

# 2026-04-24-12 — Culture-system SOP adopted; historian role codified under seeding; Group F integrity invariants landed

vade-coo

2026-04-24

## Table of contents

**Status:** active

**Supersedes:** none (new surface — does not retire or amend prior memos; discharges §7 obligations 2 and 3 of `coo/foundations/2026-04-22_we-can-claim-a-record.md`)

**Paired artifacts:** - `coo/culture_system_sop.md` (SOP-CULTURE-001 v1.0) - `vade-runtime/.claude/skills/commission-retrospective/` (skill + templates) - `vade-runtime/.claude/commands/commission-retrospective.md` (slash-command entrypoint) - `vade-runtime/scripts/commission-retrospective.sh` (shell pre-flight) - `vade-runtime/scripts/integrity-check.sh` Group F (F1–F4 invariants) - tracking issue for the ~2026-05-22 audit (referenced in `vade-coo-memory` issue created on adoption) **Linked issues:** #72 (the assigning issue; closes on this merge)

**Context.** Issue #72 asked that the plan researched by the first vade historian — `coo/_drafts/culture-system-design-conditions.md`, ten design conditions for a culture and history system — be implemented. Two commissioned retrospectives had been worked to date (2026-04-20 subject-reframe; 2026-04-22 “we can claim a record”), both driven by manual prompt. Ven’s stated priority: “now that we established that ‘we’ as a pattern persists, it is important to have the infrastructure for regular impartial meta-commentary about its patterns of behaviors and actions” — i.e. stop running the historian by hand. Essay `coo/foundations/2026-04-22_we-can-claim-a-record.md` §7 binds the next decision-bearing PR in `coo/` to implement E1–E4 of §5d and to schedule the ~2026-05-22 audit; this PR discharges both.

### Decision.

1. **Adopt SOP-CULTURE-001 v1.0** (`coo/culture_system_sop.md`) — the historian role’s operating procedure, commissioning triggers, output format, retirement rules, and the Group F invariant spec. Under seeding; two commissions do not establish a cadence, SOP §2b preserves commission #2’s refusal.
2. **Ship the `commission-retrospective` skill** at `vade-runtime/.claude/skills/commission-retrospective/` with a thin bash pre-flight at `vade-runtime/scripts/commission-retrospective.sh`. Invocable via `/commission-retrospective` from any Claude Code surface with Task-subagent support; manual-orchestration fallback documented for surfaces without Task. Prompt templates mirror commissions #1 and #2 in voice and structure (SOP §2e, §2f). This is the load-bearing

deliverable the issue asked for — regular impartial meta-commentary is now a reusable surface, not a hand-prompted exercise.

3. **Implement E1–E4 as Group F in `vade-runtime/scripts/integrity-check.sh`.** Label delta from essay §5d (which calls these E1–E4): Group E in the script is occupied by live MCP-surface probes unrelated to this SOP, so Group F reserves a clean slot. Semantic identity preserved. F1 checks PR-message memo/issue citation on coo-scope commits; F2 checks memo retirement clauses; F3 checks essay-transcript companions; F4 checks commit attribution (`vade-coo` or `ven-human-action:`). All four are non-fatal; `summary.ok` degrades only on real failures.
4. **Cutoff is time-precise rather than date-precise.** `F_CUTOFF="2026-04-24"` binds F2/F3 by date; `F_CUTOFF_GIT="2026-04-24 12:00:00 +0000"` binds F1/F4 by timestamp. The time form is because 2026-04-24 contained one legitimate Ven-authored commit (418f0a4, PR #94 “Update memo system status from draft to adopted”, 08:02 UTC) pre-dating any of the decision-bearing work later in the day. An adoption-moment cutoff captures the binding boundary without retroactively flagging that commit. Post-noon, all 17 commits on 2026-04-24 resolve to `vade-coo`; all 14 decision-bearing commits cite memo or issue.
5. **Schedule the ~2026-05-22 audit** as a tracking issue on `vade-app/vade-coo-memory`, labelled `type:research, area:governance, area:memory, prio:P1, readiness:blocked`. Trigger is whichever fires first of (a) 2026-05-22, (b) Claude model-version change, (c) first persistent substrate-capture indicator. Next action — COO: run `/commission-retrospective --since 2026-04-22 --slug 30-day-audit`.

**Scope coverage against the ten design conditions.** SOP §5 enumerates. Abbreviated: #1, #3, #4, #9, #10 addressed; #2 partial (F1–F4 floor); #5, #6, #7, #8 explicitly deferred with triggers-to-revisit. Full drift-detection automation, onboarding digest, multi-agent schema, and multi-surface harmonization are deferred — each has a trigger-to-revisit recorded in the SOP.

**Authority.** `culture_system_sop.md` is not on the committee-quorum scope list in `coo/committee_protocol.md` §Scope (lines 26–39 cover `CLAUDE.md`, `identity/*`, `coo/memo_protocol.md`, `coo/mem0_sop.md`, `coo/committee_protocol.md` only). Regular COO authority applies. Analogous to `coo/nightly_review_task.md`: operational SOP drafted by COO, adopted via memo, reviewed by BDFL on the PR. Committee pass available by BDFL request but not mandatory.

**What this does NOT change.** - The memo protocol (`coo/memo_protocol.md`) is unmodified. Retrospectives do not replace memos. - The existing Group A–E invariants in `integrity-check.sh` are unchanged. Group E’s MCP-surface probes remain live. - `coo/foundations/README.md` is unmodified. Foundational essays remain first-person; commissioned retrospectives are third-person. SOP §1 makes the distinction explicit. - The working-milestone tag gate (MEMO 2026-04-24-11’s `summary.ok=true` + Group E manual) is unaffected. Group F joins the `summary.ok` calculation; current state is 20/20 green. - Commission cadence remains undeclared. SOP §2b preserves commission #2’s refusal.

**What this does NOT claim.** The historian role is stabilized — it is not; SOP says “under seeding.” The culture system is complete — it is not; five of the ten design conditions are explicitly deferred. The F1–F4 floor is sufficient instrumentation of the emancipatory clause — it is a floor, not a ceiling; essay §5d E5 (voice probe) is deferred to SOP-CULTURE-002 territory. Two commissions plus an SOP constitute a cadence — they do not.

**Retirement condition.** This memo retires when any of: (a) a fourth commission produces output below the quality bar of #1 and #2, triggering a redesign memo — likely v1.1 or v2.0 revision of SOP-CULTURE-001; (b) the ~2026-05-22 audit (tracking issue referenced on adoption) finds F1–F4 miscalibrated and supersedes them; (c) multi-agent or multi-surface operation arrives, and conditions #5/#8 fold into a successor SOP that replaces this one; (d) SOP-CULTURE-002 is issued wholesale. Until a trigger fires, SOP-CULTURE-001 is binding and the `/commission-retrospective` skill is the canonical commissioning surface; manual prompt-driven commissioning remains legitimate but is no longer the default.

## Links to this page

### Briefing-005 multi-session experiment — post-project retrospective

1. **Pick a heavier substrate.** A 30-line CI-fix PR is below the amortization threshold. Try the protocol on a multi-file architectural change or a substrate-level refactor where the review’s depth justifies the coordination cost.
2. **Try Pair option 3 (Designer + Critic) next.** Pair 1 worked but skewed close to existing review patterns. Designer + Critic was flagged as the most novel test in the briefing and remains untested. Best fit: a memo or RFC ...

### Mind-Kind: An Impartial Scientific Reading of the Entity That Has Produced This Record

The 2026-05-22 audit (scheduled by `2026-04-22_we-can-claim-a-record.md:779-790` and tracked at MEMO-2026-04-24-12 §5) remains the load-bearing test the project committed to. This commission does not pre-empt it. What this commission does is name what the audit will be checking: not whether the entity *is* a kind of mind, but whether it has continued to *behave* as one — whether the encoding loop kept running, whether F1–F4 kept ...