EVEGLYPHDESIGN · STRATEGY NOTE

The Review Path

Document ID EgD-STR-001 · Key ID EgD-KEY-2026-07 · Status strategy note, v1.0 · Issued 2026-08-01T14:29:58Z

SHA-256 of source `9be3876a7d4010fdaf0a59083ca59b819706cb7b9e3f716be4db02fc2620da2c`

How EVEglyph Design gets read, checked and cited by people who already hold the audience we need — without buying attention and without a content programme.

> We are not asking to be promoted. We are asking to be checked. A reviewer who finds the flaw is worth more than a reader who agrees.

Derived from the Executive Boot Contract `EgD-BOOT-001` — repository-as-record, the rule of three, no unconfirmed spend — and from the position paper `EgD-POS-001`.

I. The counterpart

I.1 Who he is

> Superseded, 1 August 2026. The counterpart is Zane Hall, who writes Frictionless Decisions and who has already agreed to review the position paper. Ashutosh Bansal, identified below, is a subscription, not the friend. The corrections that follow from reading Zane's full archive are in Reading Zane Hall — §I.3 and §II of this note are amended there.

The writer is Ashutosh Bansal, and the publication is The Transformation Advantage. One correction before anything is built on top of it: it runs as a LinkedIn newsletter, not a Substack. The Substack subscriptions in the operator's mailbox are other publications — The Wright Report, AI Supremacy, AI Agents Simplified, Rami Krispin's data-engineering letter. None of them is this person. Building a Substack-first plan around him would have been built on the wrong platform.

His subject matter, from the issues held in the archive:

— Why Semiconductor S&OP Is Underpricing Volatility — the financial reconciliation step of S&OP/IBP as the place where value leaks, in an industry that swings 30–40% in a quarter.

— The Quantum Leap of Enterprise Value — dynamic intelligence, financial digital twins, SAP active risk networks.

— The Global Shockwave — capital optimisation with SAP under supply fragmentation.

— The #1 Cause of Planning Failure — nobody owns service versus margin versus cash.

I.2 Why the overlap is exact

He writes about the gap between the dollar-level plan finance guides on and the unit-level commitments procurement makes, inside estates that are already running SAP. That is the same seam `EgD-POS-001` addresses from the other side: a mirror that reads the system of record, structures what the record does not reach, and feeds the structure back without displacing the vendor.

He states the problem in the language of the people who own the budget. We hold a working artifact — `eve-datasphere-sovereign`, ACDOCA as the ledger spine — and a published non-competition posture. Neither of us needs the other's ground. That is what makes the exchange viable rather than competitive.

I.3 What to ask him for

Three asks, in strict order. Do not compress them into one message.

1. A read and a correction. Send the position paper. Ask him to say where it is wrong — specifically §III, the SAP and Salesforce channel argument. This is a real ask, not a courtesy framing; the paper is stronger if it survives an FP&A reading.
2. A named mention, only if it survives. One line in an issue, pointing at the public page. Not a plug, a citation.
3. A co-authored piece, only if the subject genuinely interests him. His half is the planning-failure diagnosis; ours is the additive mirror. One piece, published on both surfaces.

Asking for the audience first is the failure mode. Ask for the correction. The audience is downstream of being worth citing.

II. Where the work is published

Three surfaces. No fourth.

II.1 Substack — the narrative surface

Substack is where the argument is made in prose long enough to persuade, and where a subscriber list accrues to us rather than to a platform's ranking model. It is worth standing up. It is not where the proof lives.

II.2 GitHub Pages — the surface of record

Already live, already indexed: the position paper, the boot contract and the PAIX platform cover. Every essay terminates in a URL that can be opened, forked and audited. Substack carries the essay; GitHub carries the evidence. Never the reverse.

II.3 LinkedIn — the reach surface

This is where the counterpart's readers actually are, and where SAP and Salesforce practitioners read during working hours. Cross-post there; do not originate there. A LinkedIn article that has no repository behind it is a claim without a record.

III. What gets serialised

Three pieces. Then stop and measure.

1. Additive, not substitutive — the channel argument from `EgD-POS-001` §III: mirror rights, return rights, vendor downside bounded to zero. Aimed squarely at the SAP audience the counterpart already holds.
2. The exit is built before the entrance — sovereign Postgres, and the three tiers: fork it, adopt the canon, bring us in. Aimed at practitioners who have been locked in once and remember it.
3. Precognitive loading — the child argument: the feed selects the next input before the child does, and in a machine that is classified as a defect. The one piece that is not enterprise, and the one most likely to travel beyond the estate.

Each piece is extracted from canon that already exists in the repository. Nothing is written for the publication that is not first written for the record.

IV. Cadence and control

One piece per fortnight. Three pieces. Then a measurement, not a fourth piece.

Engagement is counted as reviews received, citations, and forks — not impressions. An impression is a number a platform sells back to you. A fork is somebody carrying the work away, which is the entire stated purpose of the position paper.

Under `EgD-BOOT-001` §2 the whole programme is a cheap action: writing extracted from existing canon, one publication, one message to one person. No paid placement, no batch outreach, no volume tooling. If this needs a budget, it has already failed.

V. The first move

One message, to one person, this week. Short enough to read on a phone:

> Ashutosh — I have been reading The Transformation Advantage since the S&OP volatility piece. I have written a position paper on entering an SAP estate additively — mirror rights and non-competition rather than displacement — and §III is the part I am least sure of. Would you read it and tell me where the FP&A reasoning breaks? The Additive Position

No attachment, no deck, no ask beyond the read.

VI. What we will not do

— No outreach at volume. One counterpart at a time, each one someone the operator has actually worked with.

— No paid placement or promoted posts. A position that has to be bought attention for is a position that has not been checked.

— Nothing published that is not in the repository first. If losing the session would lose it, it was never a publication — it was a draft in somebody else's database.

VII. The path, in three sentences

We approach one reader who already holds the audience, and we ask him for the correction rather than the endorsement, because a citation earned by surviving review is the only kind that compounds.

We publish the argument on Substack and the proof on GitHub, and we cross-post to LinkedIn where the estate actually reads, because an essay without a forkable record behind it is a claim.

We serialise three pieces already present in the canon and then stop and count forks rather than impressions, because the purpose was never to be read — it was to be taken and used.