deeper structural issue is that each market lacks a sufficiently reliable operating layer through which relevant parties can see, trust and rely on the material facts at the point those facts matter.

SECTION 16

Market Truth Failure Model

The case studies suggest that market-truth failure can be assessed through a repeatable diagnostic model.

This model is intended to help identify markets where infrastructure-led innovation may be justified. It does not assume that every fragmented market requires a new platform. It provides a disciplined way to ask whether fragmented truth is creating measurable market harm.

16.1 Diagnostic stage 1 – Multi-party dependency

The first question is whether multiple parties depend on the same material facts.

A market is more likely to suffer market-truth failure where different parties must rely on the same event or state to make decisions.

Examples include:

- whether a property transaction is ready to proceed;
- whether a care package is funded and deliverable;
- whether a worker has lawfully commenced work under a valid payroll route.

If only one party needs the fact, fragmentation may be manageable. If many parties need the fact, shared truth becomes more important.

16.2 Diagnostic stage 2 – Fact fragmentation

The second question is whether the required facts are held across different parties, systems or documents.

Fragmentation exists where no single party or governed process can produce the full operating picture.

This may involve:

- separate professional systems in property;
- separate commissioner, provider and NHS systems in care;
- separate agency, payroll, client, funder and insurer systems in labour.

Fragmentation is not automatically harmful. It becomes harmful where no agreed mechanism exists to determine which fact is authoritative.

16.3 Diagnostic stage 3 – Late emergence

The third question is whether key facts emerge after reliance has already formed.

Late emergence is especially damaging where parties incur cost, create expectations, accept risk or make commitments before the relevant truth is known.

In property, late search or leasehold information may undermine a transaction.

In care, late capacity or workforce information may delay safe discharge or care delivery.

In labour, late payroll-route or funding information may emerge only after work has already occurred.

Late truth creates avoidable reliance risk.

16.4 Diagnostic stage 4 – Retrospective reconstruction

The fourth question is whether the market relies on after-the-event reconstruction to establish what happened.

SECTION 16 CONTINUED

Retrospective reconstruction may use:

- documents;
- emails;
- spreadsheets;
- invoices;
- case notes;
- timesheets;
- portal records;
- audit samples;
- witness accounts;
- professional correspondence.

Retrospective reconstruction is not always wrong. It is useful for audit and investigation. But if retrospective reconstruction is necessary for routine operation, the market is structurally weak.

Routine reliance on retrospective truth means the market did not capture the material state when it mattered.

16.5 Diagnostic stage 5 – Duplicated assurance

The fifth question is whether parties repeatedly verify the same facts because they cannot rely on another party's record.

Duplicated assurance is a symptom of low shared trust.

In property, this appears as repeated enquiries and lender-specific checks.

In care, it appears as repeated assessments, monitoring exercises and fragmented reporting.

In labour, it appears as repeated supply-chain due diligence, payroll checks, invoice verification and audit trails.

Some assurance is unavoidable, but excessive duplication suggests the market lacks trusted reusable truth.

16.6 Diagnostic stage 6 – Risk transfer without visibility

The sixth question is whether parties bear risk without seeing the facts that create it.

This is especially important where funders, insurers, public bodies, buyers, workers or vulnerable individuals are affected.

Risk transfer without visibility is structurally unstable. It can lead to defensive pricing, conservative behaviour, over-insurance, under-service, disputes or regulatory intervention.

A market-truth model should ask:

Who bears the risk, and could they see the facts creating that risk when it arose?

16.7 Diagnostic stage 7 – Accountability ambiguity

The seventh question is whether it is difficult to identify who knew what, when, and on what basis.

Accountability ambiguity occurs where several parties contribute to a failure but no authoritative event record shows the relevant sequence.

SECTION 16 CONTINUED

This matters because markets cannot improve what they cannot attribute.

Without event-level accountability, failure can be explained away as delay, misunderstanding, market practice, provider shortage, payroll error, chain issue or administrative complexity.

Market truth requires more than a final output. It requires traceable lineage.

16.8 Diagnostic stage 8 – Infrastructure opportunity

The final question is whether a better operating-truth layer could materially improve the market.

The answer will not always be yes. Some markets may be fragmented but not suitable for infrastructure intervention. Others may require legal reform, funding reform or workforce reform before data infrastructure can help.

However, where the following conditions exist together, infrastructure-led innovation may be justified:

- repeated reliance on shared facts;
- high economic or public-interest value;
- fragmented records;
- late certainty;
- duplicated assurance;
- risk transfer without visibility;
- recurring audit or accountability difficulty;
- identifiable event points where truth could be captured earlier.

Where these conditions exist, the market may be a candidate for market-truth infrastructure.

16.9 Summary of the model

Diagnostic stage	Core question
Multi-party dependency	Do several parties depend on the same facts?
Fact fragmentation	Are those facts held across different parties or systems?
Late emergence	Do key facts become clear after reliance has formed?
Retrospective reconstruction	Is the market routinely reconstructing what happened after the event?
Duplicated assurance	Are parties repeating checks because they cannot rely on shared records?
Risk transfer without visibility	Are parties bearing risk without seeing the facts that create it?
Accountability ambiguity	Is it difficult to identify who knew what, when and on what basis?
Infrastructure opportunity	Could authoritative event capture materially improve the market?

This model is the central reusable output of the paper. It allows Augscope to compare markets without beginning from a preferred solution.

It also provides the bridge between research and spin-off formation. A future Augscope project should not begin with a product idea. It should begin by testing whether the market shows enough evidence of truth failure to justify infrastructure-led intervention.

SECTION 17

Requirements for Market–Truth Infrastructure

The case studies and diagnostic model suggest that market–truth failure is not solved by producing more reports, creating more portals or asking participants to perform more checks.

In fragmented markets, more information can sometimes make the problem worse. If each party creates its own dataset, dashboard, workflow or assurance pack, the market may gain more data without gaining more truth.

The requirement is more specific. A market–truth infrastructure must identify the material facts on which the market depends, determine where those facts should become authoritative, capture them at the right point, preserve their lineage, and make them visible to relevant parties in controlled form.

This section sets out the common requirements of any such infrastructure.

17.1 Authoritative state ownership

Each material fact should have one recognised authoritative source.

This does not mean that one organisation must own all market data. It means that for each material state, the market should know which record is authoritative.

In residential property, this might mean distinguishing clearly between title truth, search truth, survey truth, lender–readiness truth, chain–status truth and completion–readiness truth.

In adult social care, it might mean distinguishing between assessed need, eligibility, funding approval, provider capacity, workforce availability, scheduled care, delivered care and safeguarding status.

In temporary labour, it might mean distinguishing between worker identity, engagement route, commencement, hours, payroll output, funding support, invoice status and payment execution.

Where no authoritative owner exists, downstream parties fill the gap with assumptions, duplication or defensive checks.

17.2 Event–level capture

Material facts should be captured when the relevant event occurs.

A property transaction should not need to discover critical defects only after multiple parties have incurred significant reliance. A care system should not need to discover capacity gaps only after a care package has been assumed deliverable. A temporary labour chain should not need to reconstruct engagement and payroll truth only after work has already been performed.

Event–level capture means identifying the point at which a fact becomes market–relevant.

Examples include:

SECTION 17 CONTINUED

- when a property is listed;
- when material information is supplied;
- when a search result is returned;
- when a mortgage condition is satisfied;
- when care need is assessed;
- when funding is approved;
- when a provider accepts a package;
- when care delivery starts;
- when a worker accepts an engagement;
- when work validly commences;
- when hours become payroll-permissible;
- when payroll is calculated.

The objective is not to record everything. It is to record the events that change rights, obligations, readiness, risk or reliance.

17.3 Time-stamping and sequence integrity

Market truth depends on timing.

A fact is not only important because it exists. It is important because of when it became known, when it became valid, when another party relied on it, and whether later events changed it.

A market-truth system should therefore preserve sequence integrity.

It should show:

- when a fact was created;
- who created it;
- when it was validated;
- whether it was visible to another party;
- when it was changed;
- what the prior state was;
- whether reliance occurred before or after the fact became available.

This matters because many disputes are timing disputes.

In property, the question may be when a material issue became known. In care, it may be when capacity failed or when need changed. In labour, it may be when work commenced, when hours were finalised or when payroll obligation arose.

Without sequence integrity, the market cannot reliably distinguish between preventable failure, late discovery, changed circumstances and ordinary commercial risk.

17.4 Attribution

Every material state should be attributable.

Attribution means the record shows which party, system, professional, provider, worker, employer, funder or authority created, confirmed, modified or relied on the fact.

SECTION 17 CONTINUED

This does not mean every user should be blamed for every failure. It means the market should not have to reconstruct responsibility from email trails, phone notes or assumptions.

Attribution improves:

- accountability;
- auditability;
- dispute resolution;
- risk pricing;
- regulatory confidence;
- internal governance;
- public defensibility.

In adult social care, attribution may show who assessed need, who approved funding, who accepted a package and who delivered care. In temporary labour, attribution may show who created the booking, who accepted the work, who approved hours, who calculated payroll and who released payment. In property, attribution may show who supplied material information, who verified it and who relied on it.

17.5 Controlled visibility

Market truth does not require unrestricted data sharing.

Different parties need different views of the same underlying truth. A buyer does not need access to every internal lender record. A care provider does not need full local authority financial information about every individual. A funder in a labour chain does not need irrelevant worker personal data beyond what is necessary to assess the receivable, exposure or control position.

Market-truth infrastructure should therefore support governed views.

The underlying truth should be consistent, but access should be controlled by role, purpose, permission, legal basis and necessity.

This is especially important in markets involving personal data, vulnerable individuals, financial information or commercially sensitive supply chains.

The requirement is:

same underlying truth, different permitted views.

17.6 Correction lineage

Corrections should not erase history.

Fragmented markets often struggle because correction happens informally. A spreadsheet is overwritten. A revised figure is emailed. A new version of a document replaces an old one. A note is updated without preserving the prior position. A payroll value is corrected but the underlying cause is unclear.

A market-truth system should preserve correction lineage.

It should show:

SECTION 17 CONTINUED

- the original state;
- the corrected state;
- who corrected it;
- why it changed;
- when it changed;
- what downstream outputs were affected;
- whether earlier reliance was based on the original state.

This is essential because mature markets do not eliminate error. They govern error.

17.7 Interoperability

A market-truth system should reduce silos, not create a new one.

Interoperability means the system can interact with existing records, standards, systems and workflows where appropriate. It does not mean every market participant must abandon all existing tools at once.

In residential property, interoperability may involve conveyancing systems, lender systems, estate agency systems, HMLR services, search providers and property data standards.

In adult social care, it may involve local authority systems, NHS systems, provider records, CQC data, workforce datasets and care planning tools.

In temporary labour, it may involve agency systems, payroll systems, RTI outputs, funder reporting, insurer evidence, client approvals and audit records.

A market-truth layer should sit where truth is needed, not merely where software is convenient.

17.8 Auditability

Market truth must survive later scrutiny.

A market-truth infrastructure should produce records that can be reviewed by auditors, regulators, funders, insurers, public bodies, courts, internal governance teams or affected individuals.

Auditability requires more than final outputs. It requires lineage.

The record should show:

- source inputs;
- validation steps;
- state transitions;
- responsible parties;
- timing;
- dependencies;
- corrections;
- final outputs;
- downstream reliance.

A system that cannot explain how it reached its output is not a market-truth system. It is another black box.

SECTION 17 CONTINUED

17.9 Permissioning and privacy

Market truth must be compatible with privacy, confidentiality and data protection.

This is particularly important in adult social care and temporary labour, where records may include sensitive personal information, employment data, financial information, health-adjacent information or safeguarding context.

The existence of a shared truth layer does not justify uncontrolled exposure of personal data.

A credible infrastructure must include:

- purpose limitation;
- role-based access;
- data minimisation;
- retention rules;
- lawful basis controls;
- security controls;
- consent or authorisation mechanisms where required;
- separation between identifiable data and aggregate reporting where appropriate.

Without permissioning, market-truth infrastructure may become unacceptable even if it is technically effective.

17.10 Governance and non-reinterpretation

The most important requirement is governance.

A market-truth infrastructure must prevent downstream parties from informally reinterpreting upstream truth.

If a fact has been authoritatively created, downstream reporting should not silently change it. If a payroll value has been determined from accepted inputs, a later report should not recalculate it without a visible correction process. If a care package was accepted at a particular time, a later capacity report should not erase that state. If a transaction status was blocked because a condition was missing, a later dashboard should not imply readiness.

This principle is not specific to any one market. It is a general requirement of trustworthy operating records.

Where downstream parties can reinterpret upstream facts, the market does not have shared truth. It has shared access to contested data.

The requirement is therefore:

Market truth requires authority discipline. Without it, shared data can still become contested data.

17.11 Summary of infrastructure requirements

Requirement	Purpose
Authoritative state ownership	Prevent competing versions of the same material fact.
Event-level capture	Record facts when they become market-relevant.
Time-stamping	Preserve when facts became true, visible or relied upon.

SECTION 17 CONTINUED

Requirement	Purpose
Attribution	Show who created, validated, changed or relied on a fact.
Controlled visibility	Allow relevant parties to see permitted views of the same truth.
Correction lineage	Govern changes without erasing history.
Interoperability	Connect market participants without creating another silo.
Auditability	Allow later review without narrative reconstruction.
Permissioning	Protect privacy, confidentiality and lawful data use.
Governance	Prevent downstream reinterpretation of authoritative states.

17.12 Section finding

The common requirement across fragmented markets is not simply better data.

It is governed operating truth.

Residential property needs transaction-readiness truth. Adult social care needs need, funding, capacity and delivery truth. Temporary labour needs worker engagement, payroll, route, funding and evidence truth.

Each market has different facts, different legal duties and different risk profiles. But each requires a structure through which material facts become authoritative early enough for parties to rely on them safely.

SECTION 18

Implications for Augscope Research and Spin-Off Formation

The purpose of this paper is not to propose a product, platform, operating model or named commercial response.

Its purpose is to establish a research method.

The paper identifies a repeatable structural problem: large, multi-party markets may continue operating for long periods while lacking agreed, timely and authoritative operating truth. Where that occurs, market participants may rely on fragmented records, duplicated checks, late discovery, retrospective reconstruction and contested accountability.

For Augscope, the implication is that market-truth failure can be treated as a research lens.

Rather than beginning with a solution, the research begins with a market question:

Are there large markets where the parties who depend on the same material facts cannot see, verify or rely on those facts at the point those facts matter?

If the answer is yes, the next question is not immediately “what should be built?” It is:

Does the lack of agreed operating truth create sufficient commercial, legal, social, financial, ethical or public-interest harm to justify deeper sector-specific research?

This creates a disciplined research sequence:

market observation → structural diagnosis → evidence gathering → sector-specific research → possible model exploration → possible spin-off formation.

18.1 Research before solution

A research-led studio should not begin by assuming that a particular product or platform is required.

It should begin by identifying markets where:

- the market is economically or socially significant;
- several parties depend on the same material facts;
- those facts are held across different systems or organisations;
- reliance forms before certainty exists;
- assurance is duplicated;
- risk is transferred without adequate visibility;
- accountability is weakened by retrospective reconstruction;
- there are identifiable event points where truth could be captured earlier.

SECTION 18 CONTINUED

Only after those conditions are evidenced should Augscape consider whether deeper sector research, prototype development, model specification or spin-off formation may be justified.

This protects credibility. It allows Augscape to explain why a market matters before it explains what, if anything, should be done about it.

18.2 The Augscape market-truth lens

This paper provides a reusable lens for future Augscape research.

That lens can be expressed as:

Is this market structurally weakened because the parties who depend on the same facts cannot see, verify or rely on those facts at the point those facts create reliance, obligation, risk or accountability?

If the answer is yes, Augscape can then ask:

Could earlier, governed and more authoritative capture of those facts materially improve visibility, accountability, financeability, user experience or public defensibility?

This lens can apply beyond the three case studies in this paper.

Potential future research areas may include:

- medicines supply visibility;
- construction building-safety evidence;
- social housing repairs and compliance;
- temporary accommodation placement;
- public-procurement delivery evidence;
- subcontractor payment and retentions;
- specialist workforce credentialing;
- energy retrofit verification;
- care workforce deployment;
- property transaction readiness.

The paper does not claim that any of these areas should automatically become Augscape projects. It establishes a method for deciding whether they deserve deeper research.

18.3 Why temporary labour merits further research

Within the three markets considered, temporary labour appears to merit further sector-specific investigation because its market-truth failure intersects several high-value consequences at once.

Temporary labour affects:

SECTION 18 CONTINUED

worker pay;
 employment status;
 PAYE and NIC treatment;
 holiday pay and pension treatment;
 end-client assurance;
 agency commercial operations;
 funder confidence;
 insurer visibility;
 audit evidence;
 public procurement and social value;
 regulatory enforcement.

This concentration of consequences makes temporary labour a strong candidate for deeper research following this paper.

However, this paper should stop short of defining a solution. Its conclusion should be that temporary labour deserves further investigation because it displays an unusually dense combination of market-truth failure, worker impact, compliance sensitivity and financial consequence.

At this stage, the appropriate output is not a model. It is a research mandate.

18.4 Research-to-spin-off pathway

The pathway from this paper to any later spin-off should be expressed generically.

A later Augscape project may emerge only if further research shows that:

the market-truth failure is real and material;
 the affected counterparties can be clearly identified;
 the material event points can be mapped;
 the harms caused by fragmentation can be evidenced;
 the market has enough willingness or pressure to adopt a new approach;
 a governed infrastructure response is feasible;
 the response can improve market operation without creating worse risks.

This means the paper does not create a spin-off. It creates the criteria by which a spin-off may later be justified.

That distinction is important.

A research paper identifies and evidences a structural failure. A later model, venture or infrastructure project must be separately justified by more detailed market, legal, technical, financial and operational work.

18.5 Studio credibility

This approach gives Augscape a stronger strategic identity.

Augscape can be positioned as a research and development studio that studies structurally fragmented markets and investigates whether market-truth infrastructure could improve them.

The studio does not need to claim that every fragmented market should be solved by software. Nor does it need to claim that data alone cures funding, workforce, legal or behavioural problems.

The more credible position is:

SECTION 18 CONTINUED

Augscape researches markets where fragmentation of operating truth appears to create avoidable cost, risk, delay, opacity or unfairness. Where the evidence supports it, Augscape may undertake deeper sector-specific research and later explore controlled infrastructure models or spin-off projects.

This preserves research integrity and avoids premature solutionism.

18.6 Section finding

The implication for Augscape is that market-truth failure can become a disciplined research theme and venture-formation filter.

This paper should be treated as the first foundational paper in that theme. It identifies a repeatable structural problem across residential property, adult social care and temporary labour. It then provides a method for deciding which markets deserve deeper work.

On that basis, temporary labour may be selected for further research, not because a solution has already been defined, but because the case study reveals a particularly dense convergence of worker, compliance, funding, insurance, audit and public-defensibility issues.

The correct concluding position is therefore:

This paper does not define the response. It defines the reason to investigate further.

SECTION 19

Temporary Labour as a Candidate for Further Sector Research

The cross-market analysis in this paper identifies temporary labour as a particularly strong candidate for further research.

This does not mean that a response has already been defined. It means that temporary labour displays enough indicators of market-truth failure to justify deeper investigation.

The sector combines:

- high economic value;
- fast-moving transactions;
- multiple counterparties;
- worker-facing consequences;
- tax and employment compliance;
- funding and receivables sensitivity;
- insurance and audit relevance;
- public-procurement and social-value implications.

That combination makes temporary labour unusual. Many markets suffer from fragmented records. Fewer markets combine fragmented records with live worker pay, statutory obligations, supply-chain liability, commercial funding and public defensibility at the same time.

19.1 Why temporary labour stands out

Temporary labour stands out because the key event is not merely administrative. It is human, economic and legal at once.

When a temporary worker performs work, several consequences may arise:

- the worker expects to be paid;
- the engagement route becomes relevant;
- tax and NIC treatment may be triggered;
- holiday pay and pension consequences may arise;
- the agency or labour-chain party may incur cost;
- the end client receives economic benefit;
- a funder may rely on future invoice recovery;
- an insurer may later be asked to respond to a risk;
- an auditor or regulator may need evidence of what happened.

If the underlying labour event is not captured clearly when it occurs, the market may later need to reconstruct the truth from partial records.

This creates a stronger case for further research than a market where fragmentation causes inconvenience only. In temporary labour, fragmented truth may affect pay, compliance, financeability, risk transfer and worker confidence.

19.2 Temporary labour has identifiable event points

A further reason temporary labour is suitable for deeper research is that the market contains identifiable event points.

These include:

SECTION 19 CONTINUED

labour requirement creation;
 worker sourcing;
 worker identity and right-to-work verification;
 engagement-route selection;
 employer or payment-route confirmation;
 assignment acceptance;
 commencement of work;
 attendance or delivery evidence;
 hours approval;
 payroll calculation;
 statutory reporting;
 invoice creation;
 payment execution;
 dispute or correction;
 audit retention.

These event points can be mapped.

That matters because infrastructure-led research should not begin with vague claims about “better transparency”. It should identify the moments at which material truth is created, changed or relied upon.

Temporary labour is a strong research candidate because many of those moments are clear, repeated and economically significant.

19.3 Temporary labour has multiple affected counterparties

Temporary labour also stands out because the same truth failure affects many counterparties differently.

The worker may experience confusion over pay, deductions, rights or employer identity.

The agency may face payroll-chain, tax, funding, margin or reputational risk.

The end client may face supply-chain assurance, public accountability or commercial continuity risk.

The funder may face uncertainty over the quality of receivables or underlying labour evidence.

The insurer may face uncertainty over risk classification, control evidence or claims validation.

The auditor may face difficulty tracing payroll and engagement records back to reliable source events.

The regulator may face difficulty enforcing obligations across fragmented chains.

This multi-counterparty effect makes temporary labour valuable for further study. It suggests that the problem is not confined to one participant group. It is structural.

19.4 Temporary labour has reform pressure

Temporary labour also shows signs of regulatory and policy pressure.

HMRC’s labour supply-chain assurance guidance recommends that businesses understand who is in their supply chain, how workers are engaged and how they are paid. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk))

SECTION 19 CONTINUED

Government reforms to umbrella company non-compliance from April 2026 also indicate a movement toward greater upstream accountability for payroll-chain outcomes. ([gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk))

This policy direction does not define a solution. But it does support the research position that temporary labour is already under pressure to improve visibility, accountability and route assurance.

19.5 Further research questions

This paper therefore recommends that temporary labour be taken forward into a dedicated research programme.

That programme should ask:

- Which temporary labour routes create the greatest market-truth weakness?
- Which counterparties are most affected by fragmented worker-level records?
- At what point should labour engagement truth become authoritative?
- Which facts must be captured before work begins?
- Which facts must be captured at commencement?
- Which facts must be captured before payroll?
- Which facts must be visible to end clients, agencies, workers, funders, insurers and auditors?
- How does route opacity affect worker experience and social value?
- How does fragmented evidence affect receivables, payroll funding and insurance?
- What would an improved operating model need to prove before adoption?

These questions should lead into sector-specific papers, not directly into a product claim.

19.6 Section finding

Temporary labour should be treated as a priority candidate for deeper research because it displays a dense convergence of fragmented truth, worker impact, regulatory pressure, funding relevance, insurance relevance and audit difficulty.

The finding is:

Temporary labour appears to be one of the strongest case-study markets for further Augscape research because the absence of agreed worker-level operating truth can affect pay, compliance, funding, insurance, audit and public defensibility at the same time.

This paper should therefore close by recommending further sector-specific investigation into temporary labour, while preserving the principle that any later model or spin-off must be justified by its own research, specification and feasibility work.

SECTION 20

Conclusion

This paper began with a simple question:

What happens when large markets depend on material facts that no participant can see, verify or rely upon at the point those facts matter?

The evidence considered across residential property, adult social care and temporary labour suggests that this is not an abstract question. It is a recurring market-structure problem.

Each of the three markets examined in this paper contains many records. Residential property contains title records, searches, surveys, contracts, lender requirements and professional correspondence. Adult social care contains assessments, care plans, funding records, provider data, workforce datasets, inspection information and public expenditure reporting. Temporary labour contains agency records, worker records, timesheets, payroll files, RTI submissions, invoices, contracts and audit evidence.

Yet in each case, the existence of records does not necessarily create agreed operating truth.

20.1 The common failure

The common failure is that material facts are fragmented, late, duplicated or retrospectively reconstructed.

In residential property, this appears as transaction-readiness uncertainty. Parties may commit time, money and expectation before the full transaction state is known.

In adult social care, this appears as need, funding, capacity, workforce and delivery uncertainty. Public bodies, providers, families and individuals may struggle to rely on a joined view of care-market reality.

In temporary labour, this appears as worker-level engagement, route, payroll, funding and compliance uncertainty. Work may create obligations before all parties can see or rely on the underlying facts.

These markets differ, but the structural pattern is the same.

20.2 The reform direction

The reform direction across these markets points toward earlier, more reliable and more shareable information.

Residential property reform focuses on improving the home buying and selling process, material information and digital property data.

Adult social care reform includes improving how care data is collected, shared and analysed.

Temporary labour reform includes stronger labour supply-chain assurance and greater accountability for payroll-chain compliance.

These reforms do not all use the same language. But they point toward the same underlying need:

parties need better access to the facts that determine readiness, capacity, obligation, risk and accountability.

20.3 The market-truth proposition

The paper therefore supports the following proposition:

SECTION 20 CONTINUED

Large multi-party markets become structurally inefficient where the material facts on which parties rely are fragmented, late, duplicated or retrospectively reconstructed.

This proposition should not be overstated.

The paper does not claim that data solves every market problem. Funding, workforce supply, legal duties, commercial incentives, professional conduct and public policy all matter. Nor does the paper argue that every market requires one central database.

The narrower and stronger claim is that markets become harder to govern where no agreed operating truth exists for the facts that create reliance, obligation, risk or accountability.

20.4 The infrastructure implication

Where market-truth failure is material, the required response is unlikely to be more reporting alone.

More reports can describe fragmentation without curing it. More portals can create additional silos. More assurance can increase cost without creating reusable trust.

The more important requirement is governed operating truth:

- authoritative state ownership;
- event-level capture;
- time-stamping;
- attribution;
- controlled visibility;
- correction lineage;
- interoperability;
- auditability;
- permissioning;
- non-reinterpretation of authoritative states.

These are not product features in the narrow sense. They are infrastructure principles.

20.5 The Augscope implication

For Augscope, the value of this paper is methodological.

It establishes a research lens that can be applied to other markets:

identify markets where fragmented operating truth creates avoidable cost, delay, risk, opacity, unfairness or weak accountability; then investigate whether governed infrastructure could improve the market.

This lens supports research-led venture formation without premature solution claims.

Augscope can use the framework to decide which markets deserve deeper work, which harms are material, which counterparties are affected, which event points matter, and whether a controlled infrastructure response may be justified.

SECTION 20 CONTINUED**20.6 Final conclusion**

Residential property, adult social care and temporary labour each show that a market can be large, mature and data-rich while still lacking agreed operating truth.

That is the central finding of this paper.

The markets studied here do not merely need more information. They need better structures for determining which facts are authoritative, when those facts become true, who may rely on them, how they may be corrected, and how they can be evidenced later.

Where those structures are missing, markets continue to operate – but they operate with avoidable friction, weak visibility and hidden risk.

The final conclusion is therefore:

Market-truth failure is a repeatable structural weakness in complex UK service markets. It provides a legitimate foundation for further research, sector-specific investigation and, where justified, future infrastructure-led innovation.

PUBLICATION NOTICE

Footer / Publication Notice

This document was published by: **Augscape Research & Development Limited**. Company number: **12996074**.

This is an open research document. It may be shared, quoted, cited, adapted or used for internal education, commercial discussion, public-sector review, policy discussion, market-structure analysis, strategic research, investor discussion or future project scoping.

Where this document, its structure, terminology, market-truth framework, diagnostic model, case-study analysis, source matrices or conclusions are quoted or relied upon externally, attribution should be made to:

Augscape Research & Development Limited

AMTF-001 – Fragmented Market Truth and Retrospective Data Dependency

This document is provided for research, education, strategic analysis and market-structure assessment purposes only. It does not constitute legal, financial, tax, employment, property, conveyancing, health, social care, insurance, regulatory, procurement or investment advice.

Readers should obtain appropriate professional advice before relying on any conclusion, market interpretation, reform implication, operating-model assessment or commercial decision derived from this document.

This document does not define, endorse or prescribe any specific commercial product, system, platform, operating model, regulated service, legal structure or investment opportunity. It is a foundational research paper examining whether fragmented operating truth appears to create structural weakness across selected UK service markets.

Appendix A note

Sources in this appendix are used to support the research propositions, case-study analysis and market-structure findings in AMTF-001. They should not be read as endorsing any specific commercial model, product, platform, intervention or spin-off project.

Where third-party sources are used, they are interpreted for research and market-structure purposes only. The presence of a source in this appendix does not imply that the source author supports, endorses or is affiliated with Augscape Research & Development Limited.

APPENDIX A

Research Source and Evidence Base

The following sources support the market-truth analysis, cross-sector comparison, case-study findings, diagnostic model and research conclusions used throughout this document.

Area	Source / citation	Relevance
Home buying and selling reform	GOV.UK - <i>Home buying and selling reform</i> .	Confirms government consultation on proposals to improve the home buying and selling process.
Property transaction delay and failure	MHCLG consultation portal - <i>Home Buying and Selling Reform</i> .	Supports the finding that the process is long, complicated and frustrating, with average completion around 120 days and around one in three transactions failing.
HM Land Registry digital strategy	GOV.UK - <i>HM Land Registry Strategy 2025+</i> .	Supports the role of agreed data standards, digitisation, shared property information and digital property-market transformation.
HM Land Registry strategy launch	GOV.UK - <i>HM Land Registry launches its ambitious new Strategy 2025</i> .	Supports the finding that property-market reform is directed toward improved digital services and a faster, less stressful property market.
Property market reform context	Law Society - <i>Home buying and selling reforms</i> .	Provides professional-sector context around government reform and material information in property listings.
Property-market friction and failed transactions	Reuters - <i>UK plans to cut costs and delays in housing sales</i> .	Provides independent reporting on government proposals to reduce home-buying delay, cost and transaction failure.
Supply-chain standards and shared identifiers	GS1 - <i>Standards</i> .	Supports the universal argument that mature markets use common standards to identify, capture and share operating data.
Financial market infrastructure	BIS/IOSCO - <i>Principles for Financial Market Infrastructures</i> .	Supports the universal argument that high-risk markets require timely, accurate and reliable transaction records.
Public-sector data use	OECD - <i>The Path to Becoming a Data-Driven Public Sector</i> .	Supports the wider proposition that data quality, data sharing and data governance affect public-sector decision-making and service performance.
Administrative data quality	UK Analysis Function - <i>Quality of administrative data in statistics</i> .	Supports the distinction between data existence and data quality / reliability.
Adult social care data roadmap	GOV.UK / DHSC - <i>Care data matters: a roadmap for better adult social care data</i> .	Supports the finding that adult social care requires improvement in how data is collected, shared and analysed.
Health and social care fragmentation	CQC - <i>State of Care 2024/25</i> .	Provides core regulator evidence on the state of health care and adult social care in England.
Health and social care system strain	CQC - <i>State of Care 2024/25 Foreword</i> .	Supports the finding that the system is fragmented and under severe strain.
Adult social care demand pressure	CQC - <i>Adult social care: State of Care 2024/25</i> .	Supports the analysis of rising and changing demand for adult social care.
Adult social care provider fragmentation	Institute for Government - <i>Performance Tracker 2025: Adult social care</i> .	Supports the finding that adult social care operates through a heavily fragmented provider market.
Adult social care economic contribution	Skills for Care / sector reporting - adult social care economic contribution.	Supports the finding that adult social care is economically significant, contributing £77.8bn to England's economy in 2024/25.
Adult social care public expenditure	GOV.UK / adult social care finance reporting; King's Fund commentary on local-authority spending.	Supports the public-expenditure and taxpayer-value relevance of adult social care market truth.
Adult social care workforce data	Skills for Care - <i>The size and structure of the adult social care sector and workforce in England</i> .	Supports the finding that useful workforce datasets exist, but do not by themselves create full live operating truth.
Recruitment market scale	REC - <i>Recruitment Industry Status Report 2024/25</i> .	Supports the finding that recruitment and temporary labour are economically significant.

APPENDIX A CONTINUED

Area	Source / citation	Relevance
Labour supply-chain assurance	HMRC - <i>Help with labour supply chain assurance - GfC12.</i>	Supports the finding that labour supply-chain visibility and assurance are recognised compliance issues.
Labour supply-chain recommended approach	HMRC - <i>GfC12: Recommended approach to assurance.</i>	Supports the requirement to know labour supply-chain businesses, understand how workers are engaged and paid, review supply chains and simplify contracts.
Umbrella company non-compliance	GOV.UK - <i>Umbrella companies: tackling non-compliance in the umbrella company market.</i>	Supports the finding that payroll-chain accountability and umbrella supply-chain compliance are active reform areas.
Mini umbrella company fraud	HMRC - <i>Mini umbrella company fraud.</i>	Supports the finding that fragmented payroll structures can enable avoidance, fraud and enforcement difficulty.
Worker pay transparency	GOV.UK - key information document guidance for agency workers and umbrella-company workers.	Supports the worker-facing importance of clear information about pay, deductions, employment business identity and umbrella arrangements.
Umbrella worker guidance	GOV.UK - <i>Working through an umbrella company.</i>	Supports the analysis of worker-facing pay, deductions, employment status and assignment-rate transparency.
Public procurement and social value	GOV.UK - Social Value Model / PPN 002.	Supports the relevance of fair work, fair pay, responsible procurement and monitored social value commitments.
Modern slavery and labour supply-chain transparency	GOV.UK - transparency in supply chains and modern-slavery procurement guidance.	Supports the wider public-interest relevance of labour-chain transparency and responsible supply-chain governance.