

CONNECTED FIELD PRACTICE

Lumyn FDE School Field Capstone

A reusable workbook for taking one inherited brief through field discovery, bounded delivery, and exercised ownership.

USE

Choose one live, sanitized, or synthetic case. Preserve revisions and limitations. This workbook connects the ten mission artifacts; it is not a separate source of truth.

Start with one bounded case

Customer-safe case name: *Use a name that does not expose restricted context*

Inherited promise: *Quote or summarize the brief and source*

Decision event and deadline: *Funding, continuation, acceptance, renewal, reshape, or stop*

Evidence mode and limitations: *Live field evidence, sanitized retrospective, or synthetic practice*

How to work through the capstone

01

Correct the story

Observe one representative case, preserve the inherited brief, and surface one material conflict.

02

Prove the slice

Select the smallest sufficient mechanism, test the boundary, and bind release evidence to the exact candidate.

03

Prove ownership

Review operation, exercise recovery and change, then transfer the capability without hidden dependency.

REVIEW

A reviewer should be able to distinguish what was sold, observed, tested, allowed, asserted, contested, and still unknown.

Correct the story

Use the first three missions to establish a defensible boundary before selecting a mechanism or promising a build.

Living artifact registry

Assign stable IDs and add revisions instead of overwriting history.

Artifact ID	Type	Revision / digest	Currentness	Source dependencies

Typed dependency register

Relationships route change review. They do not grant authority or prove completion.

From object / revision	Relationship	To object / revision	Change consequence

Field evidence and conflict

Representative case: *Identity, date, scope, owner, exact passage, and limitation*

Material contradiction: *State both bounded claims, evidence classes, and what changes*

Safe fallback and next field move: *Keep it within known authority*

Current Outcome Contract

This is a current projection from the registry and evidence. Do not independently maintain it or label it accepted without a current, scoped human disposition.

Outcome statement: *What changes for whom, within an eligible workflow and explicit exclusions*

Outcome status and authority basis: *Draft / proposed / accepted; cite authority or record explicit unknown*

Baseline, target, and measurement window: *Include attribution limits*

Economic exposure, full cost basis, and decision threshold: *Include human review and exceptions*

Metric owner and independent verifier: *Do not infer either role*

Operating owner, transfer condition, and next review: *This is not proof of production handoff*

Four constraint gates

Dimension	Status	Evidence and limitation	Next move / owner
Data	satisfied / blocking / unknown / N/A		
Process	satisfied / blocking / unknown / N/A		
Governance	satisfied / blocking / unknown / N/A		
Accountable capability	satisfied / blocking / unknown / N/A		

Prove the slice

Use missions 4-8 to select the smallest sufficient mechanism, design a recoverable vertical slice, evaluate realistic behavior, secure effects, and decide readiness for the exact candidate.

Evidence to attach

[]	Intelligence-selection record: why this mechanism is the smallest sufficient option.
[]	Bounded system design packet: trust boundaries, states, failures, telemetry, and release tests.
[]	Evaluation set and report: reference authority, candidate binding, costs, and limitations.
[]	Tool contract and threat tests: trusted reads, effects, authorization, duplicate safety, and readback.
[]	Production readiness review: exact candidate, owners, rollback, and launch / constrain / hold decision.

Exact candidate and evidence bundle: *Record behavior, config, data/context, tool, and release revisions*

Highest-risk failure path and exercised recovery: *Name the trigger, detection, containment, recovery, and owner*

Readiness decision: *Launch / constrain / hold, with evidence and rollback condition*

Prove ownership

Use missions 9-10 to show that the accountable team can operate, change, recover, and retire the service without hidden delivery-team dependency.

Service and transfer evidence

Evidence	Current signal	Limitation	Owner / next review
<i>Outcome and adoption</i>			
<i>Reliability, safety, and cost</i>			
<i>Change, incident, and rollback</i>			
<i>Support and transfer capability</i>			

Final review

[]	The original brief and every superseded revision remain visible.
[]	Consequential claims are source-linked or explicit unknowns with limitations.
[]	Human authority is named, scoped, and never inferred from model output.
[]	Only dependency-linked state changed; unaffected revisions remain intact.
[]	The Outcome Contract states measurement, economics, ownership, limitations, and exit conditions.
[]	Synthetic, sanitized, and live evidence are visibly distinguished.

Capstone disposition: *Ready for peer review / needs more field evidence / stopped*

Reviewer, strongest evidence, material limitation, and next field move: *Keep the remaining uncertainty visible*