

# **Waft Open Issues & Concerns**

Date: 2026-01-10

Status: Active Development

(v0.3.1-alpha)

## **Table of Contents**

1. Critical Issues
2. High Priority Issues
3. Medium Priority Issues
4. Low Priority Issues
5. Known Limitations
6. Technical Debt
7. Future Considerations

## **Critical Issues**

**None (Post Phase 1 Refactoring) [x]**

All critical error handling issues have

been resolved in Phase 1.

## **High Priority Issues**

### **1. God Objects in Core Modules**

Severity: High

Impact: Maintainability, Testability

Files:

- src/waft/main.py (2020 lines, 54

commands)

- src/waft/core/visualizer.py (2344

lines, 10+ responsibilities)

- src/waft/core/agent/base.py (924

lines, multiple concerns)

Problem:

These files violate Single

Responsibility Principle:

main.py:

- Mixes CLI parsing, business logic,

display, gamification, epistemic

tracking

- 54 separate command functions in

one file

- Difficult to test individual commands

- Changes to one command risk

affecting others

visualizer.py:

- Git status collection
- System info collection
- Work effort tracking
- HTML generation (500+ lines of  
embedded strings)
- Analytics aggregation
- Multiple rendering methods

agent/base.py:

- OODA cycle logic
- Inventory management
- Reproduction mechanics
- Genome tracking
- Decision engine integration
- Empirica integration



Recommended Fix: See

REFACTORING\_PLAN.md Phase 2

Estimated Effort: 2-3 weeks

## **2. Foundation Module Duplication**

Severity: High

Impact: Maintenance, Confusion

Files:

- src/waft/foundation.py (1088 lines) -

PRODUCTION

- src/waft/foundation\_v2.py (1059

lines) - EXPERIMENTAL

Problem:

Nearly identical files with minor

enhancements in v2:

- Both actively imported

- Bug fixes to one don't propagate to

the other

- Unclear which should be used

- Will diverge over time

### Current Usage:

# foundation.py used by:

- src/waft/verify\_foundation.py
- src/waft/generate\_artifacts.py

# foundation\_v2.py used by:

- scripts/generate\_foundation\_demo.py (demo only)

### Recommended Fix:

1. Decide canonical version (likely v2

with enhancements)

2. Migrate all code to canonical

version

3. Deprecate and remove duplicate

4. Document migration path

See:

docs/FOUNDATION\_STATUS.md for

detailed analysis

Estimated Effort: 1-2 days

### **3. Circular Dependency Risk**

Severity: High

Impact: Architecture, Modularity

Problem:

42+ files use parent directory imports

(from ..):

- main.py imports from core.
- core. imports from api.
- api. imports from core.\*

Potential Circular Chain:

```
cli/ -> core/ -> api/ -> core/ (CIRCULAR)
```

Recommended Fix:

1. Map all imports to detect cycles
2. Use dependency injection to break

cycles

3. Create clear layering:

cli/ -> core/ -> models/

api/ -> core/ -> models/

(Never: core -> cli or core -> api)

Estimated Effort: 2-3 days

## **4. Incomplete Karma System**

Severity: High

Impact: Feature Completeness

File: src/waft/karma.py (239 lines)

Problem:

5 unimplemented methods with

TODO comments:

```
def calculate_karma(self, life_log: Dict) -> float:
```

```
    # TODO: Implement Karma calculation
```

```
    pass
```

```
def access_akasha(self, soul_id: str) -> Dict:
```

```
    # TODO: Implement Akasha access
```

```
    pass
```

```
# Similar TODOs at lines 151, 181, 204, 219
```



Impact:

Karma/reincarnation system is  
essentially a stub - non-functional  
feature exposed in API.

Options:

1. Complete implementation (3-4  
days)
2. Remove and document as "future  
feature"
3. Keep as experimental/stub with  
clear warnings

Recommended: Option 2 (remove or  
hide until ready)

Estimated Effort: 0.5 days (removal)

OR 3-4 days (completion)

## **5. Missing Abstraction Layers**

Severity: High

Impact: Testability, Flexibility

Problem:

8+ manager classes without shared

interface:

MemoryManager

SubstrateManager

EmpiricaManager

GamificationManager

GitHubManager

TavernKeeper

Narrator

DecisionMatrixCalculator

Issues:

- Can't mock in tests
- API contract unclear
- Can't swap implementations
- Hard to understand hierarchy

Recommended Fix:

Create Manager ABC:

```
from abc import ABC, abstractmethod
```

```
class Manager(ABC):
```

```
    @abstractmethod
```

```
    def initialize(self) -> bool:
```

```
        pass
```

```
    @abstractmethod
```

```
    def validate(self) -> tuple[bool, Optional[str]]:
```

```
        pass
```

Estimated Effort: 2 days

## **Medium Priority Issues**

### **6. Embedded HTML in Visualizer**

Severity: Medium

Impact: Maintainability, Separation of

Concerns

File: src/waft/core/visualizer.py

Problem:

500+ lines of HTML/CSS/JS

embedded as Python strings:

```
html = f"""

<!DOCTYPE html>

<html>

<head>

    <style>

        /* 200 lines of CSS */

    </style>

</head>

<body>

    <!-- 300 lines of HTML -->

    <script>
```

Issues:

- No syntax highlighting
- Hard to edit
- No template reuse
- Violates separation of concerns

Recommended Fix:

Extract to Jinja2 templates:



templates/

dashboard.html.j2

components/

metrics.html.j2

status.html.j2

Estimated Effort: 1-2 days

## **7. Template Organization**

Severity: Medium

Impact: Code Organization

File: src/waft/templates/init.py (434

lines)

Problem:

Templates embedded in init.py:

- Justfile template (60 lines)
- GitHub CI template (50 lines)
- agents.py template (70 lines)

Issues:

- Can't edit templates without editing

Python

- No syntax highlighting for

embedded languages

- Makes init.py unwieldy

Recommended Fix:

Move to separate files:

templates/

\_\_init\_\_.py (20 lines - just TemplateWriter)

project/

Justfile.j2

pyproject.toml.j2

github/

ci.yml.j2

code/

agents.py.j2

Estimated Effort: 1 day

## **8. Inconsistent Directory Structure**

Severity: Medium

Impact: Code Navigation

Problem:

30+ top-level files in core/ directory:

core/

memory.py

substrate.py

empirica.py

gamification.py

goal.py

reflect.py

proceed.py

resume.py

continue\_work.py

decision\_matrix.py

workflow.py

... (20+ more files)

Issue: Related functionality scattered,  
unclear organization

Recommended Fix:

Group by domain:

core/

game/ # Gamification

gamification.py

goal.py

achievements.py

decision/ # Decision systems

decision\_matrix.py

workflow.py

proceed.py

Estimated Effort: 2 days

## **9. Generic Exception Handlers Remaining**

Severity: Medium

Impact: Error Visibility

Problem:

32+ instances of except Exception:

(too broad):



```
except Exception: # Catches too much

    return {}
```

Note: While less severe than bare

except:, still hides specific errors.

Recommended Fix:

Replace with specific exception

types:

```
except (json.JSONDecodeError, FileNotFoundError) as e:

    logger.error(f"Failed to load config: {e}")

    raise ConfigurationError(...) from e
```

Estimated Effort: 2 days

## **10. Magic Numbers/Strings Scattered**

Severity: Medium

Impact: Maintainability

Problem:

Despite centralization effort, some

remain:

- Hardcoded font sizes in

foundation\_v2.py (6 values)

- Color strings in various files

- Hardcoded thresholds in

gamification.py

Recommended Fix:

Complete config centralization:

```
# config/gamification.py
```

```
INTEGRITY_DEFAULT = 100.0
```

```
INSIGHT_PER_LEVEL = 100.0
```

```
XP_BASE = 50.0
```

```
# config/typography.py
```

```
FONT_SIZE_TITLE = 24
```

```
FONT_SIZE_SUBTITLE = 18
```

Estimated Effort: 0.5 days

## **Low Priority Issues**

### **11. Inconsistent Naming Conventions**

Severity: Low

Impact: Code Clarity

Examples:

- `processtavernhook()` vs

`processcommandhook()`

- `continework.py` (workaround for

Python keyword)

- Mixed camelCase/snakecase in

some places

Recommended Fix:

Establish and document naming

standards, refactor gradually.

Estimated Effort: 1 day

## **12. Performance Optimization Opportunities**

Severity: Low

Impact: User Experience

Areas:

- Git operations in visualizer (multiple subprocess calls)
- No caching in expensive API endpoints
- generate\_html() could be optimized



Recommended Fix:

- Add response caching
- Batch git operations
- Profile and optimize hot paths

Estimated Effort: 1-2 days

## **13. Test Coverage Gaps**

Severity: Low (but important for  
production)

Impact: Reliability

Problem:

Limited automated test coverage:

- No unit tests for most managers
- Integration tests missing
- No CI/CD test automation

Recommended Fix:

Create test structure:

```
tests/
```

```
    unit/
```

```
        core/
```

```
            test_memory.py
```

```
            test_substrate.py
```

```
        cli/
```

```
            commands/
```

```
                test_project.py
```

```
    integration/
```

```
        test_project_creation.py
```

Estimated Effort: 3-5 days

## **Known Limitations**

### **Platform Support**

Windows:

- [!] Partial support
- Some terminal features don't work

(TTY operations)

- Dashboard may have rendering

issues

Recommendation: Document clearly,

test on Windows, fix critical issues

## **Scale Limits**

Not tested beyond:

- ~1000 agents
- ~100MB JSONL logs
- ~500 dashboard events

Potential Issues:

- Dashboard performance

degradation

- Memory usage with large datasets

- JSONL append performance

Recommendation: Add benchmarks,

document limits

## **Feature Completeness**

Incomplete Features:

1. Evolution cycle automation

(partially implemented)

2. Scint Gym (some error types

under-tested)

3. Karma system (unimplemented)

4. Multi-agent coordination (planned)

5. Distributed evaluation (planned)

Recommendation: Clearly mark

experimental features, set user

expectations

## **Technical Debt Summary**

### **By Severity**



Severity	Count	Top Priority
Critical	0	N/A (all fixed!)
High	5	Split god objects
Medium	5	Extract templates
Low	3	Naming consistency

## By Category

Category	Issues	Effort (days)
----------	--------	---------------

Architecture	5	10-15
--------------	---	-------

Code Organization	3	4-5
-------------------	---	-----

Error Handling	1	2
----------------	---	---

Testing	1	3-5
---------	---	-----

Documentation	0	0 (complete!)
---------------	---	---------------

Performance	1	1-2
-------------	---	-----

Total Estimated Effort: 20-29 days

(4-6 weeks)

## **Future Considerations**

### **1. Plugin System**

Status: Not implemented

Priority: Low

Effort: 1-2 weeks

Allow third-party extensions:

- Custom agents
- Custom fitness functions
- Custom narrative grammars

## **2. Distributed Evaluation**

Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Effort: 2-3 weeks

Enable multi-machine fitness testing:

- Worker pool for parallel evaluation
- Result aggregation
- Fault tolerance

### **3. Advanced Analytics**

Status: Basic implementation

Priority: Medium

Effort: 1-2 weeks

Enhanced dashboard:

- Real-time charts
- Phylogenetic visualization
- Fitness landscape maps
- Convergence analysis

## **4. API Versioning**

Status: Not implemented

Priority: Low

Effort: 1 week

Proper API versioning:

- /v1/, /v2/ endpoints
- Deprecation warnings
- Migration guides

## 5. Multi-Language Support

Status: Python only

Priority: Low

Effort: Unknown

Agents in other languages:

- JavaScript/TypeScript agents
- Rust agents
- Language-agnostic protocol



## **Prioritization Matrix**

### **Phase 2 Recommendations (Next 2-3 weeks)**

Must Do:

1. Split main.py god object (High, 3-4

days)

2. Refactor visualizer.py (High, 2-3

days)

3. Resolve foundation.py duplication

(High, 1-2 days)

4. Create Manager interface (High, 2

days)

Should Do:

5. Extract HTML templates (Medium,

1-2 days)

6. Reorganize core/ directory

(Medium, 2 days)

Could Do:

7. Fix remaining generic exceptions

(Medium, 2 days)

8. Add unit tests (Low, 3-5 days)

## **Phase 3 Recommendations (Weeks 4-6)**

Must Do:

1. Complete or remove Karma

system

2. Detect/fix circular dependencies

3. Extract template files

Should Do:

4. Performance optimization

5. Expanded test coverage

6. Complete documentation

## **Issue Tracking**

Use GitHub Issues for:

- Bug reports
- Feature requests
- Architecture discussions

Labels:

- critical - Security, data loss, broken

core functionality

- high - Maintainability, testability,

architecture

- medium - Code quality, organization

- low - Polish, documentation, minor

improvements

- technical-debt - Refactoring needed

- help-wanted - Good for contributors

## Conclusion

Post Phase 1 refactoring, Waft's  
codebase is significantly improved  
but still has work remaining:

[x] Strengths:

- No critical error handling issues
- Comprehensive logging
- Centralized configuration
- Excellent documentation
- Clear roadmap

[!] Areas for Improvement:

- God objects need decomposition
- Some code duplication remains
- Test coverage could be better
- Some features incomplete

Overall Assessment: Waft is in good

shape for continued development.

Phase 1 stabilization sets a strong

foundation for Phase 2-4

improvements.

Last Updated: 2026-01-10

Next Review: After Phase 2

completion

Maintained by: Waft Team