Interview RAG + ATXP Integration Friction Log

Date: [Today's Date]

Your Name: [Your Name]

Total Time Spent: [X hours Y minutes]

Executive Summary

What I Built:

- Python MCP server that wraps existing FastAPI RAG backend
- Node.js ATXP agent with payment handling for 3 tools:
 - (search_rag) (\$0.01 per search)
 - (ask_rag) (\$0.05 per question + Gemini)
 - (upload_file) (tiered pricing \$0.00-\$2.00 based on file size)
- Successfully integrated cross-platform Python + Node.js services

What Worked Well:

• [List 3-5 things that were smooth]

Main Pain Points:

• [List 2-3 friction points]

Suggestions for ATXP:

• [List 1-3 specific improvements]

Detailed Breakdown

Setup Experience

Time Breakdown

Step	Time	Notes			
MCP Server setup	min	[easy/moderate/hard]			
ATXP Agent setup	min	[easy/moderate/hard]			
Testing locally (3 terminals)	min	[smooth/confusing/tedious]			
Debugging/troubleshooting	min	[how long did issues take]			
Total	min				
	!				
What Was Clear?					
☐ Documentation was well-organized					
Examples were easy to follow					
☐ Installation went smoothly					
☐ Error messages were helpful					
Other:					
What Was Confusing?					
■ Missing explanation of MCP protocol basics					
☐ Unclear how to connect existing backends					
Confusing error when payment validation fai	iled				
☐ Hard to debug stdio communication issues					
☐ Pricing calculation not explained					
Other:					
Integration Experience					
MCP Server (Python)					
What I Liked:					
1.					
2.					
۵.					

What Was Painful:

- 1. "I spent [X minutes] trying to [specific task]"
- 2. "There was no example for [specific use case]" $\,$
- 3. "The error message said [error], but I needed [clarification]"

ATXP Agent (Node.js)					
What I Liked:					
1.					
2.					
What Was Painful:					
1.					
2.					
Cross-Platform Communication					
Smooth Aspects:					
HTTP between Python & Node works well					
Stdio communication mostly straightforward					
• [Other positive]					
Friction Points:					
• Had to run 3 separate terminals (no unified CLI)					
Debugging payment failures required checking multiple logs					
• [Other pain point]					
Monetization Feature (File Uploads)					
Experience with Tiered Pricing					
What Worked:					
Pricing tiers are clear and easy to understand					
Cost calculation seemed accurate					

What Didn't Work:

• No preview of cost before payment

• Charged correctly for different file sizes

• Can't set file size limits
• No refund mechanism if upload fails mid-processing
Users don't know pricing upfront
Suggestions for Pricing UX
1. "Add estimated cost preview before payment authorizes"
2. "Show pricing tiers in (/pricing/) endpoint"
3. "Allow users to set max file size to prevent accidental charges"
Payment Flow
Search Tool (\$0.01)
Status: Worked / X Failed
Experience:
• Time to first successful call: seconds
• Payment validation felt: [instant/slow/confusing]
• Feedback:
Ask Tool (\$0.05)
Status: Worked / X Failed
Experience:
• Time to first successful call: seconds
• Payments processed: [] 1st try [] after retries [] never
• Feedback:
Upload Tool (Dynamic)
Status: Worked / X Failed

Test Cases:

V / X
- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
☑ / ×
☑ / ×
☑ / ×
_

Feedback:

Specific Friction Points (Rate & Explain)

1. Documentation Quality

Rating: 1 (Poor) - 5 (Excellent)

Specific Issue: "The MCP quickstart assumes knowledge of [concept], but it's not explained. A beginner would need [X documentation]."

What Would Fix It:

- Better explanation of MCP protocol
- More examples of wrapping existing services
- Glossary of terms (stdio, MCP, LLM context)

2. Setup Complexity

Rating: 1 (Too Complex) - 5 (Very Simple)

Specific Issue: "Having to configure 3 separate services in 3 terminals is [confusing/tedious]. A [Docker Compose / CLI tool / unified config] would help."

What Would Fix It:

- Provide Docker Compose file for local dev
- Build a CLI tool to start all services at once
- Unified configuration file instead of scattered .env files

3. Error Messages

Rating: 1 (Unhelpful) — 5 (Crystal Clear)

Specific Issue: "When payment validation failed, I got error code [XXX]. I didn't know if it was a network issue, insufficient funds, or something else."

What Would Fix It:

- More descriptive error messages
- Links to troubleshooting docs
- Examples of how to debug each error type

4. Payment Validation

Rating: 1 (Unclear) - 5 (Very Clear)

Specific Issue: "I couldn't tell if payment was deducted immediately or if it was pending. There was no receipt or confirmation."

What Would Fix It:

- Show payment confirmation with amount, timestamp, and receipt ID
- Add (/transactions/) endpoint to check history
- Implement idempotency so accidental double-clicks don't double-charge

5. Cross-Platform Support

Rating: 1 (Python & Node separated) -5 (Seamless integration)

Specific Issue: "I had to write Python for MCP server and TypeScript for ATXP agent. Ideally, I'd have [one language / better interop]."

What Would Fix It:

- Provide Python SDK for ATXP client
- Provide TypeScript SDK for MCP server
- Better documentation on cross-platform integration patterns

What Worked Really Well

what worked Really well
Highlight 1: [Specific Feature]
"I was pleasantly surprised by [feature]. It just worked. For example, [specific scenario]."
Highlight 2: [Specific Feature]
"The [feature] was thoughtfully designed. I liked how [detail]."
Highlight 3: [Specific Feature]
"[Aspect] was faster/easier than I expected because [reason]."
Suggestions for ATXP (Prioritized)
Priority 1 (Critical):
Why: This blocks real-world usage because
Effort: [Low / Medium / High]
Impact: This would make ATXP [10x better for / solve the blocker for]
Suggested Implementation:
Priority 2 (High):
Why: This would improve DX because
Effort: [Low / Medium / High]

Priority 3 (Nice-to-Have): _____

Why: This would be convenient because _____

Effort: [Low / Medium / High]

Suggested Implementation:

Impact: This would make _____

Suggested Implementation:

Code Quality & Performance

Agent & MCP Server Code						
Lines of Code: ~300 total						
Complexity: [Simple / Moderate / Complex] Performance: [Fast / Acceptable / Slow]						
Observations:						
Payment Calculation Logic						
Correct: Ves / X No						
Edge Cases Tested:						
Exactly 10 MB boundary						
Exactly 200 MB boundary						
□ 0.5 MB file						
500 MB file						
Issues Found:						
Would You Use ATXP in Production?						
Current Status: Ves / With Fixes / X No						
Reasoning:						
What Would Need to Change:						
1.						
2.						
3.						

Comparison to Alternatives

If you've used similar products:

Feature	ATXP	[Alternative]	Winner
Setup time	min	min	
Documentation			
Payment reliability	[score]	[score]	
Cross-platform support	☑ / ×	☑ / X	
Cost	\$	\$	
	'		

Final	Thou	ghts
--------------	------	------

What I Learned					
1.					
2					

3.

What Surprised Me

	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Positive surprise:	
•		POSITIVE SUIDIISE.	

	•	X	
•		Negative surprise:	

Would You Recommend ATXP to Others?

Rating: 1 (No) - 10 (Absolutely)

Who should use it:

Who shouldn't use it yet:

Appendix: Session Notes

Commands That Worked

```
# Example successful command

npm run dev

# Successfully uploaded file

upload /interview_120mb.mp4 # Cost: $0.50 
# Successful search

search main themes # Cost: $0.01
```

Commands That Failed

```
bash

# Example failed command

[command] # Error: [error message]

# Resolution: [how you fixed it]
```

Log Files & Errors

If you encountered errors, paste key log snippets:

```
[Error from MCP server][Error from ATXP agent][Error from payment validation]
```

Contact & Follow-Up

Best way to reach you: [Email/Slack]

Available for discussion: [Dates/times]

Would you like to: [] Schedule call [] Email updates [] Both

Thank you for building with ATXP!

Please submit this friction log along with any code samples or video recording to: [founder email]