Domain Mandala Construction and Repair Companion

Use this workbook to build one inspectable explanation of a subject, challenge an important inference, and preserve the repair. It accompanies How to Build a Domain Mandala by Lynn Walker. A small model that answers its declared question is enough for a first construction.

Start with the input worksheet and the six-part construction record. The library example shows what those records can contain. Then attempt the new practice case before opening its review guide, and finally repeat the process on a subject of your own.

What you will keep

Keep a first version, its source records, a prediction made before a check, the check result, and a revised version when one is needed. Add one output from a task you actually performed. Preserve uncertainty when the evidence cannot support a stronger answer.

Keep the findings separate

Finding	What can support it
Method fidelity and conformance	Inspect the governing center, structure, relationships, rendering and source context. State which requirements you checked. A workshop self-check does not establish formal conformance certification.
Subject adequacy	Compare the model with the evidence and criteria for its declared question. A complete-looking structure can still omit a condition that changes the answer.
Demonstrated usefulness	Keep the output of a task actually performed, with its conditions and limits. A proposed use has not yet supplied this evidence.
Learner evidence	Record what you did, the help and resources used, and what you could explain. A copied repair or correct artifact does not establish later unaided capability.

Use a form that serves the question

A diagram is optional. Prose, a relationship list or a table can carry the working structure if its meanings are recoverable. Do not omit the center, scope, evidence and status merely because a decision table is convenient.

Companion v1.0. Based on the book, Chapters 2 to 9 and Appendix A. This companion adds a new fictional practice case. It supplies no real-world operating permission.

Input worksheet

Choose one question whose answer you can inspect. Fill this page before choosing a diagram or asking AI to generate the model. Write unknown when a necessary fact or decision is missing.

Subject and version

What subject, particular objects and version are you modeling?

Audience

Who needs the answer and what background can you assume?

Purpose

What concrete task should this model help that person perform?

Context

Which time, place, source version or other condition does the answer concern?

Questions and adequate answers

Write up to three questions. For each, name the detail an adequate answer must retain.

Boundary

What is excluded, and why can it be excluded without dropping a requirement of this task?

Starting evidence

Which records or passages have you inspected? What missing evidence or choice prevents a reliable start?

Book method: Chapter 2 and Appendix A1. Purpose and audience are separate commitments. Recording a date today does not make an older observation current.

Compact construction record

Copy this page for each build. Use extra notes where needed. These six prompts adapt Appendix A; the completed example on page 6 shows one possible record.

A1 Boundary and questions

Give the job, audience, context, version, questions, adequate-answer criteria and exclusions. Refer to your input worksheet.

A2 Sources and claim status

Retain exact source records or copies with their IDs and versions. For each consequential claim, give its kind, inspected source and locator, reasoning, contrary material and uncertainty.

A3 Center and structure

Compare two governing propositions, or explain why another is unnecessary. Choose one; name the local objects, divisions and typed relationships it requires.

A4 Views and rendering

Name the question each view answers, what it omits, and what it must preserve. If changing grain, give a valid bridge and a forbidden inference. Identify the source version.

A5 Tests and repairs

Derive the expected result from source records or domain criteria before comparing it with the model prediction. Preserve premises, both results and the comparison. If needed, compare repairs, change the least necessary, and recheck an affected and a preserved case.

A6 Performed use and stopping point

Keep one actual output and separate findings for method, subject and use. Record help, review status, limits, maintenance trigger and where this pass stops.

Keep observations, rules, inferences, interpretations, proposals and unknowns distinguishable. A citation must support the particular claim beside it. An exact copied excerpt alone does not establish that support.

Worked construction for a library

This example condenses the book's fictional community-library case. Its records concern 10:00 on September 15, 2026. The job is to explain whether a named member may borrow a named physical copy, with the decisive reason or missing evidence. It does not authorize an actual checkout.

Inspect the source records

Copy and title	Recorded state
C101 and C102 Garden Notes T1	C101 is out, serviceable and lending, with active loan LN1 to Ava. C102 is on the shelf, serviceable and lending, without an active loan.
C201 Local Birds T2	On the shelf, damaged and lending, without an active loan.
C301 Community Atlas T3	On the shelf, serviceable and reference-only, without an active loan.
C401 Story Sketches T4	On the shelf, serviceable and lending, without an active loan. Ben's earlier loan LN0 is closed.

Ava, Ben and Dia are active; Cara is suspended. Active-loan counts are Ava 1 and Ben, Dia and Cara 0. Hold H1 concerns title T1, names Ben first claimant and expires at 18:00. No other active loans or holds exist in this snapshot. The expiry gives no fresh state for a later request. These are stipulated case facts, not general library practice.

Choose a governing proposition

A shelf-centered model shows where copies are but cannot explain every borrowing result. Use a center that connects each physical copy's identity and state with rule-governed borrowing permission. Organize the model into resource identity, current state, permission constraints and inspectable evidence.

State the relationships: a copy is a copy of a title; a loan records one copy and member; a hold concerns a title and names its first claimant; policy constrains a borrowing request; a source card supports a particular fact. An evidence relationship does not establish causation.

Make all required conditions operative

At the snapshot, a yes requires shelf location, no active copy loan, serviceable condition, lending mode, active requester, fewer than two active requester loans, and, if a title hold is active, that the requester is its first claimant. Without an active hold, that last condition passes. A known failed condition gives no. With no known failure but required evidence missing, answer unknown and name the gap.

Source: book Appendix B, L-F1 to L-F8 and L-R1 to L-R9; Chapters 4 and 5. Fines and opposing proposals about them remain outside the borrowing model.

Challenge and repair the library model

The book's LIB-V1 separates copies and loans but uses only four conditions: shelf location, no active copy loan, active membership and fewer than two active requester loans. Its positive result is tentative because serviceability, lending mode and the hold claimant are absent. It is not a justified permission under the full policy.

Compare predictions with the full policy

Request at 10:00	LIB-V1	Full-policy result and basis
Dia requests C401	Tentative yes	Yes. All conditions pass; closed LN0 is not active.
Ben requests C102	Tentative yes	Yes. Ben is also H1's first claimant.
Dia requests C102	Tentative yes	No. H1 names Ben, not Dia.
Dia requests C201	Tentative yes	No. C201 is damaged.
Dia requests C301	Tentative yes	No. C301 is reference-only.

The first two agreements do not show that the omitted conditions are unnecessary. The next three make those omissions consequential. Expected answers come from the complete policy and records, rather than from LIB-V1's own prediction.

Compare the repairs

Adding a warning beside the diagram leaves the same defective inference. Rebuilding the whole subject would add work without addressing the immediate gap. The book's LIB-V2 makes serviceability, lending mode and the title-hold claimant operative while preserving the four existing checks. A displayed field is insufficient if the decision can ignore it.

Retest what changed and what should remain

LIB-V2 gives no for Dia with C102, C201 and C301 for the reasons above. It preserves yes for Dia with C401 and Ben with C102. Also check that suspended Cara with C401 remains no. Record these as worked case comparisons. Cases used to guide the repair now serve as regressions, not fresh evidence.

Two separate challenge overlays probe the repair. If Ben already has two active loans, C102 becomes no despite his hold. If C401's condition evidence is removed, Dia with C401 becomes unknown, but Cara with C401 remains no because her suspension is known. Keep overlays separate from the original snapshot.

Source: Chapters 7 and 8. The checks are authored teaching cases. Agreement does not establish real-library validity, a reader's learning, or exhaustive coverage.

Completed compact construction record

The following is a condensed record of the book's worked LIB-V2 construction. It is an example to inspect, not a record of work performed by you.

A1 Boundary and questions

Explain a named member's borrowing request at the fictional 10:00 snapshot. An adequate answer names copy, member, time and the basis for yes, no or unknown. Exclude fines, renewals, future availability and actual checkout. The performed teaching use is explaining Dia's request for C102.

A2 Sources and claim status

Appendix B supplies stipulated facts L-F1 to L-F8 and rules L-R1 to L-R9. Loan counts are derived from the ledger. L-D1 preserves competing, unapproved fines proposals. No later-state evidence supports an 18:01 availability claim. Source facts and model inferences remain distinguishable.

A3 Center and structure

Choose a center relating copy identity, current state and rule-governed permission. Use the four divisions on page 4 and typed copy, title, loan, member and hold relationships. The shelf-only alternative cannot explain the required policy distinctions.

A4 Views and rendering

The borrower view explains one request. The steward view shows its records and rules. Both retain the same identities and snapshot. A title-level yes means at least one complete eligible copy exists for that member and time; it does not make every copy eligible. A title-level no requires accounting for every candidate copy; preserve unknown if unresolved candidates could change it. Never combine favorable conditions from different copies. This companion renders selected LIB-V2 material; Appendix B retains the complete case.

A5 Tests and repairs

Keep LIB-V1 and its tentative predictions. Add the three missing policy conditions to obtain LIB-V2, then retain the changed and preserved checks on page 5. The book reports a broader set of sixteen specified checks; this companion does not turn that reported set into a new reader trial.

A6 Performed use and stopping point

The explanation follows C102 to T1, H1 and first claimant Ben. Dia is not Ben, so her request gives no. Method fidelity: the center, structure, rendering and evidence route are inspectable; formal conformance remains unestablished. Subject adequacy: the selected results agree with the fictional policy. Demonstrated usefulness: the worked explanation identifies this blocker. Learner capability remains untested here.

Stop this construction pass for that teaching use. Reopen affected checks when the question, rules, records, time or consequential relationships change. Keep the help used in any reader attempt; a delayed return remains pending until it happens.

Source: Appendix A, completed LIB-V2 example, with selected Chapter 7 and 8 checks. New practice begins on the next page.

Independent construction practice

If measuring time, start now before reading the case records. Include reading and tool use; record elapsed time at each saved version. Write unknown for unmeasured intervals.

New fictional practice case authored for this companion. The records below stipulate the exercise; they are not historical claims. Try this page without the library answer or the review guide. You may use the input worksheet and compact record. Log any other help.

Explain one exhibition object

A community exhibition needs an orientation label for visitors unfamiliar with its objects. Prepare a 35 to 50 word label for object M17. The label must identify the object and distinguish supported description, tentative dating and unverified use. It must not present a guess as established history. Count words separated by spaces; an object ID such as M17 and each numeral count as one word.

Record	Supplied material
E1 Inventory	M17 is a brass cup. The record identifies its object number but supplies no manufacture date.
E2 Catalogue entry 1998	The entry currently associated with M17 tentatively dates the cup to the late nineteenth century. No maker is identified.
E3 Conservation record 2021	The blue band on M17 was added during a repair in 1930.
E4 Donor email 2026	The donor believes M17 had ritual use but provides no supporting source. The statement is an attributed belief, not established function.

Build before checking

1. Declare your purpose, audience, source context and exclusions. Write the questions the label must answer.
2. Compare two possible centers. Choose one that can govern the source distinctions, rather than merely naming the cup.
3. Show relationships among M17, its physical features, the source records and their claims. Separate manufacture date, repair date and suggested function.
4. Create a visitor view and a source-review view. Preserve the link between each consequential statement and its actual supporting record.
5. Write your first label. Test one ordinary statement and one difficult statement, such as whether the blue decoration is original. Set the expected answer from the records.
6. Save version 1 and its label before reading the next page. Record which steps you completed and what remains open.

First attempt record

Version, exercise elapsed time or unknown, source copies, assistance used and work saved at

---

This authored case applies the book's method to source-bound explanation. The library borrowing rules do not govern exhibition labels.

Repair practice after a source correction

Read this page only after saving your first exhibition model and label. Keep that original. If your version already represents source uncertainty well, show how it handles this correction without inventing a fault.

New record E5

The catalogue custodian corrects the association: E2 belongs to object M71, not M17. No manufacture date for M17 is currently recorded. E1, E3 and E4 remain unchanged. This correction changes the exercise evidence; it does not erase your earlier attempt.

Predict before editing

Previous model prediction

What would version 1 say about M17's manufacture date if left unchanged?

Expected answer and basis

What does the corrected evidence support? Which claim and source link change?

Repair options

Compare a wording-only patch with repairing the source-to-object relationship. If another repair is smaller and adequate, explain it.

Repair actually made

Give version 2, the changed relationship or inference, and what valid information it preserves.

Affected and preserved checks

Recheck the date claim and the statement about the blue band. Give expected result, model result and basis for each.

Use the repair

Write a revised 35 to 50 word visitor label and a short source-review note explaining what changed.

Finish with separate method, subject and use findings. Record the support used. An identified date gap may be the correct completed answer; completing the form does not establish that you learned the method.

Book method: Chapter 8 and Appendix A5. This is a new authored challenge. Once you inspect its review guide, treat a later repetition as supported or familiar work.

Practice review guide

Open this guide after the repair attempt. Use it to compare meanings and evidence, not to require identical wording. Several centers and forms can be adequate.

One possible construction

A workable center is: explain what each record supports about this particular object while preserving the difference between description, dating and attributed belief. The structure can separate object identity and features, dated events, claim status and sources. The visitor label compresses that model; the review view restores its source links.

Before E5, E2 supports only a tentative manufacture date for M17. E3 concerns a repair date and contradicts calling the blue band original. E4 supports a report of belief, not a finding of ritual function. After E5, remove E2 as support for any M17 date. Repair the association, not just the label's wording.

A possible repaired label

Brass cup M17. Its manufacture date is not recorded. Conservation records identify the blue band as an addition made during a 1930 repair. Ritual use has been suggested by its donor, but that use remains unverified. No maker is identified in the supplied records.

This 44 word example preserves the case's evidence limits. A source-review note would link identity to E1, the date gap to E5, repair history to E3 and the belief to E4. E5 does not invalidate E3's repair date.

Review your attempt

Check	Evidence to retain
Boundary and center	The stated job serves visitors; the center explains why the selected divisions and relationships belong.
Source support	Each consequential assertion has a relevant inspected record. Tentative date, repair date and belief remain distinct.
Views and grain	The visitor view preserves qualifications. The review view restores record links. Changing detail does not change object identity.
Challenge and repair	The original prediction survives in the record. E2 is no longer linked as date support for M17.
Retesting and use	The date claim is corrected and the blue-band claim preserved. A revised label is actually present.
Findings and support	Method, subject and use findings have separate bases and limits. Help used and unperformed checks remain explicit.

Mark each check evidenced, needs repair or not yet checked. Give a locator in your own record rather than a score. This is a practical review rubric, not a validated learning test or a pass to certify other models.

The practice facts, correction and sample label are new instructional material. Method responsibilities derive from the book; success on this case supplies no general transfer claim.

Use the method on your own subject

Choose a new, bounded question from a subject you can investigate directly. A local history explanation, a short-song design decision or a learning topic can work. Pick a source you can inspect, rather than filling an evidence gap with an AI suggestion.

1. Make the first model and one output using pages 2 and 3. Preserve a claim whose status matters and a relationship whose meaning another reader can recover.
2. Ask a question the model was not built merely to repeat. Derive its expected answer from relevant evidence or domain criteria. If the answer is unresolved, name what would settle it.
3. If a failure appears, change its actual cause. Retest that case and a case that should remain valid. Keep the original and revised reasoning.
4. Write separate findings for method fidelity, subject adequacy and demonstrated usefulness. Record formal conformance status separately where a particular class is claimed.

What I actually performed

Identify the saved model, output, checks and help used. What can another reader inspect?

_____

_____

What remains open

Name evidence gaps, review needed and the event that would make you reopen the model.

_____

_____

Optional delayed return

At a later session, record the actual interval, exposure between attempts and resources allowed and used. Save your initial reconstruction before reopening the previous work. Compare, correct and record any retry. Until that session occurs, label it planned. One immediate exercise does not establish retention.

Sources for this companion

Lynn Walker, How to Build a Domain Mandala, first edition. WinMedia. The input and record adapt Chapter 2 and Appendix A. The library construction and repair condense Chapters 4 to 8 and Appendix B. Chapter 7 separates evaluation questions; Chapters 11 and 12 support independent work, maintenance and a later return.

The fictional exhibition case and review rubric were created for this companion.