

TERRAWATT / NEXT CLIENT CONVERSATION

Turn the vision into one accountable 90-day operating loop.

The RFP describes the destination. This brief defines the conversation that prevents the entire destination from becoming one undefined fixed-price obligation.

CONFIRMED SESSION

Today, 2:00-3:00 PM Central

Royden, Michael, Jordan, Pedro, Jason, and Roberto. Guided RFP response, implementation evidence, BusinessOS demonstration, technical-layer clarification, and alignment.

[Open Google Meet](#)

REQUIRED OUTCOME

Confirm one bounded Phase 1, one ownership schedule, one acceptance boundary, one required source package, and one sequence for the formal proposal.

Move from their RFP to evidence, then from evidence to the operating system.

Roberto controls the screen. The team supports defined sections and saves commercial or legal debates for the alignment block.

0-5 min	Open and frame	Roberto sets the sequence: RFP, evidence, product, technical layers, decisions.
5-18 min	Walk TerraWatt's RFP	Roberto interprets each major requirement; Royden confirms intent and corrects assumptions.
18-28 min	Show a real implementation process	Prove how outcomes, sources, vocabulary, workflows, modules, and acceptance become software.
28-40 min	Show BusinessOS	Connect the method to the operating surface, governed context, modules, roles, work, and evidence.
40-48 min	Separate the technical layers	Explain Claude API/SDK, Claude Code, agent harness, operating harness, MIOSA, and Fractal.
48-55 min	Resolve the boundaries	Jordan supports scope, ownership, vendor independence, dependencies, and acceptance.

55-60 min

Lock the handoff

Name owners, source package, proposal sequence, and next decision date.

02 / PRESENTATION LOGIC

Make the argument in four moves.

Every move answers a different question: what they asked for, whether the method works, what they receive, and how the technical stack fits together.

01 / THEIR LANGUAGE

Walk the RFP first.

For each major section: request, operational meaning, existing foundation, custom implementation, discovery requirement, and phase assignment.

02 / EVIDENCE

Show a real implementation process.

Outcome to source package, vocabulary, taxonomy, ontology, workflow, authority, module configuration, benchmark, deployment, and evidence.

03 / END PRODUCT

Show BusinessOS.

Organization, workspaces, people, roles, modules, sources, decisions, tasks, permissions, agents, interfaces, and accepted company context.

04 / TECHNICAL CLARITY

Separate model access from the operating system.

Claude can reason. Claude Code can build. The agent harness governs execution. The operating harness makes the work belong to the company.

Do not let one word, "Claude," collapse six different responsibilities.

MODEL INTERFACE

Claude API / SDK

Programmatic access to model reasoning and generation. It does not supply company hierarchy, durable memory, workflow state, permissions, or audit evidence.

INFERENCE INTERFACE

DEVELOPMENT AGENT

Claude Code

An interactive coding agent that can inspect repositories, edit files, and run tools. It helps build and maintain the system but is not the production backbone.

BUILD-TIME OPERATOR

EXECUTION CONTRACT

Agent harness

Controls context assembly, instructions, tools, execution, errors, approvals, and evaluation for a specific class of agent work.

AGENT-LEVEL GOVERNANCE

COMPANY CONTRACT

Operating harness

Supplies identity, hierarchy, workspaces, accepted context, policies, workflow state, evidence, observability, human authority, and recovery.

ORGANIZATION-LEVEL GOVERNANCE

THE LINE TO USE

Claude can reason and Claude Code can build. The harness determines what an agent is allowed to know and do. The operating system determines how that work belongs to the company and becomes durable evidence.

Prove the complete loop before expanding the module count.

F0, M3, bounded M1, and minimal M0 form a coherent production release. M17 remains a separately accepted proof unless TerraWatt removes equivalent scope.

One source becomes one accepted operating record, then returns as evidence.

01 / RECEIVE

Email or document arrives

Approved Outlook, OneDrive, or data-room source.

02 / PRESERVE

Store immutable source

Identity, timestamp, checksum, and provenance.

03 / INTERPRET

Classify and extract

Bounded fields, dates, obligations, and confidence.

04 / REVIEW

Human approval gate

Low-confidence and high-impact changes are reviewed.

05 / ROUTE

File the accepted record

Correct deal, project, data room, or tracker.

06 / ACT

Surface deadline and owner

Bounded M1 workflow creates accountable action.

07 / ANSWER

Respond with citations

Minimal M0 answers only from accepted records.

08 / LEARN

Return evidence

Result, correction, and approval improve future work.

These questions determine whether the proposal is responsible.

OWNERSHIP

Classify the work instead of assigning everything.

- Does "all code" mean TerraWatt-specific commissioned repositories?
- Do open-source components retain their licenses?
- Does pre-existing MIOSA and Fractal technology retain prior ownership?
- Does TerraWatt own its data, configurations, mappings, acceptance corpus, and commissioned modules?

VENDOR INDEPENDENCE

Define control and portability precisely.

- Is the requirement about avoiding lock-in and preserving continuity?
- Or does it prohibit every paid API and managed service?
- How is the prohibition reconciled with the required Claude SDK?

ACCEPTANCE

Name the benchmark and the adjudicator.

- Which deal class and user group form the pilot?
- What corpus and denominator support each accuracy target?
- Which failures block acceptance?
- When does the 60-day parallel run begin?

COMMERCIAL BOUNDARY

Fixed fee requires fixed responsibility.

- USD 200,000 covers the accepted 90-day Phase 1.
- Third-party costs remain separate.
- Client access and approval delays move the schedule.
- Material additions require a change order or new phase.

Four layers, four ownership categories, one coordinated delivery plan.

This answers the proprietary-platform concern without pretending external services do not exist.

OPEN FOUNDATION

BusinessOS + Optimal Engine

Operating interface, governed context, sources, facts, signals, decisions, permissions, evidence, and module primitives.

PUBLISHED OPEN-SOURCE LICENSES

OPERATING PLATFORM

MIOSA

Deployment, execution, release management, managed runtime, secrets, observability, and recovery services.

PAID PLATFORM SERVICE

COMMISSIONED WORK

TerraWatt implementation

Custom modules, workflows, schemas, mappings, prompts, acceptance assets, and company configuration.

TERRAWATT-SPECIFIC DELIVERABLES

SCALE PARTNER

Fractal

Joint architecture, compatibility layer, enterprise data boundaries, scale path, and selected technology where validated.

PARTNER IP AND DISCLOSED LICENSES

Ask for real work, real owners, and real failure cases.

SOURCE MATERIAL

TerraWatt sends

- Three representative data rooms: clean, typical, and difficult.
- Master Comp Sheet and data dictionary.
- Outlook, OneDrive, tracker, filing, and approval workflows.
- Templates, expected outputs, and known failure examples.
- Azure, Entra, Graph, residency, retention, and recovery requirements.

NAMED AUTHORITY

TerraWatt confirms

- Pilot deal class and user group.
- Business owner and final acceptance adjudicator.
- Benchmark corpus and acceptance denominators.
- Security and infrastructure owner.
- Who can approve workflow, taxonomy, and policy changes.

Show one truthful operating loop, not eighteen conceptual modules.

1. Open the TerraWatt workspace in BusinessOS.
2. Show how Optimal Engine scopes accepted sources, context, permissions, and evidence.
3. Ingest one representative document or email.
4. Show extracted fields, source identity, confidence, and review state.
5. Approve the result and show its deal, deadline, owner, and filing destination.
6. Ask one cited question through the command interface.
7. Show the audit event, correction path, and resulting memory.
8. Explain how MIOSA deploys the accepted system into the approved runtime boundary.

Use language that preserves alignment without accepting undefined risk.

We agree with the destination.
The question is which
operating loop must become
trustworthy first.

Vendor independence should
mean control, portability, and
continuity, not pretending no
external services exist.

The 90-day fixed fee can be responsible only when the acceptance boundary is equally fixed.

Fractal gives the architecture a credible enterprise scaling path without making Phase 1 wait for that path.

10 / INTERNAL OWNERS

Everyone enters the call with a defined job.

OWNER	BEFORE THE CALL	AFTER ALIGNMENT
Roberto	Lead the call, show BusinessOS, frame the loop, and hold scope and ownership boundaries.	Draft the 90-day proposal, acceptance schedule, architecture memo, team plan, and run-cost assumptions.
Jordan	Pressure-test commercial language, IP categories, and acceptance structure.	Review proposal narrative, assumptions, exclusions, and negotiation position.
Michael	Explain Fractal's role, the compatibility approach, and enterprise scale path.	Draft the compatibility layer and provide SDK plus test credentials.
Pedro	Support product and implementation feasibility during the demo.	Translate the accepted workflow into interface and module requirements.

11 / MEETING EVIDENCE

Jump directly to the decisions behind this brief.

Vendor contradiction and Claude SDK

Aggressive IP language

Ownership baseline

RFP response requirements

First high-value operating loop

Open-source core and custom modules

Ninety-day Phase 1

Parallel Fractal integration

Hold the scope boundary

BOTTOM LINE

TerraWatt is asking for the operating system Roberto has been building.

The opportunity is real. The risk is treating the entire future-state program as one fixed-price 90-day obligation. The next call must convert the vision into one accepted loop, one ownership schedule, one evidence-based acceptance plan, and one bounded proposal.