

INPUT AND COMPLETENESS

Notes to action review

Make the commitments and the gaps visible.

The source notes

L1: Kickoff notes - fictional example
L2: Please send the revised scope; Owner: Alex; Due: Friday
L3: We need to confirm who can approve the access request.
L4: Sam mentioned next week, but no commitment was agreed.
L5: Review the report template; Owner: Jordan; Due: Not agreed

What the rule-based check picked up

Ownership across 3 candidate actions



2 named owners | 1 unclear owner

Timing across the same 3 candidates



1 stated deadline | 1 deadline not agreed | 1 deadline unstated

Counts describe only these fictional notes. Candidate selection is keyword based; explicit Owner: and Due: labels provide the fields. It does not infer intent or confirm commitments.

OUTPUT AND DECISION POINTS

Action review register

Keep the evidence next to the work that needs review.

Source / candidate	Owner	Timing	Review action
L2 / Send revised scope	Alex	Friday	Confirm the commitment and the actual date.
L3 / Confirm access approver	Unclear	Not stated	Identify an accountable owner and deadline.
L5 / Review report template	Jordan	Not agreed	Agree timing before scheduling.

A field can be present without being settled

"Due: Not agreed" is an explicit field, but it is not an agreed deadline. A person must interpret that distinction.

Preserved source evidence

L2: Please send the revised scope; Owner: Alex; Due: Friday

L3: We need to confirm who can approve the access request.

L5: Review the report template; Owner: Jordan; Due: Not agreed

Next human step

Confirm every candidate action, resolve the unassigned access approval, and agree a date before adding work to a task system.

Try the editable example at www.xenlabz.com/workbench.html. Actual system connections and acceptance criteria are agreed separately.