

Think Like the Approver

How to Produce Work People Can Safely Approve, Rely On and Defend

Correct is only the first threshold. Decision-ready work makes the consequence safe to understand, approve and defend.

PREPARED BY

Manu Reynolds — Director

Buildit Admin Solutions Pty Ltd | ABN 35 677 590 082

0406 066 652 | manu@builditadminsolutions.com.au | builditadminsolutions.com.au

REVISION 1.0 | AUGUST 2026 | DRAFT FOR CLIENT REVIEW

Document Status and Use

CONTROLLED USE *This is an external Buildit development resource. It is not company policy, an industrial instrument, a competency matrix, legal advice or a guarantee of promotion, remuneration or retention. Adapt it to the client's delegations, systems, privacy requirements, project controls and formal people processes.*

Purpose

A practical approval manual covering authority, decision-ready submissions, evidence, options, consequences, communication sequencing and the reputational risk carried by the person who approves the work.

Audience

Contract administrators through commercial managers, and anyone who regularly submits work upward for review, endorsement or approval.

How to Use This Manual

1. Read the relevant chapter before a live conversation, review or decision—not after the consequence has already landed.
2. Apply the method to current project work. The suite is designed to change observable behaviour, not merely increase awareness.
3. Record the decision, action, owner, evidence and review date produced by the exercise.
4. Use the related manuals where the issue crosses career, communication, judgement, leadership or stakeholder boundaries.

Contents

- 5. 1. See the Approval System
- 6. 2. Think Upward
- 7. 3. Package Decision-Ready Work
- 8. 4. Handle Pressure, Disagreement and Politics
- 9. 5. Turn Review Into Career Capital
- 10. 6. Tools and Practice

1. See the Approval System

Approval is a transfer of risk, authority and reputation—not a signature at the end of a document.

The approver is responsible for more than technical correctness. They carry the downstream financial, contractual, operational, relational and governance consequence of the decision.

Understand what changes when your work moves from production to review, endorsement and approval.

1. Correct Is Only the First Threshold

Technical correctness earns entry to the approval process; it does not complete it.

A technically correct answer may still be incomplete as a business decision. The approver may need to know the contractual basis, financial effect, delivery consequence, alternatives, evidence, urgency, delegated authority and remaining uncertainty before the business can act.

This is why strong technicians sometimes feel frustrated by review. They have answered the question they were given but not the decision that follows. Senior work begins when you identify both.

Two Different Definitions of Finished

Do not stop at “Is it right?” Ask “Is it ready to be relied upon?”

The preparer often defines finished as: the calculation is complete, the assessment is supported or the draft has been issued. The approver defines finished as: I understand what is being asked, I can test the basis, I know what happens if we are wrong, and the record is strong enough for me to authorise the next step.

EXAMPLE — The accurate report that sat unread A contract administrator sent a detailed cost report containing the correct numbers but no statement of the forecast movement, decision required or recommended response. The commercial manager did not reject the analysis; they could not locate the decision inside it. A five-line covering brief turned the same report into something usable.

2. Approval Is a Transfer of Risk

When someone approves your work, they inherit part of its consequence.

An approval may release money, commit the company to a position, change a forecast, create precedent, affect programme, influence a client relationship or expose the business to later criticism. The person approving does more than confirm that you completed the task. They permit the organisation to rely on it.

The practical implication is simple: the preparer should make the transferred risk visible. If a material assumption, weak fact, time limit or counterargument remains, state it. Concealing it does not remove the risk; it merely transfers it without informed consent.

The After-the-Event Test

A good approval record is written for the decision today and the challenge tomorrow.

Imagine the decision is challenged six months later by an executive, client, auditor or dispute forum. Could the approver explain what was known, what was uncertain, why the recommendation was reasonable and what authority was exercised? Prepare the work for that future conversation.

3. The Approver Has a Wider Field of View

They usually know less detail about your package and more about everything your package can affect.

The preparer lives close to the facts. The approver may be balancing dozens of packages, client commitments, programme pressure, subcontractor solvency, forecasts, delegations, people issues and executive reporting. Their questions may sound broader because their consequences are broader.

Do not mistake distance from the detail for lack of intelligence or interest. Translate the detail into the field of view they occupy. The higher the issue travels, the more the submission must connect the immediate answer to project and enterprise consequences.

11. Technical reviewers protect correctness, definitions, calculations and reproducibility.
12. Commercial managers protect margin, cash, precedent, consistency, authority and residual exposure.
13. Project directors protect delivery, programme, client position, relationships, forecast credibility and project reputation.
14. Business-unit and executive leaders protect governance, portfolio exposure, external representations and enterprise reputation.
15. Clients, auditors and dispute forums test whether the contemporaneous record remains fair and defensible without relying on memory.

4. Authority Has a Personal Cost

The signature is organisational authority, but the judgement beside it is still attached to a person.

Managers and directors know that poor approvals are remembered. If the position fails, the conversation is rarely limited to the preparer. People ask who reviewed it, who approved it, what they knew and why the weakness was not identified.

That makes approval partly a reputation decision. The approver is assessing both the work and whether the person preparing it is predictable under pressure. Repeatedly accurate, balanced and transparent work earns latitude. Surprises, hidden assumptions and overconfident claims consume it.

The Reputation Test

People put their name beside work they believe will not make them look careless later.

Ask: would this person be comfortable explaining the approval to the executive team six months later using the evidence available today? If not, the submission is not ready.

KEY TAKEAWAY *Trust in your work is not the belief that you never make mistakes. It is confidence that you expose material uncertainty, respond honestly when tested and do not create avoidable surprises.*

5. Map the Approval Chain

A submission can be correct for one reviewer and incomplete for the next.

Material work often travels through several gates: preparer, discipline reviewer, commercial lead, project director, business unit, client or corporate function. Each gate is asking a different question. A common failure is preparing only for the person immediately above you and forcing every later reviewer to rebuild the wider context.

Map the chain before the work is finished. Identify who recommends, who endorses, who approves, who must be consulted and who needs to be informed. Then identify the information each person requires and the sequence that avoids surprise or rework.

16. Who owns the underlying analysis?
17. Who has technical or contractual review responsibility?
18. Who has delegated authority to approve the decision?
19. Whose budget, forecast, client relationship or programme is affected?
20. Who may later challenge or audit the record?
21. Which people should be spoken to before the formal paper arrives?

2. Think Upward

Start with the decision and work backwards to the minimum evidence required to support it.

Approvers need a clear recommendation, boundaries, options, material consequences, assumptions and the weakest point in the case.

Work backwards from the decision, authority and challenge rather than forwards from the task.

6. Start With the Decision

If you cannot state the decision in one sentence, you are not ready to package the detail.

Before opening the spreadsheet or drafting the paper, write the approval sentence: “Approval is sought to...” or “A decision is required on...”. This forces clarity about scope, authority and timing.

Many weak submissions are informative but directionless. They describe the history, attach calculations and explain what happened without stating what the reader must decide. The approver is left to infer the question and may solve a different one.

The Five-Line Approval Brief

Lead with the decision. Put the detail behind it, not instead of it.

22. Decision required and by when.
23. Recommendation.
24. Basis and evidence.
25. Material consequences and alternatives.
26. Remaining uncertainty, control and next step.

7. Identify Authority and Boundaries

Good judgement includes knowing when you can decide, when you can recommend and when you must escalate.

Delegated authority is not administrative decoration. It defines who can commit money, accept risk, issue positions, approve settlements, alter forecasts or bind the organisation. A well-prepared submission states the authority required and does not force the approver to discover that the decision belongs somewhere else.

Thinking like the approver also means respecting the boundary of your own role. You can analyse, recommend and prepare without presenting an unapproved position as though it has already been authorised.

EXAMPLE — The position issued before approval A draft subcontract position was technically strong but circulated externally before the delegated approver had reviewed it. The problem was no longer only the merits. The business had to manage an apparent commitment, relationship damage and a governance failure. Correct analysis was undermined by the wrong sequence.

8. Separate Fact, Assumption, Interpretation and Judgement

Confidence improves when the reader can see what is known and what has been concluded.

Documents often blur four different things. Facts are supported observations or records. Assumptions fill information gaps. Interpretations explain what words, events or obligations mean. Judgements select a course of action under uncertainty.

When these categories are mixed, the recommendation appears stronger than its foundation. When they are separated, the approver can test the fragile parts without dismantling the entire analysis.

27. Fact: the subcontractor submitted the notice on 14 July.
28. Assumption: the programme impact continues beyond the current update period.
29. Interpretation: the event falls within the relevant contractual entitlement.
30. Judgement: the project should assess the claim now rather than await complete quantum detail.

KEY TAKEAWAY *Do not manufacture certainty. Show the ladder from evidence to conclusion so the approver can see which rung carries the weight.*

9. Read Materiality, Timing and Proportionality

Not every issue needs a board paper; every material issue needs enough thought for its consequence.

Approver thinking is not the production of more paperwork. It is the proportionate treatment of risk. A low-value routine matter may need a clear calculation and record. A precedent-setting interpretation, forecast movement, client commitment or major cash decision may need options, legal input, wider consultation and explicit residual risk.

Timing is part of materiality. A small problem can become large when a notice period expires, procurement slips, a forecast closes or the approver loses room to act. Early warning is valuable because it preserves options.

31. How large is the financial or programme consequence?
32. Does the decision create precedent beyond this item?
33. Is the issue reversible after approval?
34. How quickly does the risk grow if no decision is made?
35. What level of evidence and consultation is proportionate?
36. What can be decided now, and what should remain conditional?

10. Present Options, Consequences and a Recommendation

The approver needs choice without being abandoned to it.

A professional recommendation is not a single preferred answer presented as inevitable. It identifies realistic alternatives, explains their consequences and states why one course is preferable. This demonstrates judgement and allows the approver to test the trade-off rather than reverse-engineer it.

Avoid the opposite failure: presenting five options with no view. “Here are the possibilities” often means the preparer has transferred the hard thinking upward. Senior people value a clear recommendation that remains open to challenge.

EXAMPLE — *Three ways to treat a recovery A forecast note showed three positions: include the full recovery, recognise only the evidenced base case, or exclude it pending agreement. It compared evidence, probability, margin effect, client relationship and reporting risk, then recommended the evidenced base case with the upside tracked separately. The approver could see both ambition and control.*

11. Expose the Counterargument and Weakest Point

The strongest position is the one that has survived its own best challenge.

If a subcontractor, client, auditor or executive were trying to defeat your recommendation, what would they attack first? Identify it before submission. State the answer honestly and distinguish a manageable weakness from one that changes the recommendation.

Hiding the counterargument may make the first page look cleaner, but it converts a known weakness into a later surprise. Approvers trust people who bring the uncomfortable point into the room while there is still time to respond.

The Red-Team Questions

A disclosed weakness can be controlled. A concealed weakness controls the room when it appears.

37. What fact, clause, calculation or definition is most vulnerable?
38. What would the other party say happened?
39. What evidence would change our conclusion?
40. Are we relying on an outcome that somebody else must deliver?
41. What happens if the assumption is wrong by 20 per cent?
42. Are we applying the same principle consistently elsewhere?

12. Think About Precedent and Consistency

An apparently isolated approval may teach the project how similar decisions will be treated.

Approvers look beyond the immediate amount. A concession, interpretation, valuation method, notice treatment or behavioural exception can establish an expectation for the next ten matters. The value of today's decision may be small while the precedent is expensive.

Consistency does not mean repeating a poor decision. It means identifying whether like cases are being treated alike, explaining material differences and controlling any deliberate departure from the prior position.

EXAMPLE — The minor variation with a major tail A small variation was proposed for quick payment despite weak records. The amount was immaterial, but the same subcontractor had dozens of similarly recorded items. The commercial manager approved a practical settlement only after documenting that it was without precedent, tied to a specific evidentiary gap and accompanied by a process correction for future work.

3. Package Decision-Ready Work

One page should expose the decision; the detail behind it should prove the case.

Good packaging is not cosmetic. It lets a reviewer understand the issue quickly, test the evidence and locate the record that matters.

Make it easy to understand and test the decision without making it easy to wave through.

13. One Page First, Detail Behind

The first page should carry the decision; the attachment should carry the proof.

Senior reviewers often have minutes, not hours, to understand an issue before deciding where to focus. A concise front end respects that reality. It should state the ask, recommendation, reason, consequence, main risk and location of supporting detail.

Concise does not mean simplistic. It means the hierarchy is visible. The reader can stop after the first page if the issue is routine, or descend into calculations, correspondence, clauses and records if the consequence requires it.

43. Decision required.
44. Recommendation and value.
45. Why this position is reasonable.
46. Material alternatives and consequences.
47. Weakest point or uncertainty.
48. Required approval date.
49. Supporting attachments and record location.

14. Build an Evidence Chain, Not an Attachment Dump

Evidence is useful when the reader can see what proposition each record supports.

Large attachments can create the appearance of diligence while transferring the review burden upward. Organise evidence around the reasoning. Identify the key record, explain what it proves, and separate decisive material from background.

The record should allow another competent person to reproduce the analysis. Calculations need sources and assumptions. Contractual positions need relevant words and facts. Forecasts need ownership, probability and timing. Verbal directions need an appropriate written confirmation.

Evidence Questions

Do not attach everything and call it evidence. Show the relationship between the record and the conclusion.

50. What proposition does this document support?
51. Is it contemporaneous, complete and reliable?
52. Is there conflicting evidence?
53. Can the calculation be reproduced?
54. Are key conversations recorded proportionately?
55. Can the evidence be located after staff or systems change?

15. Translate the Downstream Consequence

The approver is deciding what happens next, not merely what has already happened.

Connect the recommendation to the consequences that matter: cost, margin, cash, programme, procurement, client position, subcontractor behaviour, precedent, resourcing, reporting and reputation. Not every category will matter on every issue; identify the few that change the decision.

This translation is often the difference between task-level and senior-level thinking. The task explains the event. The senior view explains what the business should now do and what changes if it delays.

EXAMPLE — The design issue became a procurement decision. A technically worded design query appeared minor until the contracts manager connected it to a long-lead package, identified the final date for instruction and quantified the likely delay cost. The decision moved from “await consultant response” to “choose an interim basis this week or accept the procurement consequence.”

16. Give Early Warning Without Creating Noise

Bad news becomes more useful when it arrives with consequence, ownership and a proposed next step.

Approvers dislike surprises because surprise removes options and damages their ability to manage upward. That does not mean escalating every uncertainty. A good early warning explains what has changed, why it matters, when it becomes material and what is being done next.

Do not wait for complete certainty when the decision window is closing. Label the confidence level and update as evidence improves. Equally, do not repeatedly raise vague concern without analysis; that trains people to ignore you.

56. State the new information.
57. Explain the potential consequence and decision date.
58. Separate current fact from developing risk.
59. Name the owner and immediate control.
60. Say when the next update will be provided.

17. Use the Right Channel, Room and Sequence

The approval begins before the paper arrives.

Material or contested issues often benefit from a short conversation before formal submission. This gives the approver context, tests misunderstanding and avoids an important position arriving cold by email. The written record should then confirm the decision and basis proportionately.

Read the location. A challenge raised in front of a client, a correction made in an open office or a confidential issue discussed within earshot of others may be factually justified and professionally clumsy. Choose the setting that gives the truth the best chance of being heard without needlessly exposing someone's position.

Sequence for Material Issues

Talk first when meaning may be contested; write afterwards when the record matters.

61. Pre-brief the person carrying the decision.
62. Consult people whose evidence or accountability is affected.
63. Issue the concise written submission with supporting detail.
64. Answer stress-test questions without becoming defensive.
65. Record the decision, conditions, actions, owners and timing.

18. Stress-Test Before Submission

A ten-minute hostile review before submission can save a week of formal rework.

Ask a colleague who was not involved to read only the first page. Can they state the decision, recommendation, main evidence, consequence and weakness? If not, the hierarchy is unclear.

Then ask them to challenge the position. The purpose is not to win the rehearsal. It is to locate ambiguity, missing evidence and untested assumptions while revision is still cheap.

66. What decision do you think I am asking for?
67. What would make you refuse approval?
68. Which statement appears stronger than the evidence?
69. What consequence have I ignored?
70. What would the other party or an executive challenge first?
71. What condition should be attached to the approval?

4. Handle Pressure, Disagreement and Politics

Do not transfer emotion, status conflict or organisational pressure into the commercial record.

A defensible position remains accurate when the room becomes uncomfortable. It separates fact from pressure and disagreement from disloyalty.

Keep the work defensible when the room becomes uncomfortable.

19. Disagree Without Transferring Emotion Into the Record

Challenge the reasoning firmly while protecting the decision process.

Thinking like the approver does not require agreement. If you believe a position is wrong, explain the issue, evidence, consequence and alternative clearly. Separate the technical disagreement from frustration about hierarchy, personality or previous decisions.

Once the authorised decision is made, distinguish between matters you can professionally implement, matters requiring a reservation on the record and matters you cannot lawfully or ethically support. Do not use passive resistance, selective evidence or vague drafting to fight a decision indirectly.

EXAMPLE — The recommendation was rejected A senior CA recommended a conservative assessment. The commercial manager chose a firmer position after considering client strategy and wider precedent. The CA recorded the evidence, the manager's decision and the conditions for review, then implemented it professionally. When new evidence emerged, the position could be revisited without anyone rewriting history.

20. Play a Straight Bat Under Pressure

Build the strongest defensible position; never manufacture the facts needed to support it.

Office politics becomes dangerous when it reaches forecasts, payment assessments, claims, records or external representations. Pressure may arrive as “be more commercial,” “make the number work,” “do not put that in writing” or “everyone knows what happened.” Some requests are legitimate challenges to refine judgement. Others invite the record to outrun the evidence.

A straight bat is not passive or naive. Use definitions carefully, test grey areas, develop the strongest interpretation available, distinguish base case from upside and explain what further evidence would improve the position. But do not invent events, suppress decisive records, misstate confidence or create a representation that the company cannot control once issued.

When the Pressure Feels Wrong

Short-term political relief is a poor trade for uncontrolled financial, legal and reputational exposure.

72. Clarify the actual instruction and decision owner.
73. Separate disagreement about judgement from a request to misstate fact.
74. Explain the uncontrolled risk created by the proposed record.
75. Offer a defensible alternative that achieves the legitimate commercial objective.
76. Escalate through the appropriate channel when the issue remains material.
77. Keep a proportionate contemporaneous record.

21. When Approval Stalls

A stalled approval is a diagnostic problem before it is a personality problem.

Work may stall because the submission is unclear, evidence is missing, authority sits elsewhere, the approver is overloaded, stakeholders have not been aligned, timing is poor or the organisation does not want to make the decision yet. Treating every delay as obstruction produces unnecessary conflict.

Ask directly what prevents a decision. Offer a short summary, narrow the approval, identify the missing condition or propose a staged decision. If the issue is genuinely blocked, make the consequence and required date visible without pretending the matter has been approved.

78. Confirm the decision and authority are correctly identified.
79. Ask which question remains unanswered.
80. Separate missing evidence from organisational hesitation.
81. Offer conditional, staged or time-limited approval where appropriate.
82. State the consequence of no decision by the required date.
83. Record status without describing silence as consent.

22. Do Not Confuse Confidence With Defensiveness

Stress-test questions are often the price of authority, not proof that the reviewer dislikes you.

Approvers may ask blunt questions because they are testing the work under time pressure. If you defend every sentence as though your competence is on trial, the review becomes a contest between people rather than a test of the decision.

Pause, answer the question asked, acknowledge a gap quickly and revise the position when evidence changes. Confidence is the ability to remain useful while your analysis is being tested. It is not the performance of never being wrong.

KEY TAKEAWAY *The person who can say “that assumption is weaker than I first thought; here is the revised consequence” usually earns more trust than the person who protects the original answer at all costs.*

5. Turn Review Into Career Capital

The red pen is a map of the judgement you have not yet internalised.

Review comments reveal the decision models, materiality tests and stakeholder considerations used by more senior people. Read the pattern, not only the correction.

Use every approval cycle to become easier to trust with larger decisions.

23. Read the Red Pen

Repeated review comments are a map of the next capability you need to build.

Do not treat every returned submission as a one-off correction. Track the questions. If reviewers repeatedly ask for the contractual basis, counterargument, financial effect, authority, evidence or recommendation, that pattern identifies a gap in how you think before submission.

A personal approval checklist should be built from real red pen, not generic aspiration. When the same question stops appearing because you now answer it before review, you have converted feedback into capability.

- 84. What did the reviewer ask that I should have anticipated?
- 85. What evidence ultimately changed the decision?
- 86. Where did my language overstate certainty?
- 87. What consequence did the approver see that I missed?
- 88. What can become a reusable checklist item or template?

24. Move From Doer to Reviewer to Approver

Progression is the widening of the decisions you can safely carry, not the abandonment of technical skill.

The doer produces accurate work. The reviewer tests whether the work is complete, consistent and supported. The approver decides whether the organisation should rely on it and accepts the residual risk. Senior roles require fluency across all three positions.

To progress, practise reviewing work before you hold the title. Ask what is missing, what could fail, what the next person needs and whether the record will survive. Then practise approving in bounded situations: make the call, state the conditions, monitor the consequence and learn from the outcome.

EXAMPLE — The unofficial reviewer A CA began reviewing junior payment assessments before they reached the commercial manager. They did not simply correct arithmetic. They asked for basis, evidence, consistency, counter-position and approval amount. Over time the manager relied on the CA to protect the review gate. That behaviour became stronger promotion evidence than saying they were ready to lead.

25. Approval Skill Is Promotion Evidence

Promotion becomes easier to support when your current work already protects the authority of the next role.

Promotion is a forward-looking risk decision. The organisation is deciding whether you can carry greater consequence with less supervision. Decision-ready work provides repeatable evidence: you understand

authority, anticipate questions, expose uncertainty, communicate early and produce records others can rely on.

It also reduces the reputational risk of sponsorship. A manager can put their name beside your promotion when they have seen your judgement survive pressure, not merely your technical output succeed in routine conditions.

Evidence Worth Recording

Evidence, not mythology: record what you owned, what changed, who relied on it and what remained untested.

- 89. A material decision you framed and moved to approval.
- 90. A weak assumption you identified before it became a surprise.
- 91. A contested position you kept defensible under pressure.
- 92. A submission that reduced review time or rework.
- 93. A junior person whose work became more decision-ready through your review.
- 94. An approval you monitored through to outcome and lessons learned.

6. Tools and Practice

Approval skill is built by repeatedly exposing the decision, testing the weak point and closing the evidence chain.

Use these tools on live work. The aim is a repeatable operating system that reduces review cycles and makes your recommendation safer to carry.

Use these pages against live work. The blank tool is not the value; the repeated thinking is.

Tool 1 – Five-Line Approval Brief

If the decision cannot be explained in five lines, the detailed work is not yet organised.

Field	Working note
1. Decision required	
2. Recommendation	
3. Basis and evidence	
4. Consequences and alternatives	
5. Remaining risk / next step	

Tool 2 – Approver Lens Map

Map what each decision-maker must protect before choosing what each one needs to see.

Person / role	Authority or interest	Likely challenge	Pre-brief / evidence needed

Tool 3 – Facts, Assumptions, Interpretation and Judgement

Expose the ladder from evidence to recommendation.

Type	Statement	Evidence / owner	Effect if wrong

Tool 4 – Options and Consequences Matrix

Give the approver real choice, then state your recommendation.

Option	Commercial	Programme / delivery	Relationship / precedent	Residual risk
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

Recommended option and why:

Tool 5 – Evidence Chain

Show what each record proves and where the chain remains weak.

Proposition to prove	Key record / source	Conflict or limitation	Location / owner

Tool 6 – Red-Team Pre-Submission Check

Try to defeat the recommendation before someone with authority has to.

Check	Yes	Fix
The exact decision, approver and deadline are stated.		
The recommendation is clear and not hidden in background detail.		
Facts, assumptions, interpretations and judgement are distinguishable.		
Realistic alternatives and consequences are shown.		
The weakest material point and counterargument are disclosed.		
The financial, programme, relationship and precedent effects are proportionate.		
Delegated authority and required consultation are confirmed.		
The evidence can be located and the calculation		

Check	Yes	Fix
reproduced.		
The language does not overstate confidence or omit a decisive fact.		
The first page can be understood by someone outside the immediate package.		
The decision and conditions can be defended six months later.		
The right people have been pre-briefed before formal issue.		

Tool 7 – Review Feedback Log

Turn repeated questions into a personal approval system.

Date / work	Question or correction	What I missed	Checklist change

Tool 8 – Approval Readiness Self-Assessment

Rate observable behaviour, then record evidence a manager would recognise.

Observable behaviour	Rating 1–5	Evidence / next step
I identify the decision, authority and timing before doing detailed work.		
I separate fact, assumption, interpretation and judgement.		
I state a recommendation and compare realistic alternatives.		
I expose the weakest material point before the reviewer finds it.		
I connect the answer to cost, cash, programme, relationships and precedent where material.		
I provide evidence that allows another person		

Observable behaviour	Rating 1–5	Evidence / next step
to reproduce the analysis.		
I give early warning while the approver still has room to act.		
I choose the right channel, room and sequence for material issues.		
I remain useful rather than defensive when the work is stress-tested.		
I can disagree firmly without distorting the record or undermining authority.		
My work is trusted without repeated re-checking.		
I learn from review comments and prevent the same question recurring.		
I can review junior work through the approver's lens, not only correct the task.		
I have examples of decisions others relied on that survived later scrutiny.		

Tool 9 – 90-Day Practice Plan

Choose live work that will reveal whether the thinking has changed.

Behaviour to practise	Live work / forum	Evidence of improvement	Reviewer / date

Commitments and Review

Use this page to convert the manual into a small number of observable commitments. A manual has no value if the reader cannot identify what will be done differently, where it will be practised and what evidence will prove the change.

Commitment	Practice ground	Evidence / reviewer	Review date

Related Buildit Manuals

- 95. 04 — Communicating Under Pressure
- 96. 08 — Commercial Judgement
- 97. 10 — Recovering a Difficult Package
- 98. 17 — Stakeholder Pathway and Communication Routing Playbook

Closing Position

Correct is only the first threshold. Decision-ready work makes the consequence safe to understand, approve and defend.

Notes
