

PUBLIC PROOF ASSET

Illustrative Worked Example

When "Ready" no longer resolves into one clear current written basis.

01**THE SCENE**

A clean dashboard status sat beside approvals and conditions supporting a narrower position.

02**THE QUESTION**

What could the existing record safely support at the reporting cut-off?

03**THE RESULT**

A bounded written position that could stand without oral reconstruction.

THE BUYER QUESTION

Can the current record safely carry the statement **"Ready for Operational Handover"** into an executive steering pack - and, if not, what is the narrowest written position it can support?

Fictional composite - not client work.

Created solely to demonstrate the structure of a bounded RGRA clarification. It does not reproduce, describe or imply any client engagement.

rgra30.com

01 | THE SITUATION

The headline looked clear. The written basis was narrower.

The issue was not whether the word "Ready" was automatically wrong. The issue was whether the current record could safely carry the institutional weight being placed on it.

THE SCENE

A fictional infrastructure programme dashboard reported **"Ready for Operational Handover"**. The same matter also contained conditional acceptance, an approved change to the target date, a failed readiness test and minutes deferring formal acceptance. An AI-assisted summary repeated the dashboard wording without carrying forward the conditions.

Why the apparent answer was unsafe

- The dashboard carried a clean status, but it did not hold acceptance authority.
- The acceptance record authorised limited mobilisation only under unresolved conditions.
- The operative target date had moved beyond the reporting cut-off.
- Current test evidence and approved minutes showed that formal acceptance remained deferred.
- The AI-assisted summary carried forward the headline, not the qualifying basis.

THE RELIANCE QUESTION

At the 28 June reporting cut-off, what could the organisation safely state in writing - without asking readers to reconstruct the matter through meetings, memory or explanation?

02 | THE RECORD

Six records. Six different roles.

Existence was not the test. The test was what each record was authorised to establish at the operative cut-off.

Record	Role in the current basis	Why it mattered
Approved handover plan	Governing criteria	Defined the mandatory readiness conditions.
Conditional acceptance	Active, but qualified	Allowed interim mobilisation while unresolved items remained.
Dashboard status	Reporting output	Carried unqualified READY wording, but did not create acceptance authority.
Approved change memo	Change authority	Moved the operative target beyond the reporting cut-off.
Test result and minutes	Current contrary evidence	Confirmed an unmet condition and deferred formal acceptance.
AI-assisted summary	Derivative record	Repeated the dashboard wording without carrying forward the source qualifications.

The control distinction

- A record can be authentic and current without being authorised to decide the issue.
- A reporting output can remain active while the underlying position is conditional.
- A later summary can be newer than its sources and still carry the basis incorrectly.

03 | THE CLARIFICATION

What had to be separated before a position could be stated.

The aim was not to create a new narrative. It was to make the current written basis readable without oral repair.

1

CRITERIA

What had to be true for readiness to be established.

Source role: approved handover plan

2

AUTHORITY

Which records could approve, change or qualify the position.

Source role: conditional acceptance and approved change memo

3

CURRENT CONDITIONS

What remained unmet or expressly deferred at the cut-off.

Source role: test result and approved minutes

4

**REPORTING /
DERIVATIVE**

What repeated or compressed the position without changing authority.

Source role: dashboard and AI-assisted summary

THE WRITTEN FRACTURE

The clean status travelled faster than the conditions attached to it. The current position could be understood only if someone explained which approval, date and condition still governed. The need for oral reconstruction was the risk.

04 | THE OUTPUT

Illustrative file position at the operative cut-off.

The smallest safe output was a bounded written clarification - not a broad review of the whole programme.

ILLUSTRATIVE FILE POSITION

The available written record did not support unqualified use of "Ready for Operational Handover" or "No Major Issue".

It supported a narrower current position: interim mobilisation could proceed under controls, while handover readiness remained conditional and formal acceptance remained deferred pending the listed conditions.

Illustrative wording for this fictional matter only.

What the output did

- Separated authority-bearing, conditional, reporting and derivative records.
- Fixed the operative time and documentary boundary.
- Made the narrower current position readable without oral reconstruction.
- Recorded what remained open and what had to stay attached if the wording was carried forward.

What the output did not do

- Provide legal advice or an audit, safety or contractual-completion opinion.
- Determine claims, entitlement, liability or third-party rights.
- Treat later evidence as silently changing the released position.
- Represent a real client engagement or outcome.

05 | HOW A REAL MATTER BEGINS

A short written route. No full-file intake at first contact.

The first step is a short, non-sensitive written background. File-specific work begins only after the route and engagement basis are confirmed in writing.

01**SEND BACKGROUND**

Describe the matter, records believed to exist, current difficulty, intended use and timing pressure.

02**RGRA CHECKS ROUTE**

RGRA checks whether the matter, reliance question, authority path and documentary boundary can be bounded.

03**DECISION-BASIS REVIEW**

If suitable, RGRA confirms the fixed scope, fee, documentary boundary, intended use and material route in writing before work begins.

What not to send at first contact

- Confidential files, full repositories or sensitive attachments.
- A request for a free conclusion on which document governs.
- A broad instruction to reconstruct an entire programme, repository or dispute.

START THE REVIEW

Send a short, non-sensitive written background or request a 20-minute scoping call. If the matter appears suitable, RGRA confirms the review scope and commercial basis in writing.

rgra30.com | tl@rgra30.com

DISCLOSURE

Fictional composite created solely to demonstrate the structure of a bounded RGRA clarification. It does not reproduce, describe or imply a client engagement. No real organisation, project, person or confidential material is represented.