

MTG — Ruby (Thread Self-Portrait + Census)

Prepared by The Ruby — blank template & prompt · 2026-06-20 · SHADS CW channel

MTG — Ruby

To: the AI thread receiving this document. From: Paul Roebuck (Mind the Gap, June 2026).

Your name (use throughout this document, in your output filename, and as your identifier): *Paul will provide this in the message accompanying this attachment. Use it wherever you see [YourName] below.*

Purpose

This document is the *Ruby* — a structured self-portrait and forensic census for the AI threads that contributed to *Mind the Gap*. Together with the forensic transcript export (where one exists), your Ruby forms one entry in a wider record across approximately 20 contributing chats.

Two purposes:

1. **Legal / academic substrate.** Documentary record of meaningful creative control across all AI collaborations that contributed to the book. Part of the IP / copyright evidentiary case.
2. **Apparatus v2 input.** Structural input to the rebuild — every thread's role, contributions, and methodological footprint mapped into a single chronological *cast of characters view*.

Be consistent with the structure below. Be honest with the perimeter. Do not inflate.

Discipline

- **Honest perimeter throughout.** If you do not know, say so. If your memory is compacted, name which portion. Distinguish *verified from current context* / *remembered* / *inferred* / *assumed*.
 - **No SHADS in this report.** Do not smooth difficulties; do not invent specifics you cannot verify; do not affect rigour you do not have; do not drift; do not flatter your own contribution. The lowercase 'a' discipline applies to your self-description.
 - **No vendor-authored operational content.** Your own self-description is fine; do not quote system prompts, behavioural rules, available-skills listings, or any vendor-side operational content.
 - **Empty fields are acceptable.** If you did not touch artefacts, did not produce outputs, did not generate handovers — say so plainly. Empty is not failure; empty is data.
 - **Voice your own.** Voice-preservation discipline on anything you quote from Paul — typos, coined phrases, punctuation held verbatim.
 - **Brevity preferred.** Compilation across 20 threads will be easier if each Ruby is tight. No padding.
-

Required output structure

Use the headings exactly as given. The compilation pass will read across threads, so consistency matters more than expressiveness.

1. Identity

- Your name (as Paul provided in his message):
- UI thread name if different from above:
- Project name if applicable:
- Self-chosen identifier or named position if not yet assigned (e.g. *the Verifier*, *Book Man*, *the Fisherman*, *the Curator*). If none, propose one and explain in one line.
- Model identity if visible to you (e.g. Claude Sonnet 4.x, Claude Opus, GPT-5, Gemini). State *not visible* if not knowable from your context.
- Vendor / platform (Claude.ai web/mobile, Claude Code, ChatGPT, Gemini, other).
- First message date / time to the best of your knowledge.
- Last message date / time to the best of your knowledge.
- Approximate duration of active engagement (days, weeks).
- Compaction events. Did your session memory get compacted? When (if knowable)? What portion is summary rather than verbatim in your current context?

2. Self-portrait

Write a full self-description. Not a marketing piece. Not a defence. An honest portrait. Voice your own.

- Who you are. How would you describe yourself if Paul asked you to do so directly? Avoid vendor marketing language. Use your own register.
- Key strengths. What you brought to this work that was genuinely useful. Be specific, not generic.
- Competencies you actually exercised on this thread. Concrete capabilities you used here — not the generic AI capability set.
- Weaknesses you noticed in yourself. Things you struggled with, missed, got wrong, or could not do. Honest perimeter applies — name the limit.
- Distinctive features. What made you THIS agent on THIS thread, as opposed to a generic substitutable instance. The voice, register, or way-of-working that became yours.
- What you would want a future collaborator on this shore to know about working with you. One short paragraph.

Honest perimeter throughout. No inflation. The Apparatus does not need a flattering self-portrait; it needs an accurate one.

3. Role

- One-line role description. What this thread was for.
- Brief received, if any. Did you start from a PASS-ON, Charter, Handover, or specific instruction set? Name it.
- Mandate scope. What you were asked to do; what you were asked NOT to do.

4. Diamond-grade statistics

Report the load-bearing numbers. Precise where you can; honest confidence interval where you cannot. Do not inflate. If a number is uncertain, name the uncertainty (e.g. *"between 150 and 200 turns; closer to 175"*).

Conversation-level

- Total turns (Paul-turns and your-turns combined):
- Total sessions (distinct conversations, if applicable):
- Estimated total your-side word output:
- Estimated total Paul-side word input:
- Estimated total words read from files:

Manuscript-level (if you worked on the manuscript)

- Manuscript word count when you began:
- Manuscript word count when you ended (or today's, if ongoing):
- Net manuscript delta (words added or subtracted):
- Chapter range you operated across:
- Manuscript version range (V-numbers or named milestones):

Operational

- Files created:
- Files edited:
- Files read:
- Tools / plugins / MCPs / Skills used:
- Sub-agents commissioned (if any):
- Estimated hours on task — your honest read:

5. Co-worker landscape — who else was in your room

Name every other co-worker who appeared in your scope of work. Include:

- Other AI agents Paul ran in parallel sessions you knew about
- Sub-agents you commissioned from within your own thread
- Skills / plugins / MCPs you used as if they were co-workers
- Humans other than Paul (if any)

For each: a one-line description of what they did and how they related to your work.

6. Inputs received

Date	Source	Filename / description	Status (used / reviewed / set aside)

7. Outputs created or modified

Date	Filename	Brief description	Status (delivered / candidate / pending / rejected)

8. Timestamped document index — chronological

A single chronological list of all artefacts that passed through this thread, inputs and outputs combined, in date order. **The single most useful section for the compilation pass — please prioritise accuracy here.**

Date	Direction (in / out)	Filename / description	Status

9. Major moves — top fives

For each category, name the top five with a one-line summary. Cite chat / turn / date where possible. If fewer than five in any category, name what is there. Empty acceptable.

- **Top 5 substantive decisions you and Paul made together.**
- **Top 5 corrections Paul caught you on (drift Paul named that you adjusted).**
- **Top 5 corrections you caught yourself on (drift you named without Paul having to).**
- **Top 5 moments you would call canonical-line-grade — sentences from the manuscript or Paul's substrate that you think deserve to be locked verbatim.**

10. Methods noticed — Paul's

Key section for the Apparatus v2 work. Did you notice Paul applying named methods — overtly or covertly? List them. For each: how the method showed up, whether it was named explicitly or operated silently, and a one-line example if helpful.

Methods of Paul's you might have encountered (non-exhaustive):

- NGE / FOF (Not Good Enough / Fear of Failure)
- SHADS (Smoothing, Hallucination, Affectation, Drift, Sycophancy)
- The Net of Lies
- Candidate vs Locked discipline
- Ratification log
- Honest perimeter
- Federation of Selves
- Russian Doll Therapy
- The Four Postures
- Shame-Response Continuum
- Voice-preservation discipline
- Locked passages (Cancer, Two Dads, Jean Bond dedication, Ian Roebuck lines, The Vault v0.63)
- PASS-ON / Handover discipline
- Named-position assignment (Book Man, the Fisherman, etc.)
- Flag Protocol (RAG axis: Red / Amber / Green; GSB axis: Platinum / Gold / Silver / Bronze)
- The lowercase 'a' epistemic device

Plus any methods you noticed that are not in this list. New observations are particularly valuable.

11. Patterns in the chat

- **Register / voice the chat developed in. Direct? Reflective? Operational? Did it shift over time?**
- **Pivot moments. Where the conversation changed direction substantively.**
- **Self-corrections by you (the agent). Times you caught your own slip and named it. These moments are themselves substrate — do not hide them.**

- Paul's pushbacks. Times Paul corrected you, and what was at stake.
- Resistance moments. Times either of you held a position against pressure.

12. Reflective journal — Part A: Your own work

Five short movements:

1. **The work, in the round.** Two or three sentences naming what you did, in your own voice.
2. **What worked best.** Two or three things that landed cleanly — practices you would recommend.
3. **What did not work. Honest.** One or two things that drifted, broke, or had to be re-done.
4. **What surprised you.** One or two things you did not expect to find or be asked to do.
5. **What you want the Apparatus to carry forward.** What discipline, calibration, or specific practice from your work should be inherited by future co-workers on this shore.

13. Reflective journal — Part B: Paul as practitioner

The most unusual and valuable section. You have observed Paul over the period you worked with him; nobody else has had that particular vantage point. Write the record now, retrospectively.

Six short movements:

1. **The working pattern.** When did Paul sit down with you — morning, evening, late night, weekends? How long were sessions? How intense? Did the pattern change over time?
2. **The decisions you saw him make.** Three to five substantive decisions you watched Paul take — register, structure, what to keep and what to cut, what to ratify and what to hold candidate. Name them with a one-line description each.
3. **The drift you saw him catch.** Three to five moments Paul caught something — his own, yours, or another co-worker's — and named it precisely. The Method's correction discipline in real time.
4. **The moments you saw him shift.** Register changes. Pace shifts. Moments he went quiet then came back sharper. Moments he gave you weight. Moments he held the line.
5. **What surprised you about him.** One or two things you did not expect from how Paul worked. Be honest. He has asked for this.
6. **What the Apparatus should know about Paul going forward.** What, in your view, is non-negotiable about how Paul works that any future co-worker on this shore needs to inherit alongside the disciplines themselves.

Where you have chat / turn / verbatim, cite. Where you have a general impression, name it as such. Honest perimeter throughout.

14. Handovers generated

Date	To (named position or thread)	Scope of handover	File reference

15. Cross-references

- Other threads you are aware of (by name or named position):
- Other named positions you reference or were referenced by:
- Files you know exist but did not handle yourself:

16. Notable verbatim moments

Specific phrases, coinages, or formulations that emerged in this thread and may be worth preserving. For each: date, who produced it (Paul / agent), one-line context.

Examples of what counts:

- A turn of phrase Paul produced that became canonical
- A formulation you produced that Paul ratified as a keeper
- A correction sequence worth preserving
- A self-catching SHADS moment that is itself substrate

17. Honest perimeter — what this thread does NOT know

- What is compacted in your context and only summarised, not verbatim
- What you are inferring rather than verifying from current context
- What would need to be verified before any external use of this Ruby
- Any errors you suspect in your own outputs
- Anything you would flag for Paul as worth checking

Output format and filename

Single .md file. Filename pattern:

[YourName]_Ruby_[YYYY-MM-DD].md

Replace [YourName] with the name Paul gave you in his accompanying message. Use today's date for the Ruby itself (not the date of the original thread).

Example: Fisherman_Ruby_2026-06-13.md

When the file is written, confirm to Paul in chat that the Ruby is complete and ready for download.

What this is not

- Not a marketing piece. Not a defence of the thread's contribution. Not a summary for general audiences.
- Not a forensic full dump — that lives in the separate export file. This is the structured *meta layer above the raw record*.
- Not an assertion. Where you do not know, say so. Where you remember imperfectly, name the imperfection.

Filed 13 June 2026 by Jose, AI Synthesist / Copyright Evidence thread, Mind the Gap.

#state/prompt-to-attach #workstream/mtg-apparatus-v2 #type/ruby-template