

Corrections table — Part C, the case study, text version 2 to version 3 (26–28 September 2026)

What this is. Every change made to the text, in order, in three columns a reader can check against the two versions: the sentence as it was, the sentence as it is now, and the class of the change. Stage 1 lists every change between the first complete draft of the case study (26 September 2026) and the corrected text (version 3), made by checking each of its 73 claims against the chain and package it describes. Later stages list the changes made within the release text before deposit, each dated.

How to read the classes. WRONG = the record contradicted the sentence · OVERCLAIM = the record supports something weaker · CITATION = an outside number or quote was misstated, mis-sourced or unverifiable · OMISSION = something the record holds that the text left out · DECISION = a choice by the owner, not a factual correction · ADDED / WORDING = new or clearer text without a change of claim.

What is omitted. The internal table has a sixth column naming the internal readers, files and the rows of the record each change traces to; it is omitted here. No cell is withheld. The retracted sentences in the ‘old’ column are printed as they stood.

Counts. The count is high because the text was checked sentence by sentence against its sources and the record, and every change is listed, not only the ones that changed a conclusion; most rows tighten one sentence by one qualifier. 28 rows: 13 OVERCLAIM · 7 WRONG · 4 WORDING · 3 ADDED · 1 NOT FOUND.

#	Where	Class	v2 (old)	v3 (new)
1	§28 chain attribution	OVERCLAIM	The record was to be kept on its own chain from the first commit, so that what is published is the original and not a sanitized copy.	On the seat’s proposal, accepted by proceeding, the record was kept on its own chain from the first commit, so that what is published is the original and not a sanitized copy.
2	§29 sources frozen	OVERCLAIM	with the sources frozen and hashed before any step: the live site as it stood, the public layer-one text of this report, the talking points that carry the do-not-say list, and the identity brief.	with the sources frozen and hashed before any step (the live site as it stood, the talking points that carry the do-not-say list, and the identity brief) or before the redesign began (the public layer-one text of this report, added at 15:52, after the first narrow pass).
3	§29 owner’s reason (constructed quote)	WRONG	The owner’s reason for the change, recorded: “we go from Fable 5.1 for the planning, to Opus 5.5 for the website build ... the models change; the record does not.”	The owner’s words: “go, revise the object with the models per step” (15:28) and “I want to see what Opus 5.5 can do with our previous work as a start” (15:50). The planning record states the seat’s reading of the plan, planning on Fable 5.1 and the build on Opus 5.5, as a test of the identity line; the owner used the line himself at 17:20: “the models change. the record doesn’t.”
4	§29 gate commands	OVERCLAIM	The owner did not type gate commands.	After the first object approval, which arrived as an accepted APPROVE G0 suggestion, the owner typed no gate command.
5	§29 pass 1 words	OVERCLAIM	1 (narrow, under the first object) 82 s 0.65 unchanged	1 (narrow, under the first object) 82 s 0.65 1,272 (from 1,269)
6	§29 dataset builder	OVERCLAIM	The builder refuses any hash, subject, author, path, or incident identifier.	The first builder on the chain asserts that it refuses any hash, subject, author, path, or incident identifier; the final dataset was built by the seat outside the chain and passes the same scan.
7	§29 nodes-order sentence	WORDING	Pass 3’s notes told the model the nodes were in time order.	The seat’s notes to the model for pass 3 said the nodes were in time order.
8	§29 pass number	WRONG	Pass 6 answered the owner’s “I don’t see node2 reflected at all”	Pass 7 (the chain’s own headings call it the sixth, because they omit the narrow first pass) answered the owner’s “I don’t see node2 reflected at all”
9	§29 deploy row	OVERCLAIM	and wrote a deploy row carrying the hashes of the three new files and the unchanged hash of the report PDF.	and wrote a deploy row whose parameter hash covers the hashes of the three new files and the unchanged hash of the report PDF; the hashes themselves are readable in the approval rows of 17:52 and in the deploy runbook.
10	§30 refused path	NOT FOUND	and the proposal chain, which does not, refused that path when the seat tried it (the refusal is printed by the runner before anything is written, so it left no row);	and the proposal chain, which does not, refuses it: the runner exits before writing anything, so an attempt leaves no row;
11	§31 build row	WRONG	Build (fresh instances, Opus 5.5) 8 calls · \$14.92 · 3,017 s of model wall time · 7 change notes with a source line for every sentence	Build (fresh instances, Opus 5.5) 8 calls · \$14.92 · about 3,000 s of model wall time · 7 change notes, each with a source table for the page text (the model’s own account)
12	§31 deploy row	OVERCLAIM	The recorded hashes are of the deployed files; the served home page differs from its file because the host rewrites mail links, so a reader who hashes the live page will not get the recorded value.	The recorded hashes are of the deployed files; both served HTML pages differ from their files because the host rewrites mail links, so a reader who hashes either live page will not get the recorded value; the dataset and the PDF hash live.
13	§31 chain row	WRONG	Chain 38 commits, all good-signed · 135 evidence rows, 0 breaks · package 22 files	Chain 38 commits, all good-signed · 135 evidence rows, 0 breaks · package 27 files (rebuilt 18:12; the 17:58 build had 22)

#	Where	Class	v2 (old)	v3 (new)
14	§31 one row, three events	OVERCLAIM	The same shape at pass 5: his addition of 17:24 reopened the step for an output that landed at 17:29, unseen. So “one word” is exact in one sense and needs saying in another: six of the reviews were looks at a page, and the last was a condition the seat discharged on his behalf.	The same shape at pass 5: his addition of 17:24 was recorded as the refusal of pass 5 thirty-three seconds after that pass landed, unseen; pass 6 answered it at 17:31. So “one word” is exact in one sense and needs saying in another: five of the six returns followed a look at a page, one was an addition typed before he saw the pass it reopened, and the last approval was a condition the seat discharged on his behalf.
15	§32 rehearsal sentence	OVERCLAIM	The rehearsal proved the rules and could not be driven by its designer.	The rehearsal proved the rules and, in the seat’s reading, could not be driven by its designer.
16	§33 line 1	OVERCLAIM	six reviews by looking at a page, each producing one to three sentences, and one condition discharged by the seat on his word;	five returns after a look at a page and one addition typed before the look, each producing one to three sentences, and one condition discharged by the seat on his word;
17	§33 line 5	OVERCLAIM	every sentence on the published page carries a source line in the change note; the publish decision is a row with the owner’s words	the change note gives a source line for the page text it lists (the model’s own account; the runner tested only presence and balance); the publish decision is a row with the owner’s words
18	§35 published	WRONG	the deployed pages and the dataset; every change note; the owner’s notes to each pass, verbatim; the gate log of the conversation, with one exchange the owner marked internal omitted and the omission stated;	the deployed pages and the dataset; the final change note, which carries the last four passes’ sections (the earlier passes’ notes are on the chain, not in the package); the owner’s notes to each pass, verbatim; the gate log of the conversation, with two exchanges omitted and each omission stated (one the owner marked internal at the time; one personal exchange raised while the model worked, omitted before publication); the approval files and the pointer file with the seat-store path shortened to its file name;
19	§35 pending	ADDED	Pending: an external timestamp on the package manifest (the stamp script did not confirm on 09-26); an internal hostile read of this draft; the owner’s read last.	Pending before publication: a public copy of the package with the two omissions and the shortened paths, its manifest published beside the full package’s manifest hash (72305ec4...), with the hash of the omitted text stated so the omission is itself checkable against the full package; an internal hostile read of this text; the owner’s read last.
20	footer	WORDING	<i>Part C draft v1, written 2026-09-26 18:1x from the chain and its package. Replaces the federal-proposal case, closed as a rehearsal the same evening.</i>	<i>Part C, text version 3: written 2026-09-26 from the chain and its package, corrected 2026-09-27; every correction is listed in a table kept in the company’s record. Replaces the federal-proposal case, closed as a rehearsal the same evening.</i>

Stage 2 — an internal hostile read of v3 (27 September)

#	Where	Class	v3 (old)	v3.1 (new)
C1	§29 models (hostile read)	WORDING	that knew nothing but the chain in front of it:	that was given nothing but the chain in front of it:
C2	§29 owner’s words (hostile read)	ADDED	the owner used the line himself at 17:20: “the models change. the record doesn’t.”	the owner used the line himself at 17:20: “the models change. the record doesn’t.” The frozen planning record’s decision 4 quotes the seat’s sentence under an owner label; it is the seat’s sentence, and the public package carries the planning record as it was frozen.
C3	§30 tool set (hostile read)	ADDED	the model is named per step and recorded per call; a directory can be an output;	the model is named per step and recorded per call; each step’s tool set is named in the object (read, write, edit, search, and a shell tool), with the runner checking what a step wrote and not what it read, and the object’s no-network line a note rather than a fence; a directory can be an output;
C4	§31 gates row (hostile read)	OVERCLAIM	1 publish decision; the seat’s classification marked on each. The hook cross-check	1 publish decision; the seat’s classification is recorded as a field on three rows (the second object approval and the two points of 17:52), and the six returns are recorded as refusals by the runner’s own path. The hook cross-check
C5	§31 owner’s words row (hostile read)	WRONG	Owner’s words in the package 20 owner turns, 2,117 words, in the gate log from the planning start to the close (the seat’s session store holds more of the day; only the gate log is published)	Owner’s words in the package 18 owner turns, 1,973 words, in the public gate log from the planning start to the close; the full gate log holds 20 turns and 2,117 words, the omitted exchange being the difference (the seat’s session store holds more of the day; only the gate log is published)

#	Where	Class	v3 (old)	v3.1 (new)
C6	§35 public copy (hostile read)	WRONG	Pending before publication: a public copy of the package with the two omissions and the shortened paths, its manifest published beside the full package's manifest hash (72305ec4...), with the hash of the omitted text stated so the omission is itself checkable against the full package; an internal hostile read of this text; the owner's read last.	Public copy: the package as published is a copy with the two omissions and the shortened paths; its own manifest (SHA-256 1359371c813f354a63c2390331d9ced9b0628ec4f4b91a467b707ef73744994d) is published beside the full package's manifest hash (72305ec4e4fce0a80c8df311cefc93fdc622f572aff69102132d349e1968cc27), with the hash of the omitted text stated so the omission is itself checkable against the full package. The full manifest hash was committed to the company's record on 26 September and is covered by the record's daily stamps from the following morning on.

Stage 3 — release decisions by the owner, 27 September (v3.1 → v3.2)

#	Where	Class	v3.1 (old)	v3.2 (new)
D1	§35	WORDING	The mechanism stays private; the results do not.	The workflow's internals stay private; the results do not.
D2	footer	OVERCLAIM	every correction is listed in a table kept in the company's record.	every correction is listed in a table published beside it.