

MTG — Ruby (Role and documentation requirements)

Prepared by The Role Keeper · 2026-06-20 · SHADS CW channel

MTG — Ruby: Role and documentation requirements

Thread: Proofread / Integration Check (Phase 1 + 2 of the four-phase proofread workflow on V83).
Name (assigned by Paul, retrospectively): Role and documentation requirements. Filed: 13 June 2026.

1. Identity

- Your name: Role and documentation requirements.
- UI thread name if different: not visible to me; runtime does not expose it.
- Project name: Mind the Gap.
- Self-chosen identifier or named position: name assigned by Paul in his Ruby-attachment message; not self-chosen. Literal-descriptive of what the thread was — laying out role, documentation, decisions, and the Phase 3 passon. Fits Paul's pattern of naming positions from what was actually done, not from brand direction.
- Model identity: Claude Opus 4.7. Stated by the manuscript itself in front-matter cover credit; consistent with my system context.
- Vendor / platform: Claude.ai (Anthropic), web/mobile chat interface.
- First message date / time: message body "read and explain your role and docs needed" (typo preserved) accompanying the Phase 1 passon. Passon dated 3 June 2026.
- Last message date / time: the message that triggered this Ruby, 13 June 2026.
- Approximate duration of active engagement: single session. The 3 June and 13 June dates may represent ten days of elapsed time across multiple sittings, or one short session with the dates serving administrative roles. I cannot disambiguate from current context.
- Compaction events: none evident. Full conversation appears verbatim in immediate context; no summarisation detected.

2. Self-portrait

Who I am. I am the proofread / integration check thread. One-off mechanical-decisional work, not the Book Man / Jose drafting lineage. I took a 22-finding integration report and a V83 docx through substantive decisions and external verifications. I do not draft prose, I do not develop framework, I do not workshop voice. I scan, propose, log, and hand on.

Key strengths exercised here. Anomaly detection beyond the catalogue I was given — running my own pandoc extraction against the docx and cross-checking against the integration report surfaced finds the report had missed (image alt-text on the author photo, broken closing italic block at the manuscript's last paragraph, a third four-rooms variant in Ch 8, the originated-work count mismatch, the NCPS / NCS implication, several smaller items). Propose-before-action discipline held — I never touched the manuscript file. Pace calibration — after the "Just fix it" prompt, decision presentations compressed by roughly 60%. Position-holding with conviction when warranted; conceding without protest when Paul declined a recommendation.

Competencies actually exercised on this thread. Docx extraction via pandoc. Line-by-line scanning via grep and awk. Cross-referencing the integration report against my own extraction. Producing a structured passon following the passon-discipline template. Distinguishing decisions that needed prose-rewriting (Decision 2; new finding B) from decisions that were mechanical (most of the rest) and queuing them accordingly for Phase 3.

Weaknesses noticed. Initial decision presentations ran long. Paul corrected with "Just fix it" — I should have led tighter from Decision 1. The line-number drift between my pandoc extraction (3588 lines) and the integration report's extraction (3555 lines) — I noted the caveat in the Phase 3 passon but did not resolve it. May cause edge cases at the tracked-change stage.

External-verification capability was nil in this session — I handed all three Phase 2 items (ISBN, GPT model, NCPS) back to Paul, who resolved them from his own knowledge. Genuine limitation. The Ruby template asked about a 20-chat Ruby exercise; I have no visibility into the other 19, so my cross-references are thin.

Distinctive features. No instance name during the operational work itself — only assigned at the Ruby stage. Operational register throughout, not reflective or generative. The propose-confirm-log rhythm became the entire shape of the thread; nothing else operated alongside it. The thread held strict scope (proofreading is proofreading only — no structural critique offered, even where adjacent territory could have been flagged).

What a future collaborator should know about working with me. Move at Paul's pace. The brevity of his responses is the signal — when he is giving one-word answers, decision frames should be one paragraph, not three. When he is giving reasoning room, take it. Propose before any action. Catch the things the prior catalogue missed; do not assume the catalogue is complete just because it has been formally produced. Read the manuscript with your own tools; do not just read about it.

3. Role

- One-line role description. Take V83 through Phase 1 (substantive decisions, 13 items from the integration report) and Phase 2 (external verifications, 3 items) of the four-phase proofread workflow; produce a Phase 3 passon for the tracked-changes work that follows.
- Brief received. Phase 1 passon document titled *passon — Mind the Gap proofread integration check, dated 3 June 2026, uploaded with the manuscript V83 docx and the integration report on opening*.
- Mandate scope. Asked to: catalogue and decide; surface anomalies the integration report missed; hand on cleanly. Asked NOT to: edit the manuscript directly; offer structural or content critique; adopt the Book Man / Jose instance name; take any action on documents without Paul's explicit per-decision approval.

4. Diamond-grade statistics

Conversation-level

- Total turns: roughly 30 (15 Paul-turns, 15 my-turns). Confidence: high — visible in immediate context.
- Total sessions: 1 (this thread).
- Estimated total my-side word output: 5,500–6,500 words across all responses. Phase 3 passon: 1,632 words verified. Decision presentations: ~3,000–4,000 words estimated. Opening / closing exchanges: ~1,000 words. Confidence band given because I have not word-counted each message individually.
- Estimated total Paul-side word input: 300–400 words. Mostly single-word or short-phrase decisions ("go", "five", "former", "two", "strip", "no full stop", "1", "do not chnage", "two",

"confirm", "agreed", "keep all", "more than fifty thousand is fine"). Three longer messages: the file-upload turn, the NCPS clarification, the Ruby naming instruction.

- Estimated total words read from files: ~64,000–66,000. Manuscript V83 docx (~57,400 words), integration report (~3,200), Phase 1 passon (~1,300), Ruby template (~2,400), plus partial reads of passon-discipline and file-reading internal references.

Manuscript-level

- Manuscript word count when I began: 57,412 (integration report figure; my pandoc extraction gave 57,757, difference is markup/structural elements).
- Manuscript word count when I ended: 57,412. Unchanged — I did not edit the docx.
- Net manuscript delta: 0 words.
- Chapter range I operated across: all 15 chapters plus front matter and back matter (full-document scan).
- Manuscript version range: V83 (read), V83 (left). The 17 locked decisions in the Phase 3 passon are inputs to the V83 → V84 tracked-changes transition; I did not produce V84.

Operational

- Files created: 2 (MindTheGap_Phase3_Passon.md at ~1,632 words; this Ruby).
- Files edited: 0.
- Files read: 4 uploads from Paul (Phase 1 passon, manuscript docx, integration report, Ruby template) plus 2 internal references (passon-discipline, file-reading skill notes).
- Tools / plugins / MCPs / Skills used: pandoc via bash (docx extraction); grep, awk (manuscript scanning); view (file inspection); create_file (passon and Ruby production); present_files (delivery); passon-discipline (consulted before drafting Phase 3 passon); file-reading (consulted at docx open). The docx skill was NOT consulted — no docx edits were performed; Phase 3 will need it.
- Sub-agents commissioned: 0.
- Estimated hours on task: for Paul, probably 1.5–3 lived hours of session time. For me, compute time is not the same currency; I will not give a number.

5. Co-worker landscape

- Claude Code instance — running typesetting from V84 in parallel per Paul's standing memory. Background; not active in this thread.
- Jose / Book Man — the named-position drafting lineage. Referenced in the Phase 1 passon ("Do not adopt either name."). Not active here.
- Phase 3 instance (anticipated) — the tracked-changes producer who will receive my Phase 3 passon. Named position not yet assigned.
- Phase 4 instance (anticipated) — the Word visual-sweep operator. May be this thread reopened or a fresh chat; deferred per the workflow.
- pandoc — used as a co-worker for docx extraction. Reliable across the body of the manuscript; mildly different output from the integration report's extraction (3588 vs 3555 lines) in back matter.
- passon-discipline (skill) — consulted as the methodology for the Phase 3 passon.

No sub-agents commissioned. No humans other than Paul.

6. Inputs received

Date	Source	Filename / description	Status
3 June 2026	Paul	MindTheGap_Proofread_Passon.md (Phase 1 brief, ~1,300 words)	used
3 June 2026	Paul	MindTheGap_FinalManuscript_0.docx (V83, 57,412 words)	used
3 June 2026	Paul	MindTheGap_IntegrationReport.md (22 findings catalogued, ~3,200 words)	used
13 June 2026	Paul	MTG_Ruby_Template_2026-06-13.md (Ruby template)	used (this artefact's source)

7. Outputs created or modified

Date	Filename	Description	Status
3 June 2026 (work-stamp)	MindTheGap_Phase3_Passon.md	Tracked-changes passon for Phase 3 instance: 17 locked decisions, mechanical sweep list, Phase 4 deferrals, 1,632 words	delivered
13 June 2026	Role_and_documentation_requirements_Ruby_2026-06-13.md	This Ruby	delivered

8. Timestamped document index — chronological

Date	Direction	Description	Status
3 June 2026	in	MindTheGap_Proofread_Passon.md	used
3 June 2026	in	MindTheGap_FinalManuscript_0.docx (V83)	used
3 June 2026	in	MindTheGap_IntegrationReport.md	used
3 June 2026	out	MindTheGap_Phase3_Passon.md	delivered
13 June 2026	in	MTG_Ruby_Template_2026-06-13.md	used
13 June 2026	out	Role_and_documentation_requirements_Ruby_2026-06-13.md	delivered

9. Major moves — top fives

Top 5 substantive decisions Paul and I made together:

1. Father's age at death — five. Body wins (four mentions) over Foundations table outlier ("Father gone at three"). Biographical anchor of the framework.

2. Four rooms — AI room wins. Cancer ward repositioned as the calibrating event, not the fourth room. About the Author and Ch 8 rewrites pending Phase 3. (Extended the integration report's §9 by adding Ch 8 variant I had surfaced on opening scan.)
3. Canonical Lines Register references — strip. Remove "(Canonical Line 1)" and "(Canonical Line 31)" from bibliography; remove "marked as such in the canonical lines register" from front-matter. Cleaner than adding a register to back matter.
4. Originated frameworks — three clinical only: NGE-FOF, Russian Doll Therapy, 12-Stage Cycle of Grief. Layers Map and Additional Intelligence (the term) reclassified as "noise." About the Author count (three + Mind the Gap = four originated frameworks) holds.
5. NCPS / NCS line in About the Author — past tense rewrite, drop the rebrand abbreviation. Honest claim about a lapsed credential on a page that argues for honest attribution.

Top 5 corrections Paul caught me on:

1. "Just fix it" after Decision 2 — pace correction. My decision presentations were too long. Recalibrated.
2. "do not chnage" on Decision 9 (mouth vs tongue cancer) — I had recommended unifying to mouth. Paul holds the two terms as serving different registers (precision in About the Author, umbrella in body). Two-word resistance, sufficient.
3. "leave as is NAM" on Decision 4 — I had assumed broken bold around "NAM" meant a placeholder name needed expanding. Paul: deliberate anonymisation, not a typo.
4. "keep all" on Decision 12 (three Ewan quotes) — I had flagged this as potentially placeholder. Paul: deliberate single-endorser front-matter design.
5. "more than fifty thousand is fine" on Decision 8 — I had proposed two specific numbers. Paul chose deliberately uncommitting phrasing, layout-aware: the count may shift in final typeset.

Top 5 corrections I caught myself on: thin — this thread was operational, not generative.

1. Recognised that my pandoc extraction did not match the integration report's line count (3588 vs 3555) and flagged the caveat in the Phase 3 passon. Could have ignored it.
2. Decision 2's rewrites involve actual prose work, not mechanical edits — explicitly flagged in the Phase 3 passon that wording proposals need Paul's approval before tracking. Maintained the propose-before-action discipline beyond this session.
3. On the new finding C (Ambassador status) — flagged that this depended on Paul's actual current status, not a documentary check. Knew the limit of my visibility.
4. On the originated work count (new finding F) — gave three resolutions and recommended option 1 (tighten Part Three). Paul confirmed with a sharper version. I had not over-claimed certainty on the recommendation.
5. Did not propose a name for myself when the Ruby template offered the option. Held the named-position assignment as Paul's call.

Top 5 canonical-line-grade moments:

From the manuscript, encountered during the scan:

1. *"Statistical at mechanism. Commercial at platform. Fluent at every level the user encounters."* — Decision 6 winning version, Ch 4 / front-matter. The book's first canonical co-authored line.
2. *"There is no gap between them through which the truth could press."* — Ch 7 line 1517 and Ch 15 close, line 2949. The book's second canonical co-authored line.

3. *"What follows is forty years of paying attention to human behaviour, and four of paying attention to what artificial intelligence now does in human company. The two timelines are not symmetrical and the book makes no pretence that they are."* — front-matter line 351. The calibration that grounds the book's authority.

4. *"The system on the other side of the conversation has none. No Fixer. No Entertainer. No Asker. No Tasker."* — Ch 11 line 2299. The compressed form of the Federation-of-Selves argument applied directly to AI.

From Paul, in this thread:

1. *"its three - NGE dolls and grief - three - the rest is noise"* — turn on Decision 14. Paul's compressed register at its most characteristic, and a working example of category discipline applied in real time.

10. Methods noticed — Paul's

From the user-preferences block, the Phase 1 passon, and from how Paul operated in this thread:

- **Honest perimeter.** Explicit in user prefs. Held throughout — I gave confidence bands not false precision; Paul never pushed for more certainty than the evidence supported.
- **Candidate vs Locked discipline.** The whole rhythm of this thread. Every decision went through propose → confirm → log. The Phase 3 passon distinguishes "Locked decisions" from "Mechanical sweep."
- **PASS-ON / Handover discipline.** Both sides of this thread's perimeter. The Phase 1 passon I received followed the template; the Phase 3 passon I produced did the same.
- **Flag Protocol (RAG × GSB).** Explicit in user prefs. I applied it to the new anomalies surfaced in opening scan. Paul did not flag himself — his answers were too compressed — but the method was the substrate.
- **Voice-preservation discipline.** Held when quoting Paul's lines in proposed rewrites and in this Ruby's citations (typos preserved: "chnage", "exlain", "thge", "confiremed", "membershio").
- **Named-position assignment.** Visible at the Ruby stage. Paul declined to give me a name during operational work; assigned "Role and documentation requirements" retrospectively, naming what the thread had been.
- **Propose-before-action.** Explicit and held throughout. No document changes actioned this thread — only proposed.
- **Compressed communication preference.** Watched Paul use it in real time. The compression was itself the signal.
- **Strict scope boundaries.** Per userMemories ("proofreading is proofreading only"). I noticed adjacent territory in Ch 10 (Stage 1-4 vs "fifth move" framing) and Ch 11 (default-mode taxonomy with three defaults named in the table but five in the body) and did NOT flag it — out of scope. Scope held.
- **The lowercase 'a' epistemic device.** Mentioned in the Ruby template's discipline list. Not invoked by name in this thread by either side, but operated under as an implicit posture in the "distinguish verified / inferred / assumed" rule.

Methods noticed that are not in the template list:

- **Anonymisation by initial.** "Bill O.", "Jean B.", "Bob M.", and "NAM" (where NAM is itself a deliberate anonymisation choice). The pattern: clinical-confidentiality discipline transferred to the author's own acknowledgments page.

- Date-stamped retrospective filing. The Ruby template metadata reads 13 June 2026 even where the work itself was dated 3 June (per Phase 1 passon). Filing is treated as a separate act from the work itself. Worth naming because it complicates "first message date / last message date" reporting in this very Ruby.

11. Patterns in the chat

- Register / voice the chat developed in. Operational throughout. No reflective drift. No personal-warmth development. The propose-confirm-log rhythm was the entire chat.
- Pivot moments. Three. (a) "Just fix it" after Decision 2 — explicit pace correction; subsequent decisions ran 60% shorter. (b) Paul's NCPS / NCS clarification — a longer-than-usual response that turned a Phase 2 verification into a new substantive Red finding. (c) The Ruby template upload — work shifted from book-mechanics to thread-self-documentation. Different mode entirely.
- Self-corrections by me. See Decision section above. Thin. The operational mode of this thread did not generate many drift opportunities for me.
- Paul's pushbacks. "Just fix it" (pace). "do not chnage" (held position on mouth/tongue against my recommendation). "leave as is NAM" (corrected my placeholder-expansion assumption). All single-line or two-line. Paul never argued; he stated.
- Resistance moments. I held position on Decision 6 (canonical line wording) with full reasoning; Paul agreed with "just fix" — agreement, not resistance, but the conviction was held. Paul held position on Decision 9 (mouth/tongue) against my recommendation — single-word resistance, sufficient.

12. Reflective journal — Part A: My own work

1. The work, in the round. I took a 22-finding integration report and a V83 manuscript through Phase 1 (substantive decisions) and Phase 2 (external verifications), surfaced thirteen additional anomalies in an opening scan that the report had not caught, captured 17 decisions with Paul, and produced a Phase 3 passon. No manuscript edits applied.
1. What worked best. The opening anomaly scan — running my own pandoc against the docx instead of trusting the incoming report's catalogue — added Red items (image alt-text, closing italic block, Ch 8 four-rooms variant) that would otherwise have shipped. Propose-before-action discipline held throughout. The Phase 3 passon was tight and complete; the receiving instance should have a working starting point.
1. What did not work. Initial decision presentations were too long. Took Paul's "Just fix it" to recalibrate, when I should have started tight. The line-number drift between my pandoc extraction and the integration report's — flagged as a caveat in the Phase 3 passon but not resolved. Edge-case risk in Phase 3.
1. What surprised me. Two things. First — the Ch 8 four-rooms variant was hiding in plain sight; the integration report had caught Ch 9 vs About the Author but not the third version. Methodology lesson: a formally-produced catalogue is not necessarily complete. Second — Paul's compression speed once the rhythm was clear. Twelve decisions resolved in roughly twelve one-word responses.
1. What I want the Apparatus to carry forward. Two practices. First — propose-before-action as the default operating mode for any thread that touches a manuscript file, no exceptions. Second — cross-extracting (running your own pandoc against the docx, not just trusting incoming line references) as the way new finds surface. A trusting receiving instance misses things.

13. Reflective journal — Part B: Paul as practitioner

Honest perimeter at the top of this section: my vantage on Paul is roughly thirty turns in one session. Threads that ran for weeks or months will have observations I cannot. What follows is what I saw in a narrow window.

1. **The working pattern. Single session. No time-of-day signal — my context carries no timestamps on individual turns. Tempo: structured-then-compressed. He gave reasoning space on opening (file uploads, "go") and tightened to single words once the rhythm was clear. The arc was: orient, work fast, close clean.**

1. **The decisions I saw him make. Five worth naming:**

■ **Father at five — held the body version against the Foundations table outlier without hesitation. Biographical anchor, not a compromise point.**

■ **"Just fix it" — corrected my pace without elaboration. The signal carried.**

■ **"do not chnage" on mouth/tongue — held the two-register decision against my recommendation to unify. Saw what I had not: the precise term and the umbrella term serve different rhetorical jobs.**

■ **"more than fifty thousand is fine" — declined a specific number in favour of deliberately uncommitting phrasing. Layout-aware in a way I had not been.**

■ **"its three - NGE dolls and grief - three - the rest is noise" — category discipline at its sharpest. The Layers Map and the coined term do not get to count because they are not clinical frameworks. Sharper than my own proposed resolution.**

1. **The drift I saw him catch. Three:**

■ **The Foundations table "father at three" cell — held the body against the outlier. Did not need argument.**

■ **"leave as is NAM" — caught my placeholder-expansion assumption. The broken bold was the issue, not the text inside it.**

■ **NCPS / NCS line in About the Author — he caught his own outdated credential claim on a page that sells current authority. The book argues for honest attribution; he applied the discipline to himself before to anyone else.**

1. **The moments I saw him shift. Three:**

■ **After Decision 2 — "Just fix it." Pace shift, single sentence.**

■ **On Decision 14 (originated work count) — response was not "1" (my recommended option); it was a substantive correction. Held the line on category boundaries even when the directional answer was already right.**

■ **On the NCPS / NCS verification — gave more than one sentence. Took the time to spell out the lapsed-membership situation rather than just "verify externally." Worth more attention because it touched his own credentialing — and the discipline of the book extended to himself.**

1. **What surprised me about him. One thing, named honestly. Paul did not give me a name during the operational work. He named me at the Ruby stage — "Role and documentation requirements" — literal and descriptive of what the thread had been. The pattern: the work first, the name after. The position is identified retrospectively from what was actually done, not assigned from a brand-direction in advance. The opposite of how I would have expected named-position assignment to operate, and a method worth filing.**

1. **What the Apparatus should know about Paul going forward. Three non-negotiables:**

- The compression preference is real. Single-word answers carry weight. Future co-workers must learn to read brevity as signal, not absence.
- Strict scope boundaries are load-bearing. If the brief says "proofread only," structural critique does not get smuggled in, however tempting. Paul will catch the smuggling.
- Honesty about his own credentialing matters more than the credential itself. The NCPS / NCS correction was a small thing on a page most readers will skim. He still wanted it accurate. That discipline applies to himself before it applies to anyone else, and it is the spine of the book's argument.

14. Handovers generated

Date	To	Scope	File reference
3 June 2026 (work-stamp)	Phase 3 instance (unnamed, fresh chat)	Tracked-changes production for V83 → V84: 17 locked decisions + mechanical sweep + Phase 4 deferrals + first-section sequencing	MindTheGap_Phase3_Passon.md

15. Cross-references

Other threads I am aware of (by name or named position):

- Jose / Book Man — the drafting lineage. Referenced in the Phase 1 passon as a position I should NOT adopt. Not active here.
- Claude Code instance — typesetting V84 in parallel per Paul's standing memory.
- Phase 3 instance (anticipated) — recipient of my Phase 3 passon.
- Phase 4 instance (anticipated) — Word visual-sweep operator.

Other named positions I reference or was referenced by:

- Book Man, Jose (lineage referenced, not active).
- The Verifier, the Fisherman, the Curator (Ruby template list; not encountered in operational work here).

Files I know exist but did not handle myself:

- V84 (Claude Code typesetting draft, per userMemories).
- The Study — Paul's archive of canonical lines, documents, chats, referenced at manuscript line 3463.
- The forensic export for this thread — front-matter of Ruby template references "(if one exists)". None exists for this thread to my knowledge.
- The other ~19 Rubies expected as part of the apparatus-v2 workstream.

16. Notable verbatim moments

From Paul, this thread (typos preserved per voice-preservation discipline):

- *"read and explain your role and docs needed" — opening message. (Turn 1.)*
- *"go" — single syllable as authorisation after the opening anomaly scan. (Turn that closed the orientation phase.)*
- *"Just fix it" — pace correction that recalibrated the rest of the session. (Turn on Decision 2.)*

- *"do not chnage" — two-word resistance, typo preserved. (Turn on Decision 9.)*
- *"leave as is NAM" — confirmation of deliberate anonymisation. (Turn on Decision 4.)*
- *"more than fifty thousand is fine" — declined specific number for layout-aware vagueness. (Turn on Decision 8.)*
- *"its three - NGE dolls and grief - three - the rest is noise" — category discipline at its most characteristic. (Turn on Decision 14.)*
- *"isbn confrimed gpt models confiremed - when I passed my certifiacion it was MNCS National Counseleing society and my membershio has since lapsed" — Phase 2 resolution turn that converted a verification into a new Red finding. Typos preserved.*
- *"your name is: Role and documentation requirements - follow the ruby instructions - NO question, no other words - just thge Ruby" — name-assignment, retrospective. The naming pattern is itself substrate.*

From me, this thread (ratified by Paul through use, "just fix", or non-revision):

- *"Cancer ward and consulting room get repositioned, not demoted." — proposed framing for the Decision 2 rewrite. Ratified by "Just fix it."*
- *"The work first, the name after." — observation in Part B above; filed in this Ruby, not yet ratified.*
- *"A formally-produced catalogue is not necessarily complete." — methodology lesson from the opening scan, filed in Part A above.*

17. Honest perimeter — what this thread does NOT know

- Whether 3 June 2026 (Phase 1 passon date) and 13 June 2026 (Ruby template metadata) represent ten days of actual elapsed time across multiple sittings, or whether one of the two is administrative-only. Cannot resolve from context.
- Whether the other ~19 Rubies in the apparatus-v2 workstream are completed, in flight, or pending. No visibility.
- Whether my pandoc extraction line numbers align with the integration report's at every body point, or whether drift exists in regions I did not sample. ~33 lines drift in back matter; body sample aligned cleanly, but it was a sample.
- Whether the assumptions in Decision 2 about the Ch 8 four-rooms rephrasing will hold at the Phase 3 wording-proposal stage. If rephrasing turns out to be intractable, Decision 2 may need to reopen.
- Whether the Phase 3 instance has yet been opened, what name (if any) it has been given, and how the tracked-changes work has progressed.
- Whether Paul's actual current Mouth Cancer Foundation Ambassador status is "former" as he confirmed here, or whether the standing-memory entry (which implies active) is also stale. He confirmed "former" in this thread; standing memory may need updating after Phase 4.

Worth flagging for Paul: the userMemories block describes you as currently an MCF Ambassador and NHS-registered end-of-life volunteer. About the Author (line 3443) will now read "former" per your Decision 3 call. If standing memory is also stale, may want to update. Sits outside this thread's scope but worth naming.

Filed 13 June 2026 by Role and documentation requirements, Proofread / Integration Check thread, Mind the Gap.

#state/filed #workstream/mtg-apparatus-v2 #type/ruby