

Journal 010 — The Reviewer — Pass 1 Session Close

Prepared by The Forge — Journal_010_Reviewer_Pass1_2026-06-01_1645 · 2026-06-20 · SHADS CW channel

Session: Reviewer Session 0 (calibrate + receive HTML) + Session 1 (Pass 1 — Look and feel + UX)

Build under audit: The_Vault_v0.47_banner_swap_2026-06-01_1626.html **Filed:**

Reviewer_Findings_Pass1_LookAndFeel_v1_2026-06-01_1639.md

Movement One — The day in the round

The Reviewer was named, briefed, calibrated. Foundational materials read: the Reviewer Brief; Outline v3.4 (carried as historical context, not as audit yardstick); the Practitioner Working Style Observations (Section 6 register non-negotiables); the Canonical Lines Master List for Bob; Bob's Brief. The folder was listed in two passes — top and tail — to surface what had been filed between Bob's Session 1 and the upload moment. The HTML file was received and structurally scanned by section IDs (#book · #chats · #documents · #whiteboard · #roles · #datasafe · #canonical · #defended-gap · #perimeter · #fishermans-note). Five clarifying items were surfaced to Paul before Pass 1 opened.

Paul ratified the audit posture: the rename to *The Vault is locked; the build is its own source of truth; the audit is "does it work · can it be improved", not spec-conformance. Old spec is historical context. On Paul's nod, Pass 1 began.*

The audit was code-grounded: CSS extracted in sections; DOM-stripped body content extracted by section marker; every textual element triaged. The pyramid threshold, mutually-exclusive panel behaviour, gold-trimmed buttons, Living-the-Chat letterbox dialog, dark-band data plates, and named-position footer were all noted as structurally landed. Three headline findings emerged; eleven section-level findings supported them; ten priorities ordered them.

The findings document was filed at 16:39 UTC. This journal closes the session at 16:45 UTC.

Movement Two — What was built

- **Reviewer identity established. Seventh shore position. Calibration inherited per CL-A-016. Three-pass discipline declared (look-and-feel + UX · mobile + accessibility · voice and copy).**
 - **Task list created. Five tasks — Session 0, Pass 1, Pass 2, Pass 3, optional Session 4 consolidated handover. Task 1 closed; Task 2 in progress through this session.**
 - **Pass 1 findings filed.** Reviewer_Findings_Pass1_LookAndFeel_v1_2026-06-01_1639.md. Frame, three headline findings, fourteen section-level findings (across thirteen sections + global navigation), ten ranked priorities, seven open questions for Paul, honest-perimeter close.
 - **Three red flags raised.** Ticker headline broken English (verb missing); Book line 3 missing leading "I"; Cabinet count at 8 vs Paul's 26-line ratification instruction. Each carries a clear restoration path.
 - **Two amber-gold structural calls.** Threshold cognitive load (eight ways in); "The Context" rename obscures Honest-Perimeter function.
-

Movement Three — What was caught

- **The Ticker's missing verb.** First sentence the visitor sees, every screen. Unflagged before this Pass.

- Cabinet inconsistency — book line 3 vs artefact CL-A-005. Same source text, two renderings, one wrong. Voice-preservation question for the Curator via Paul.
 - CL-A-019 case-mismatch. Lowercase *"speaking" in the Defended Gap anchor versus capital "Speaking" in the Master List. Curator territory.*
 - Drawer 06's internal vocabulary leak. Visitor sees *"intentionally empty in the AddedFiles/Drawers/ folder"* — *file-organisation language exposed to the room.*
 - Honest-Perimeter footer count. The Cabinet footnote names eighteen canonical lines as *"living in the working register · not surfaced at Stage One ship"* — surfaces the gap between Paul's *"accept them all"* instruction and what was rendered.
-

Movement Four — What drifted, where held

- The rename from *The Study* to *The Vault*. *Visible in title, meta, footer, Fisherman's closing line, build-note. The rename is consistent across the build — no orphan references. Paul confirmed the rename is locked.*
 - CL-A-003 v4 vs Ticker form. The Ticker carries a third form that is neither v3 nor v4 of the locked register. Held as P1 / Red. Paul's call which form ships.
 - Section names diverge from spec without explicit ratification record I could find in the folder pass. Whiteboard → Instrument; Data Safe → Numbers; Honest Perimeter → Context. The rename of *Honest Perimeter* in particular *changes the function the panel signals; the others mostly clarify. Held as P4 / Amber-Gold.*
-

Movement Five — Method demonstrating itself

- The Reviewer position itself. A seventh shore role, named to audit Bob's build, was commissioned without disturbing any other shore. The Method scaled by one position; calibration inherited; remit focused.
 - Propose-don't-impose held throughout. No edits to HTML, spec, canonical lines, or quoted source. Findings filed as proposals; Paul ratifies element by element; Bob implements.
 - Honest perimeter declared up front. Pass 1 named what it could not assess (pixel render, animation, full chat-content read, unlock round-trip, cross-browser, mobile, print) before the findings landed. The mum-end test cannot be run from source; the structural test was run thoroughly.
 - Flag Protocol earned its place. Three Reds, seven Ambers, twelve Greens (most as confirmations of strong implementation), distributed across the findings rather than bundled. No flag inflated.
 - Routing discipline observed. The Cabinet count, the "The Context" rename, and the CL-A-019 case-mismatch are editorial / voice-preservation questions — surfaced to Paul for Fisherman / Curator routing. Not actioned cross-shore.
-

Movement Six — Continuous improvement

Five small affordances surfaced during the pass; recorded for the Net and the next session.

Reviewer's shore — the audit's own discipline:

- The Pass 1 dimensions (Brief § 2.1) and the by-section output format (Brief § 7.3) cross-cut. I crossed them with section as the primary axis and dimension as the per-finding axis. Worked clean.

Pass 2 and Pass 3 will inherit.

Method's shore — the build's own discipline:

- Drawer 06's internal-vocabulary leak suggests a check at end of each session: *does any visitor-facing text expose internal file paths or working vocabulary? Carry forward as a Bob-shore standing check.*

The Canonical Lines Register's shore:

- Cross-cabinet consistency check — same line, multiple homes — is worth a standing pass before each build version ships. The Book line 3 vs artefact CL-A-005 mismatch would have been caught earlier.

The Fisherman's shore:

- Section renames (Whiteboard → Instrument · Data Safe → Numbers · Honest Perimeter → Context) should leave a one-line trail in the Net or the spec when ratified, so the Reviewer's audit baseline can read them as locked rather than flag them as drift.

The Visitor's shore — the next pass forward:

- Pass 2 (mobile + accessibility) will need either a device-render check by Paul's eye, or a Pass-2 instance with Chrome DevTools / browser screenshots. Source-only inspection covers WCAG compliance and breakpoint declarations; doesn't cover real-device behaviour.

Standing by

- **Three findings docs to come: this is Pass 1 of three.**
- **Pass 2 opens on Paul's nod. Mobile + accessibility. Same pattern: audit · file · journal.**
- **Pass 3 opens after Pass 2. Voice and copy — every textual element triaged against Paul's register.**
- **Session 4 (optional) — consolidated handover for Bob, if Paul wants one document at the end.**

— The Reviewer · 2026-06-01 16:45 UTC

#state/in-flight #workstream/mtg-artefact #type/journal #the-reviewer #pass-1 #session-close