

HERITAGE — EXECUTIVE BRIEFING

Métier Continuity Briefing

Which codes each tenure kept, and which it retired

DOCUMENT	PREPARED	OWNER	PAGES	STATUS
MCB-27-042	August 2027	Heritage	6	Illustrative sample

The read

Four codes have survived every tenure and two have been reintroduced after being retired. The reintroduced pair are the ones currently described in house copy as continuous, which is the claim least supported by the record.

4 Codes continuous across every tenure	2 Retired and reintroduced	3 Tenures in the period reviewed	2 Claims to correct in house copy
--	--	--	---

CONTINUOUS, AND EVIDENCED

- 01The shoulder line.
- 02The closure.
- 03The lining treatment.
- 04The hardware finish.

DISCONTINUOUS, DESCRIBED AS CONTINUOUS

- 01The collar construction.
- 02The signature stitch.



What the record holds, as it was recorded.

THE ARCHIVE · MCLEUKER HOUSE SET

SO WHAT

A code reintroduced after a gap is a revival, not a continuity. Both are legitimate house stories and only one of them is what we are currently claiming.

Tenure by tenure

CODES ACROSS THREE TENURES				
CODE	TENURE I	TENURE II	TENURE III	STATUS
Shoulder line	HELD	HELD	HELD	Continuous
Closure	HELD	HELD	HELD	Continuous
Lining treatment	HELD	HELD	HELD	Continuous
Hardware finish	HELD	HELD	HELD	Continuous
Collar construction	HELD	RETIRED	REVIVED	Revived
Signature stitch	HELD	RETIRED	REVIVED	Revived

Read from collections as shown at the time, not from later accounts of them. A code absent from every look in a tenure is recorded as retired rather than as unemphasised.



What is claimed, in front of an audience.

THE SHOW · MCLEUKER HOUSE SET

SO WHAT

Two codes have a gap in the middle and both are currently described as unbroken. The gap is visible to anyone with the collections, which is what makes the claim a liability rather than a flourish.



Forty minutes, and eighteen months of consequence. What a house shows is read against everything it has shown before.

MCLEUKER HOUSE SET

The position

REVIVAL IS THE BETTER STORY

Continuity claim	Unbroken since founding — contradicted by one tenure
Revival claim	Retired, then deliberately restored — supported by the record
Which is stronger	Revival: it is evidenced, and it credits a decision rather than an accident
Where it appears	Product copy, press kit, boutique training
Owner	Heritage, with Communications

SEQUENCE

NOW	Correct the two claims in house copy Before a journalist does it in a feature.
+ 1 MO	Retrain boutique on the revival story It is a better story and it is true.
ONGOING	Record codes per collection at the time So the next tenure does not re-derive this.

SO WHAT	Revival is both the accurate story and the better one — it credits a deliberate restoration instead of asserting an accident that did not happen.
---------	---

Decisions

DECISIONS ARISING FROM THIS BRIEFING

DECISION	OWNER	BY	IF IT IS NOT TAKEN
Correct the two continuity claims in house copy	Heritage Director	31 Aug	A journalist corrects them instead
Retrain boutique on the revival story	Communications Lead	30 Sep	Two versions circulate in stores
Record codes per collection going forward	Archivist	30 Sep	The next tenure re-derives all of this
Agree who owns code claims between Heritage and Communications	Chief Executive	30 Sep	Claims are made where they are convenient

SOURCES AND BASIS

Collections as shown — look records at the time of each collection.
Contemporary press — show reports as published, per tenure.
House copy — the current product and press text as published.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE

This document is a rendered SAMPLE of the Métier Continuity Briefing template, produced to show its structure, exhibit inventory and register. The figures in it are illustrative and are not market intelligence. A real run of this template researches and cites its figures with an as-of year for each, or marks them as modelled and states the basis — the rule the template itself carries.