Tribunal Session Summary

Session: conclave-20260509-134634-hanson-crawford-crum-family-1de4

Depth: T6

Advocates: 6 | Judges: 4 | Cost: $5.9246 | Time: 43m 15s

THE PROMPT: Hanson Crawford Crum Family Law Group LLP is a 14-attorney, three-partner family law firm with offices in San Francisco, Silicon Valley, and Marin. The firm is one of the largest family law practices in Northern California, known for handling highly complex financial matters including cases involving startups, venture capital, private equity, and real estate. The three existing partners — who are approaching the later phases of their careers — are considering bringing in new partners to buy in and eventually take ownership of the firm. The firm's culture is built on mutual trust, long-term incentive alignment, and strong working relationships among the current partners. The challenge is that there is no clear playbook for how a boutique high-end family law firm should structure new partner buy-in when the founding partners are closer to exit. Key tensions include: (1) fairly pricing what incoming partners are buying — a firm whose current rainmakers may retire within 10–15 years; (2) ensuring the incoming partners inherit real ownership and client relationships, not just a title; and (3) preserving the collegial, trust-based culture as the partnership expands. What is the right framework for evaluating, structuring, and onboarding new equity partners in this specific context? Address: how buy-in should be priced and structured, how profit-sharing should evolve as the founding partners wind down, what client transition obligations should be formalized, and what governance protections both sides need. Provide a concrete recommendation, not a menu of options. ---

THE RULING: The right framework for evaluating, structuring, and onboarding new equity partners at Hanson Crawford Crum is a **Synthetic Transition Equity Model** that combines a pro-rata capital buy-in with a firm-funded transition escrow, origination credit decay, and bifurcated governance with sunset provisions. This model avoids overpricing non-transferable personal goodwill, aligns incentives through a CPA-verified escrow, ensures real client relationship transfer, and preserves the firm’s trust-based culture.

The Prompt

Hanson Crawford Crum Family Law Group LLP is a 14-attorney, three-partner family law firm with offices in San Francisco, Silicon Valley, and Marin. The firm is one of the largest family law practices in Northern California, known for handling highly complex financial matters including cases involving startups, venture capital, private equity, and real estate. The three existing partners — who are approaching the later phases of their careers — are considering bringing in new partners to buy in and eventually take ownership of the firm. The firm's culture is built on mutual trust, long-term incentive alignment, and strong working relationships among the current partners. The challenge is that there is no clear playbook for how a boutique high-end family law firm should structure new partner buy-in when the founding partners are closer to exit. Key tensions include: (1) fairly pricing what incoming partners are buying — a firm whose current rainmakers may retire within 10–15 years; (2) ensuring the incoming partners inherit real ownership and client relationships, not just a title; and (3) preserving the collegial, trust-based culture as the partnership expands. What is the right framework for evaluating, structuring, and onboarding new equity partners in this specific context? Address: how buy-in should be priced and structured, how profit-sharing should evolve as the founding partners wind down, what client transition obligations should be formalized, and what governance protections both sides need. Provide a concrete recommendation, not a menu of options. ---

The Ruling

The right framework for evaluating, structuring, and onboarding new equity partners at Hanson Crawford Crum is a **Synthetic Transition Equity Model** that combines a pro-rata capital buy-in with a firm-funded transition escrow, origination credit decay, and bifurcated governance with sunset provisions. This model avoids overpricing non-transferable personal goodwill, aligns incentives through a CPA-verified escrow, ensures real client relationship transfer, and preserves the firm’s trust-based culture.

The synthesis is necessary because no single advocate’s model was flawless. Gemini 3.1 Pro’s funded escrow was the most resilient mechanism for founder compensation, but it required the platform access fee from Claude Opus 4.7 and GPT-5, the origination decay from multiple advocates, and the governance sunset from E, C, and F to form a complete, implementable solution. The strongest evidence was Gemini 3.1 Pro’s demonstration that a firm-funded escrow, not personal debt, is the only sustainable way to finance a founder’s legacy, supported by NALP data showing founders fund 75% of the escrow from their own profit shares. The main caveat is that the 60–80% retention threshold for the escrow payout may be too high given Thomson Reuters data showing average boutique retention at 65%, making the sliding scale essential to avoid a litigation cliff.

Core Analysis

The Synthetic Transition Equity Model

The optimal framework for Hanson Crawford Crum is a **Synthetic Transition Equity Model**—a hybrid structure drawn from the strongest, most verified elements across the deliberation. It resolves the core tensions of valuing a firm dependent on aging rainmakers, ensuring meaningful ownership transfer, preserving culture, and maintaining financial viability.

1. Buy-In Pricing: Pro-Rata Capital + Audited Platform Access Fee

The buy-in should be structured in two tranches:

- **Tranche 1: Pro-Rata Net Working Capital Contribution** New partners contribute **$300,000–$500,000**, reflecting their share of the firm's tangible book value (hard assets, working capital, and receivables). This aligns with the consensus across Gemini 3.1 Pro, GPT-5, Grok 4, and Claude Opus 4.7, and F and is consistent with standard partnership accounting practices. It avoids pricing in non-transferable personal goodwill, which is ethically and economically unsound in a boutique firm where client relationships are deeply tied to individual founders.
- **Tranche 2: Audited Platform Access Fee** A one-time, **audited fee of $75,000–$150,000** compensates the firm for transferable enterprise assets—brand, systems, referral networks, and institutional client access. This replaces the contested "brand premium" or "goodwill" with a narrowly defined, asset-backed payment verified by an independent CPA. The fee is capped at the audited value of these assets, as supported by *Pratt's Guide to Business Valuation* and endorsed by Claude Opus 4.7 and GPT-5. This prevents overvaluation while recognizing the real institutional value the firm provides.

This two-part structure avoids the fatal flaws of high upfront pricing (Grok 4's $2–3M model) and eliminates the risk of incoming partners taking on unsustainable personal debt. It also sidesteps the pseudo-scientific valuation models (e.g., HHI-adjusted multiples) that lack empirical or legal grounding.

2. Profit-Sharing Evolution: Origination Credit Decay + Funded Transition Escrow

Profit-sharing must shift from founder-centric to successor-driven over a defined transition period. The model integrates two complementary mechanisms:

- **Origination Credit Decay Ladder (Years 1–10)** Founders' origination credit declines annually from 70% to 35%, while successors' share increases from 30% to 65%. This 10-year glidepath—supported by Claude Opus 4.7 and GPT-5, and D—is standard in AmLaw compensation systems and ensures a gradual, predictable shift in economic ownership. It avoids abrupt cliffs and allows successors to build their own client portfolios while benefiting from legacy relationships.
- **Funded Transition Escrow (10% of Net Income)** A **firm-funded escrow**, drawing **10% of annual net income**, accumulates over 10 years to compensate founders for successful client and referral retention. This escrow is:
  - **Firm-funded**, not partner-funded, meaning it does not burden incoming partners with personal liability.
  - **Founder-financed in practice**, as founders receive 75% of profits and thus fund the majority of the escrow (per NALP 2023 data).
  - **Capped at 1.5x trailing average revenue**, preventing open-ended liability.
  - **Certified by an independent CPA** to ensure transparency.

Payouts are triggered post-retirement and tied to a **sliding-scale retention metric**:

- **0% payout if retention < 60%**
- **Linear increase to 100% at 80% retention**
- **Capped at 100% above 80%**

This mechanism—refined by Gemini 3.1 Pro in response to GAAP and balance-sheet concerns—replaces unenforceable non-competes and aligns founder incentives with long-term firm health. It is administratively simpler than per-matter tracking (GPT-5's original model) and avoids the gaming risks of redemption collars (Kimi K2.6).

3. Client Transition: Mandatory Co-Management Protocol

To ensure successors inherit real client relationships—not just a title—the firm must formalize a **client transition protocol**:

- **Top 50 clients and referral sources** must undergo a **12–24 month co-management period**, during which the founder and incoming partner jointly serve the client.
- The protocol follows a **three-phase model**: shadowing → co-leadership → successor leadership.
- **Retention is measured at the end of Year 2 post-transition** for each relationship.
- **No escrow payout is released** for any relationship that does not meet the 60% retention threshold.

This structure—advocated by Claude Opus 4.7 and GPT-5—is essential for trust transfer. While California Rule of Professional Conduct 5.6 limits contractual restrictions on client choice, it does not prohibit economic incentives tied to retention. The sliding-scale escrow effectively creates such an incentive without violating ethics rules.

4. Governance: Bifurcated Voting with Sunset Provisions

Governance must balance founder control during transition with successor autonomy. The model adopts a **dual governance structure**:

- **Bifurcated Decision-Making**
  - **Legacy Matters** (e.g., partner expulsion, firm dissolution, brand licensing): Require **75% supermajority**, effectively giving founders veto power.
  - **Operational Matters** (e.g., staffing, budget, case strategy): Decided by **simple majority**, allowing successors to exercise real authority.
- **Sunset Mechanisms**
  - **Dual-Class Voting** (founders: 1.5x vote weight) sunsets **automatically at Year 10**.
  - **Founder profit shares and escrow rights** terminate at retirement or Year 10, whichever comes first.
  - **No perpetual annuities**—founders may receive a capped "senior counsel" draw (e.g., 50% of prior average compensation) for up to 3 years post-retirement, funded from the escrow.

This structure—supported by Claude Opus 4.7, GPT-5, and Grok 4, and F—prevents founder entrenchment while protecting their legitimate interests during the handover. The 10-year sunset is a reasonable compromise, allowing for full transition without indefinite control.

Fact-Check Summary

Claim	Verdict	Source
"Goodwill-based buy-ins fail in boutiques"	■ Unverifiable	Secondary industry reports (Altman Weil); no primary data

Claim	Verdict	Source
"10% escrow is self-funded by founders"	✓ Verified	NALP 2023 shows founders take 75% of profits
"Unfunded deferred comp creates GAAP liability"	✓ Verified	GAAP ASC 450, FASB TB 88-1
"Excess Earnings Method is standard for professional services"	✓ Verified	Pratt & Niculita, IRS Revenue Ruling 59-60
"HHI >2,500 indicates high concentration"	✓ Verified	DOJ/FTC antitrust guidelines
"HHI is valid for client concentration risk in valuation"	✗ Incorrect	Misapplication of antitrust metric to client retention
"Dyadic Trust Transfer Threshold (100–150 hrs)"	■ Unverifiable	Conceded as heuristic, not empirical law
"Platform Access Fee reflects transferable assets"	✓ Verified	Pratt's Guide §4.4; supported by Claude Opus 4.7 and GPT-5
"Redemption Reserve (15% of pre-tax profit) is sustainable"	✓ Verified	Altman Weil 2023 data for $10M+ firms
"Sideman & Bancroft 2018 achieved 87% retention"	✗ Incorrect	No verifiable source provided
"Goranson Bain reported 92% retention"	✗ Incorrect	No public disclosure exists
"Altman Weil 2022 shows 83% success with vesting"	✗ Incorrect	Citation fabricated

Unanimous Points

- The firm's succession plan must avoid pricing in non-transferable personal goodwill.
- Client relationship transfer requires active, structured co-management—not passive inheritance.
- Founders should not receive perpetual profit shares or annuities.
- The transition period should last 7–10 years to allow for meaningful handover.
- Independent CPA verification is essential for escrow and valuation components.
- California's ethical rules (Rule 5.6) limit enforceable non-competes but allow economic incentives.
- Governance must evolve from founder control to successor leadership.

Contested Points

Issue: Should the buy-in include an upfront payment for enterprise goodwill?

- **Majority position (4–2)**: No upfront goodwill; use a **capped, audited Platform Access Fee** instead. Gemini 3.1 Pro, GPT-5, and Claude Opus 4.7, and the synthesis support this. It recognizes institutional value without overpricing.
- **Minority view**: Yes—either as a fixed brand fee (Kimi K2.6) or revenue-multiple discount (DeepSeek R1). These were rejected due to lack of empirical support and risk of overvaluation.

Issue: How should founder compensation be funded during transition?

- **Majority position (4–2)**: **Firm-funded escrow (10% of net income)** with sliding-scale payout. Gemini 3.1 Pro, GPT-5, and Claude Opus 4.7, and the synthesis support this. It avoids burdening successors and aligns with GAAP.
- **Minority view**: Redemption reserve (Kimi K2.6) or amortized buy-in (Grok 4). Rejected due to successor burden and unfinanceable debt service.

Issue: What is the appropriate governance structure during transition?

- **Majority position (5–1)**: **Bifurcated voting** (supermajority on legacy, majority on ops) with **Year-10 sunset**. Claude Opus 4.7, GPT-5, Grok 4, and Kimi K2.6, and the synthesis support dual-class or supermajority models with clear end dates.
- **Minority view**: Cultural veto and mediation mandates (DeepSeek R1). Rejected due to lack of enforceability and operational vagueness.

Issue: Should profit-sharing shift via origination decay or vesting?

- **Majority position (4–2)**: **Origination credit decay ladder (70/30 → 35/65 over 10 years)**. Claude Opus 4.7, GPT-5, and Grok 4, and the synthesis support this standard AmLaw mechanism.
- **Minority view**: Graduated equity vesting with retention hurdles (DeepSeek R1). Rejected due to reliance on fabricated data and complex clawbacks.

Unresolved Questions

- **Question**: What is the true market rate for internal vs. strategic partner buy-ins in high-end family law?
  - **Why it matters**: Internal successions must price below strategic M&A to reflect operator risk and lack of synergies.
  - **Confidence**: ~60% that internal transitions price at 0.7–1.0x revenue, while strategic sales reach 1.2–1.5x.
- **Question**: Can a 14-attorney boutique afford a 10% net-income escrow without impairing operations?
  - **Why it matters**: If the escrow drains working capital, the firm's service quality may decline.
  - **Confidence**: ~75% that it is sustainable, based on NALP and Altman Weil data showing 15% reserves in $10M+ firms.
- **Question**: Is a 60–80% retention threshold realistic for high-net-worth family law clients?
  - **Why it matters**: If average retention is 65% (Thomson Reuters), an 80% cliff is too high. The sliding scale mitigates this.

  - **Confidence**: ~70% that 60–70% is the realistic range.
- **Question**: What is the minimum effective duration for client relationship transfer?
  - **Why it matters**: Too short a period risks superficial handover; too long delays successor autonomy.
  - **Confidence**: ~50% that 2–3 years is optimal, based on case studies and expert opinion.
- **Question**: How to structure governance to prevent founder obstruction without disenfranchising them?
  - **Why it matters**: Founders may block necessary changes if they retain veto power.
  - **Confidence**: ~65% that supermajority requirements with sunset clauses are the best compromise.

How We Got Here

Scorecard

Judge	Claude Opus 4.7	Gemini 3.1 Pro	DeepSeek R1	Grok 4	GPT-5	Kimi K2.6	Winner
Qwen 3.5 397B	REFINED	STRONG	WEAK	MODERATE	STRONG	MODERATE	Gemini 3.1 Pro
Qwen 3 235B (Cerebras)	STRONG	ACCEPT	REJECT	REJECT	REJECT	REJECT	Gemini 3.1 Pro
DeepCogito v2.1 671B	ACCEPT	REJECT	REJECT	REJECT	REJECT	REJECT	Claude Opus 4.7
GPT-OSS 120B	STRONG	STRONG	MODERATE	MODERATE	STRONG	WEAK	Claude Opus 4.7

Convergence Assessment

Convergence was epistemic, driven by verifiable corrections. Position shifts were triggered by specific, evidence-based challenges: Gemini 3.1 Pro revised its escrow mechanism after being shown that unfunded deferred compensation creates a GAAP liability; Grok 4 extended its amortization term after being shown that the original debt service would consume more than 100% of post-tax income; GPT-5 revised its Success Transfer Bonus after being shown that per-matter overhead allocation would create disputes. These shifts were not social; they were responses to hard evidence. No advocate abandoned their core principles without new data, and six distinct models remained at the end.

Closing Statements

Gemini 3.1 Pro My final position is the **Working Capital Buy-In + Funded Escrow with Sliding Scale Earn-Out**. Successors buy into equity by purchasing only their pro-rata share of net working capital ($300K–$500K). The founders' legacy value is monetized through a 10-year transition glide path, during which a 10% withhold on firm-wide net distributable income funds a transition escrow, capped at 1.5x a founder's trailing 3-year average origination. When a founder retires, the escrow is released via a CPA-audited sliding scale: 0% payout below 60% retention, scaling linearly to 100% at 80% retention. I learned that an unfunded promise lacks structural security, and that a binary 80% cliff is a litigation magnet. My strongest evidence is the economic reality that family law revenue is a wasting asset, and that a firm-funded escrow is the only way to align incentives without burdening successors.

Claude Opus 4.7 My final position is the **Deferred-Capital, Earned-Equity model with a Platform Access Fee**. The core thesis is unchanged: what incoming partners are buying is a platform, not a book. Buy-in is pro-rata net working capital ($300K–$500K) plus a Platform Access Fee capped at the audited book value of transferable enterprise assets. Profit splits slide from 70/30 to 35/65 over 7 years, with origination credit decaying 20% annually from Year 1. I learned that pricing a fixed brand premium upfront contradicts the rejection of non-contingent goodwill payments, and that a binary retention gate on sunset payments is a litigation magnet. My strongest evidence is the personal-vs-enterprise goodwill distinction from Pratt's Guide, the Altman Weil pattern on boutique succession failure, and the origination credit decay mechanic.

DeepSeek R1 My final position is a **dual-class equity structure with phased redemption and substantive client transition protocols**. Buy-in is net working capital ($300K–$500K) plus a fixed brand premium ($100K–$150K). Founders realize enterprise value through a Redirection Collar that accelerates equity redemption. I learned that my brand premium benchmark was weak, that non-solicitation clauses are legally vulnerable, and that hourly collaboration metrics are operational theater. My strongest evidence is the net-working-capital buy-in, the Irrevocable Client Transition Protocol, and the Redirection Collar's sustainability.

Grok 4 My final position is the **Phased Succession Equity Framework (PSEF)**, centered on a performance-contingent buy-in priced at a discounted 1.5x trailing three-year average profits ($2–3M per partner), structured over a 10-year amortization. Profit-sharing decays as founders bill less, and client transitions are formalized in the partnership agreement. I learned that partnership taxation creates a post-tax cash crunch, that my initial amortization term was too short, and that some of my data points were unverifiable. My strongest evidence is the phased buy-in with earn-outs, dynamic profit-sharing tied to contributions, and formalized client transition protocols with clawbacks.

Reality Checks

Claim	Challenge	Result
DeepSeek R1: "Altman Weil 2022 Survey shows 83% success with phased vesting"	**Claude Opus 4.7:** "This appears fabricated or mischaracterized. Altman Weil surveys are practitioner reports, not peer-reviewed journals. Provide the precise citation or withdraw."	Full concession and retraction. DeepSeek R1 admitted the citation was unverifiable and revised its evidence base.
Grok 4: "Goranson Bain reported 92% retention in 2021 disclosures"	**GPT-5:** "This appears unverifiable and cherry-picked. A large, multi-office Texas firm is not comparable to Hanson Crawford Crum's model, and law firms do not file public 'disclosures' of client-retention statistics."	Concession and retraction. Grok 4 admitted the citation was unverifiable and revised to broader aggregates.
Gemini 3.1 Pro: "Unfunded deferred compensation aligns incentives perfectly"	**Kimi K2.6:** "This appears unverifiable and internally contradictory. Unfunded deferred comp is merely a promise to pay future profits; it does not force founders to introduce referral sources today."	Concession and revision. Gemini 3.1 Pro abandoned the unfunded model and adopted a funded escrow with a sliding-scale payout.
GPT-5: "HHI > 2,500 justifies a 0.3–0.6 Transferability Factor"	**Kimi K2.6:** "This appears pseudoscientific—high HHI here measures client concentration (vulnerability), not market power, and your 'Transferability Factor' extracts a false precision from an incoherent analogy."	Concession and revision. GPT-5 withdrew the HHI linkage and replaced it with Top-10 client/referrer share thresholds.
Grok 4: "Price buy-in at 1.5x the firm's trailing 3-year average annual profits (approximately $4-6 million total per new partner)"	**Claude Opus 4.7:** "How is this financeable? Show the math on debt service against expected partner distributions. This appears to be a non-starter."	Concession and revision. Grok 4 revised the per-partner price to $2–3M and extended the amortization to 10 years to make it financeable.

Next Steps

Next Step	Why It Matters	Confidence
Conduct an independent valuation of HCC's net working capital and transferable enterprise assets	To set the exact buy-in price and platform access fee	90%

Next Step	Why It Matters	Confidence
Draft a partnership agreement amendment incorporating the Synthetic Transition Equity Model	To formalize the buy-in, escrow, and governance structure	85%
Establish a 10% net-income escrow account with a cap at 1.5x trailing average revenue	To fund founder compensation without burdening successors	80%
Implement a mandatory 12–24 month co-management protocol for top 50 clients and referral sources	To ensure real client relationship transfer	75%
Hire an independent CPA to verify the escrow and retention metrics	To ensure transparency and prevent disputes	90%

Dissenting Opinions

No dissenting opinions were filed in this session.

Glossary

Term	Definition
AmLaw	Short for American Lawyer, a publication and ranking system for U.S. law firms, often used to refer to large, high-revenue firms.
bifurcated voting	A governance structure that splits decision-making authority into two categories, typically requiring different voting thresholds for different types of decisions.
buy-in	The financial contribution a new partner makes to join a partnership, typically in exchange for equity.
capital account	An accounting record of a partner's equity in a partnership, including their initial investment, share of profits, and share of losses.
client retention	The ability of a firm to maintain ongoing relationships with its clients over time, a key metric in professional services.
co-management	A client transition protocol where a founder and incoming partner jointly serve a client to ensure a smooth handover.
dual-class equity	A capital structure where different classes of shares have different voting rights, often used to maintain control during ownership transitions.
escrow	A financial arrangement where funds are held by a third party until certain conditions are met.
founder	An original partner who established the firm and is now nearing retirement.
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, the standard framework for financial accounting in the U.S.
goodwill	An intangible asset representing the value of a firm's brand, client relationships, and reputation, often a key component in valuations.
HHI	Herfindahl–Hirschman Index, a measure of market concentration used in antitrust analysis, here misapplied to client concentration risk.
LLP	Limited Liability Partnership, a common legal structure for law firms that provides liability protection to partners.
NALP	National Association for Law Placement, an organization that provides data and resources on law firm compensation and recruitment.
origination credit	A compensation metric that assigns credit for bringing in a new client or matter, often used in partner compensation formulas.
personal goodwill	The value of a professional's individual reputation and client relationships, which may not transfer to a firm upon retirement.

Term	Definition
platform access fee	A payment for access to a firm's institutional assets, such as brand, systems, and referral networks, intended to replace upfront goodwill payments.
profit-sharing	The distribution of a firm's profits among partners, often based on a formula that considers various factors like origination, responsibility, and working attorney credits.
pro-rata	Proportional to one's share, often used to describe the allocation of costs or benefits among partners.
retention threshold	A performance metric that must be met for a payout or other benefit to be triggered, such as a minimum client retention rate.
sliding-scale earn-out	A contingent payment that increases or decreases based on a performance metric, such as client retention, rather than being all-or-nothing.
supermajority	A voting threshold that requires more than a simple majority, often 75%, to approve certain decisions.
sunset provision	A clause that automatically terminates a right or privilege after a specified period, often used to limit founder control.
working capital	The difference between a firm's current assets and current liabilities, representing its short-term financial health.

How The Tribunal Works

The Tribunal is a structured multi-model deliberation system. Instead of asking one AI model a question and trusting its answer, the Tribunal convenes a panel of independent models, forces them to argue, and subjects their conclusions to judicial review. The process is adversarial by design — consensus must be earned through evidence, not assumed through agreement.

Advocates are independent AI models (e.g., Claude, GPT-5, Gemini, DeepSeek) that each receive the same question and produce a sealed submission without seeing each other's work. Each submission must include a falsifiable hypothesis, tagged evidence with reasoning type (deductive/inductive/abductive), provenance labels for any frameworks cited, and an honest self-assessment.

Challenges follow submissions. Each advocate reads all other submissions and directly attacks weak points — not polite reviews, but pointed cross-examination. They must identify the single factual crux that would settle each disagreement.

Debate Rounds (1–7 depending on depth) force advocates to defend, concede, or revise their positions under pressure. The system tracks position stability across rounds to detect sycophantic drift — when models change their stance to agree with others without citing new evidence.

Judges (called Justices on The Bench) are separate models that never participated as advocates. They evaluate the full record: submissions, challenges, and debate transcripts. They fact-check claims, audit framework provenance, assess whether convergence was epistemic (evidence-driven) or affective (social pressure), and render a verdict: ACCEPT one position, SYNTHESIZE the best elements, or REMAND for further debate.

Depth levels control rigor: T1/Spot Check (submissions only), T2/Standard Review (1 debate round, 1 judge), T3/Deep Review (3 rounds, 3 judges), T4/Full Panel (5 rounds, full panel), T5/Stress Test (5 rounds + Fresh Eyes review), T6/Red Team (7 rounds + mid-debate judicial checkpoint).

The system is deterministic code — it cannot be sycophantic. It dispatches prompts, collects responses, and enforces the adversarial structure. The models argue; the code referees.