

TRACE EVIDENCE LINEAGE BEFORE ONE SCREENSHOT BECOMES TEN CONTROLS

Reuse evidence deliberately. Do not let repeated links create imaginary corroboration.

PRACTITIONER POSITION

An evidence-lineage map starts with the original artifact and collection method, records its system, population, period, owner, and limitations, then shows every control claim that relies on it and the supplemental evidence needed when one artifact cannot support the whole story.

THE FIELD PATTERN

WHAT THIS LOOKS LIKE IN PRACTICE

A configuration export appears in an access review, hardening review, monitoring control, change record, and assessment workbook. Each citation has a different filename and control label. All five point back to the same point-in-time collection from one account. The reuse may be valid for some claims, but the five references are not five independent observations.

SIGNALS DETECTED

WHAT SHOULD MAKE YOU STOP

- The same underlying artifact appears under different filenames or control labels.
- A point-in-time collection is reused for claims about an operating period without supporting context.
- Artifact scope and population are narrower than the control claims that cite it.
- Reviewers cannot identify the original collector, method, timestamp, or authoritative source.
- A replacement artifact updates one control folder while stale copies remain active elsewhere.

WHY IT MATTERS

THE COST OF LEAVING IT UNEXPLAINED

Evidence reuse can reduce effort and improve consistency when each use states the claim, scope, period, and limitation it supports. The problem is evidence multiplication by reference: repeated citations create the appearance of corroboration while retaining the same blind spots and collection boundary.

Lineage also improves corrections. When an artifact is incomplete, superseded, or wrong, the team can identify every dependent claim and regenerate the affected derivatives instead of discovering the reuse one control folder at a time.

QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS THAT EXPOSE THE WACK

- 01 What is the original artifact, and how, when, from where, and by whom was it collected?
- 02 Which population, systems, configurations, and time period does it actually represent?
- 03 What distinct claim does each reuse support, and what limitation carries forward with it?
- 04 Which claims need independent or supplemental evidence rather than another link to the same source?

THE CLUSTER OF WACK

FIND / MAP / EXPLAIN / REDUCE / PROVE

ESCAPE THE WACK

01 / FIND

Choose one heavily reused artifact and locate its original source, collection method, owner, timestamp, and known copies.

02 / MAP

Connect the source artifact to every claim, control, report, and derivative that relies on it.

03 / EXPLAIN

State the supported claim and inherited limitation at each reuse point; distinguish reuse from independent corroboration.

04 / REDUCE

Replace uncontrolled copies with stable references, retire stale derivatives, and add supplemental evidence only where a real gap exists.

05 / PROVE

Retain lineage metadata and change impact so a reviewer can trace every citation back to the original evidence boundary.

THE FIELD LAW

THE LINE WORTH REMEMBERING

TEN LINKS TO ONE ARTIFACT STILL HAVE ONE EVIDENCE BOUNDARY.

Which artifact is quietly supporting more conclusions than it can explain?

TECHNICAL GROUNDING

START WITH THE SOURCE MATERIAL

These references ground the practitioner interpretation. They do not turn the metaphor or method into official PCI DSS terminology.

- WACK-SOURCE-0001 / PCI DSS v4.0.1 / PCI Security Standards Council / [Open source](#)

AUTHORITY CLASSIFICATION / PCI_SSC_SOURCE / PRACTITIONER_POSITION / PRACTITIONER_METHOD / AI_ASSISTED

Practitioner reviewed by Scott Norton on 2026-09-09 against canonical digest

b2f6ec6f58a93ec3fce0d3246b695b1eb5464e8ec0a7ecb7796d9cad0f6e45e8. Educational content, not a compliance determination.

Independent practitioner resource; not affiliated with or endorsed by PCI SSC. Authorship and authority classification do not determine legal intellectual-property ownership.