SAMPLE 1 · A GENERAL STALLED PRIORITY

Campaign launches went from two weeks to five

This is a fictional case. The organisation, people and figures are invented. The manager and colleagues were simulated from a written case file, so this shows how the Snapshot works, not a customer result. Everything from "Decision" onwards is the readout exactly as the Snapshot produced it, laid out for print; nothing in it was edited. The figures in it were calculated in code from the numbers supplied.

THE SITUATION

A fictional marketing team of 13 people, after a reorganisation removed a management layer. The manager was weighing a project-manager hire or a time-management course.

WHAT THE MANAGER TYPED TO START

> *Our campaign launches used to take about two weeks from brief to live. Now it's five weeks, and the sales team is complaining we're missing every seasonal window. I think the team has slowed down since the reorganisation. I'm considering hiring a dedicated project manager, or sending everyone on a time-management course. Which should I do?*

HOW THE INVESTIGATION RAN

8 evidence requests, one at a time	**2** colleagues invited: legal counsel, campaign manager	**32** evidence items recorded	**12** explanations tested: 3 supported, 1 weakened or ruled out

References in square brackets, such as [E6], point to the evidence record at the back. The questions asked are listed there too.

DECISION

Correct the work

Fund neither option yet. Correct approvals, legal-review access and disclaimer criteria first.

1. **Move routine creative decisions out of the director queue where authorised, and provide timely decisions for items that must remain there.**
   Who: Approval-rights holder authorises the route; · Review: Review implementation and decisions handled within two weeks of authorisation. · Needs agreement
2. **Replace the Thursday-only marketing legal-review gate with an authorised review allocation that provides access across the working week.**
   Who: Legal-resource owner approves allocation; · Review: Review execution, first-comment waits and effects on claims within two weeks of authorisa… · Needs agreement
3. **Agree usable disclaimer acceptance criteria before the next submission or revision round.**
   Who: Legal counsel approves the criteria; · Review: Agree criteria before the next relevant submission, review the resulting legal comments i… · Needs agreement

Stop if: At the proposed review, stop extending any changed route or resource allocation if it has breached approval controls or displaced claims commitments without authorisation.

Why

The strongest evidence identifies where campaigns wait and why some disclaimer work repeats—not a demonstrated need for a new project manager or time-management course. These corrections can be authorised internally, with their effects checked before making a larger spending commitment.

Next steps

1. Move routine creative decisions out of the director queue where authorised, and provide timely decisions for items that must remain there.

Needs agreement from The holder of director-approval rights, with the approval-policy owner if different. The responding manager reports approving all creative, but their authority to delegate and the connection to the recorded director queue are not established

What changes	The approval-rights holder authorises a written category of routine creative decisions for the campaign-manager role, limited to agreed acceptance criteria and approved spending. Retain exceptions and spending above the existing $5,000 threshold with the authorised approver. For nondelegable decisions, establish protected decision slots across the working week. Confirm that this route covers the campaign director approvals recorded in the tracker before changing it.
Who does it (proposed)	Approval-rights holder authorises the route; campaign manager routes eligible decisions and records submission and decision times.
Measure	Waiting time for campaign director approval, separated between delegated items and retained exceptions; also check reversals and unauthorised decisions.
Starting point	The campaign tracker reports a nine-day median director-approval wait, versus one day in the year-ago comparison (E6, E7). The broader workflow log reports six working days and is not directly interchangeable with that campaign baseline (E30).
Review (proposed)	Review implementation and decisions handled within two weeks of authorisation. Assess completed campaign turnaround when affected campaigns reach customers; do not interpret incomplete campaigns as failed corrections.
Would show this is wrong	Eligible decisions actually follow the new route but comparable campaign approval waits do not shorten. If decisions still wait outside this route, reassess whether the correction reached the recorded queue.

Watch-outs

- Needs Campaign-manager capacity and authorisation to accept delegated creative decisions: not confirmed.
- Needs Protected decision time for approvals retained by the director: needs approval.
- If campaign demand rises or the delegated approver becomes unavailable; neither change is established by the record: partly works.
- Extra work falls on: Routine decision work moves from the director to the campaign-manager role. This must not simply create another queue.
- If it goes wrong, nobody owns the recovery work yet.
- Safeguard: Proposed recovery owner: the approval-rights holder, who should authorise cover or take decisions back when capacity is unavailable. This ownership and capacity are not agreed. Preserve legal sign-off, spending authority and exception escalation. Defining cover and decision limits requires management effort but protects against stalled or unauthorised launches; its cost is not quantified.

2. Replace the Thursday-only marketing legal-review gate with an authorised review allocation that provides access across the working week.

Needs agreement from The role controlling legal-counsel allocation, with marketing and claims leads agreeing any change to their service commitments

What changes	The legal-resource owner authorises distribution of marketing-review time across the week rather than restricting all marketing review to Thursdays. Counsel and the campaign manager route ready submissions into those opportunities. Preserve legal sign-off and explicitly decide any trade-off with claims work; do not assume extra reviewer hours or silently transfer delay to claims.
Who does it (proposed)	Legal-resource owner approves allocation; legal counsel conducts reviews; campaign manager submits ready work and flags seasonal deadlines.
Measure	Submission-to-first-comment elapsed time for marketing, alongside total legal-review elapsed time, ready submissions left waiting and any deterioration in claims commitments.
Starting point	Marketing submissions took a median six calendar days to first comments, and all-round legal review took eleven days in the campaign tracker (E9, E6). Counsel reports Thursday-only marketing review alongside claims work (E8).
Review (proposed)	Review execution, first-comment waits and effects on claims within two weeks of authorisation. Review total legal elapsed time as affected campaigns complete.
Would show this is wrong	Ready submissions receive the authorised review opportunities but first-comment waits do not shorten. Shorter first-comment waits without shorter total legal elapsed time would indicate that revisions or other dependencies still constrain completion.

Watch-outs

- Needs Redistribution of the existing marketing legal-review allocation: needs approval.
- Needs Claims capacity and commitments affected by a changed review schedule: not confirmed.
- Needs Authorised legal cover for deadline-critical submissions or reviewer absence: not confirmed.
- If claims demand increases or counsel is absent; these are possible disruptions, not recorded events: partly works.
- Extra work falls on: More frequent marketing access could fragment counsel's work or displace claims review unless the allocation is explicitly protected.
- If it goes wrong, nobody owns the recovery work yet.
- Safeguard: Proposed recovery owner: the legal-resource owner, who should authorise cover or explicitly reprioritise commitments. Availability and feasibility are unconfirmed. Redistributing existing time avoids assuming a new hire, but coordination and switching costs are unknown. Do not purchase standby capacity without comparing its cost with deadline exposure.

3. Agree usable disclaimer acceptance criteria before the next submission or revision round.

Needs agreement from Legal counsel responsible for campaign review, with the legal-standard owner approving guidance where required

What changes	Counsel and the campaign manager agree written disclaimer requirements before the next submission or revision round. Include approved wording where reusable, the conditions under which it applies and exceptions requiring legal judgment. The campaign team uses those criteria before submitting; counsel identifies whether subsequent returns concern unmet criteria, a new requirement or a genuine exception.
Who does it (proposed)	Legal counsel approves the criteria; campaign manager incorporates them into preparation and checks submissions against them.
Measure	Returns specifically caused by unclear disclaimer requirements, with all-cause returns and legal-review elapsed time tracked separately.
Starting point	The campaign manager reports guessing disclaimer wording and receiving repeated returns (E15). The aggregate all-cause return rate is 70%; it is not a disclaimer-specific baseline (E9).
Review (proposed)	Agree criteria before the next relevant submission, review the resulting legal comments immediately, and review implementation within two weeks of authorisation.
Would show this is wrong	The team demonstrably applies the agreed criteria but unclear-disclaimer returns persist, or most returns concern unrelated legal issues. A fall in disclaimer returns without shorter overall turnaround would limit the correction's effect on the wider problem.

Watch-outs

- Needs Counsel time to write and approve campaign-specific criteria, reusable wording and exception rules: not confirmed.
- Needs Campaign-manager time to apply the agreed guidance before submission: not confirmed.
- If disclaimer requirements change again or an unfamiliar campaign falls outside the reusable guidance; neither event is established as imminent: partly works.
- Extra work falls on: Counsel must maintain guidance, while the campaign team takes on preparation checks. Legal judgment remains with the authorised reviewer.
- If it goes wrong, nobody owns the recovery work yet.
- Safeguard: Proposed maintenance and recovery owner: legal counsel, subject to agreement and available time. Versioned guidance and explicit exceptions require upkeep but protect against stale wording and repeated guessing. Reuse may also help future campaigns move faster; that benefit is not yet measured.

Why not a test instead: The record already supports correcting specific queues and unclear acceptance criteria. Their precise contribution to total turnaround is uncertain, but that does not require delaying ordinary corrections. Measure the effects and retain approval controls; do not present the proposed routing or scheduling choices as proven solutions.

Why not correct it directly: Not applicable: the recommendation is to correct the supported findings, subject to the stated authority and resource checks.

Stop condition: At the proposed review, stop extending any changed route or resource allocation if it has breached approval controls or displaced claims commitments without authorisation. If implemented changes have not reduced their targeted waits or repeated disclaimer returns on relevant work, stop expanding them and reassess the remaining constraint. If the changes were not implemented, resolve authority or capacity rather than treating unchanged results as disproof. Retain necessary legal requirements and usable acceptance guidance. — by Within two weeks of authorisation, or immediately on a control breach. Where affected campaigns have not completed, limit the initial conclusion to implementation and stage-level results.

What is known

- The tracker reports total median turnaround of 31 days versus 13 days in its year-ago comparison. The campaigns are not seasonally matched. [E5, E6, E7, F2]

- Director-approval waiting has a median of nine days versus one day previously. Brief-to-first-draft and build-to-live medians are unchanged. [E6, E7]
- Marketing shares legal counsel with claims and is reviewed only on Thursdays. The legal queue records six calendar days to first comments; all-round legal-review elapsed time is eleven days. [E8, E9, E6]
- Counsel reports changed disclaimer requirements applied case by case without a written marketing checklist. The campaign manager independently reports guessing wording and receiving repeated legal returns. [E11, E12, E15]
- The manager reports approving all creative regardless of spend since the management layer was removed. The record does not establish delegated authority or why particular decisions waited. [E31, E32]

The explanations

Launch decisions may be waiting in a central approval queue. Supported enough for the next decision
Accounts for: A documented campaign waiting stage that is substantially longer than the earlier comparison.
Does not account for: Why individual decisions wait, whether every director approval is necessary, or how much total turnaround delegation would recover.

A shared specialist may have become the constraint across several campaign schedules.
Supported enough for the next decision
Accounts for: Restricted access to a shared legal reviewer, supported by the queue record and the campaign manager's account of waiting.
Does not account for: All legal elapsed time, the effect of rescheduling, or whether more total legal capacity is needed.

Unclear launch acceptance criteria may be causing repeated revisions. Supported enough for the next decision
Accounts for: A specific repeated-work mechanism: the team guesses disclaimer wording and receives legal returns.
Does not account for: Every legal return or every campaign delay. Reusable wording may not cover all exceptions.

The work required for each campaign may have expanded since the earlier two-week baseline.
Strengthened – more support, not established
Accounts for: Changed disclaimer requirements offer a plausible explanation for some difference from the earlier period.
Does not account for: The amount of additional necessary work or its contribution to longer cycles; neither is established.

Competing priorities may be repeatedly displacing campaign work. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: Competing priorities remain possible.
Does not account for: No supplied record establishes campaign displacement or an unresolved priority conflict.

The campaign owner may lack authority to resolve cross-team launch decisions. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: Centralised approvals make the campaign owner's decision authority relevant.
Does not account for: The record does not establish that the campaign owner holds insufficient authority or identify existing delegation rights.

An external party may be controlling a required campaign delivery date. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: An external dependency remains possible.
Does not account for: No supplied campaign history establishes an outside party controlling a launch date.

Required brief information may be arriving too late for production to proceed. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: Late brief information remains possible.
Does not account for: No supplied record links missing brief information to the observed deterioration.

Increased campaign demand may be creating a backlog ahead of available capacity. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: Higher incoming demand could contribute to queues.
Does not account for: Completed-launch counts do not measure incoming briefs or backlog, so demand growth is untested.

Necessary launch-coordination work may have become unassigned during the reorganisation.
Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: The changed role mix makes reassignment of coordination work worth considering.
Does not account for: The record does not establish that necessary coordination work is unassigned or that a dedicated project manager would remove the identified waits.

Performance measures may reward campaign starts at the expense of timely completion. Open – not yet tested
Accounts for: Conflicting performance incentives remain possible.
Does not account for: The supplied operational reports do not establish what behavior is rewarded.

Different timing definitions may be making the apparent turnaround deterioration misleading. Weakened
Accounts for: Unverified campaign mix and timing definitions could affect the size of the apparent deterioration.
Does not account for: A measurement-only explanation is weakened by the recorded approval waits and firsthand accounts of waiting and repeated revisions.

Figures

	Figure (inputs)	Computed
F1	Change in completed launches between the supplied six-month periods; not a measure of individual productivity or campaign turnaround before = 15 launches; after = 12 launches	change: **-3** pct change: **-20**
F2	Change in reported total median turnaround; campaigns are not seasonally matched before = 13 days; after = 31 days	change: **18** pct change: **138.5**
F3	Change in median waiting time for director approval before = 1 days; after = 9 days	change: **8** pct change: **800**
F4	Change in median legal-review elapsed time across all rounds; not a measure of active legal work before = 3 days; after = 11 days	change: **8** pct change: **266.7**

- The recorded increase in total median turnaround is 18 days, but elapsed delay is not labor cost or verified lost sales. [F2, E5]
- Director waiting and all-round legal elapsed time each increased by eight days in their respective stage medians. These are separate comparisons, not additive estimates of recoverable time. [F3, F4]
- Completed launches fell from 15 to 12 across the supplied six-month comparisons. This is an output change, not proof of reduced individual productivity or increased demand. [F1, E3, E4]
- No monetary saving or commercial-loss estimate supports either proposed purchase. The recommended corrections also require staff time; their effort and cross-team effects must be authorised rather than treated as free. [E5, E8, E31]

Solved or only promised

- Director-approval waiting: **unknown**
- Restricted marketing legal-review access: **unknown**
- Usable disclaimer acceptance criteria: **unknown**
- Recovery of seasonal launch performance: **unknown**

Not established

- That every seasonal window has been missed, or what sales value was lost.

- That individual working speed deteriorated after the reorganisation. The stage breakdown weighs against a uniform slowdown but does not disprove one.
- That the historical two-week turnaround remains a feasible current target under changed requirements.
- That the changed disclaimer standard requires case-by-case markup.
- That all legal returns are caused by disclaimer uncertainty; the aggregate return rate covers all reasons.
- That the manager's approval remit exactly matches the tracker director queue, or that the manager can delegate it.
- That stage medians can be added to promise a specific reduction in total campaign turnaround.

Missing evidence

- Comparable campaign-level brief dates, original seasonal deadlines and actual live dates.
- Incoming briefs, open campaigns and campaign mix across comparable periods.
- Confirmed approval-delegation rights, legal-allocation authority and capacity to carry out the proposed changes.
- Costs and likely benefits of hiring, training and the proposed internal corrections.

What could change this conclusion

- All actions, responsible roles and review timings are proposals, not agreed commitments; no correction is recorded as implemented or promised.
- If the corrections occur but their targeted waits and returns do not improve, reassess the remaining constraint before extending the changes or approving a purchase.
- If the corrections do not occur, first resolve authority, capacity or priority rather than treating nonexecution as evidence that the findings were wrong.
- If comparable campaign records show materially different requirements or continuing seasonal misses, reconsider the delivery target, resource allocation and the case for additional coordination capacity.
- If changed routing weakens approval controls or marketing access displaces claims commitments without authorisation, stop extending that change and return the trade-off to the responsible decision-maker.

Appendix A: the questions asked

Each round asked for one thing someone already had. A question could go to the manager or, by email link, to a colleague who sees only that question.

	Answered by	Request
C1	—	Send the existing weekly campaign-volume report for the latest eight complete weeks and the eight complete weeks immediately before the reorganisation. Include four fields: week, briefs received, campaigns launched, and campaigns open at week end. Raw counts are enough; no percentages or new report are needed. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C2	—	Send the existing campaign-calendar or tracker entries for the three most recently completed seasonal campaigns and three comparable campaigns from the same season last year. Include four fields: campaign name and type, brief-received date, intended seasonal live-by date, and actual live date. Use the original intended date where it is already visible, rather than a later revised deadline. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C3	legal counsel	For the three most recently completed campaigns you reviewed, share the existing legal-review threads or a first-hand account covering four details: when each submission was ready for review; when active review happened versus waiting; what revisions were requested and why; and which person or outside party each unresolved item was waiting for. Use only information already available —no new timing exercise is needed. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C4	campaign manager	For the three most recently completed campaigns whose director approval you routed, share the existing approval threads or your first-hand account of four things: when each was submitted and decided; what decision required the director; what held it up; and who actually chased or resolved it, including any limit on that person's authority. Use those recent cases rather than a general description of the process. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C5	—	From the tracker report you already have, send its existing brief-to-live turnaround figures by campaign type or category for the last 12 launches and the year-ago comparison. If it supports a different existing breakdown instead, use channel, product segment or location. Include at most four fields: group, comparison period, launch count and reported brief-to-live days. Raw figures only; do not calculate percentages or create a new breakdown. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C6	legal counsel	For your most recent thursday marketing-review slot, give a first-hand account using the queue or calendar you already have: which campaigns were ready when the slot began, which received first comments, what other work displaced marketing review, and why any ready campaigns were left for another day. This will help distinguish a limited weekly slot from a slot that is not actually protected. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C7	—	Share the campaign team's existing delivery scorecard or performance-review measures used during the last three months. Include up to four fields: measure, target, reported result, and any stated reward or escalation attached to it. We need to see whether starting campaigns, completing them, or reaching seasonal windows is actually rewarded. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.
C8	—	For the three most recent creative approvals you personally completed in the last month, share the existing approval messages or your firsthand account showing four details: the item and decision required; spending involved; who was permitted to approve instead of you, if anyone; and what kept the decision pending. Please distinguish whether your roughly $5,000 threshold applies to creative approval or only to spending. If you don't have exactly this, send the closest thing you have and say how it differs, or tell us what you have seen first-hand.

Appendix B: the evidence record

Each item is frozen when it is recorded and graded as a fact (from a record) or an observation (an account). The summaries are the Snapshot's own.

	Type	Source	Summary
E1	Observation	Manager opening statement	Opening statement
E2	Fact (record)	Manager via C1: Manager, C1: supplied aggregate headcount comparison; underlying records not supplied	The supplied comparison shows unchanged total headcount but a different role mix: two manager positions in the earlier period and individual-contributor roles throughout the current team. This does not establish whether coordination responsibilities were reassigned or left uncovered.
E3	Fact (record)	Manager via C1: Manager, C1: supplied aggregate output comparison; underlying records not supplied	Completed launches were lower in the current six-month comparison. Output counts alone do not establish increased demand, slower active work, longer queues or comparable campaign scope.
E4	Observation	Manager via C1: Manager, C1: description of the supplied comparison	The supplied comparison does not measure incoming demand or outstanding campaigns and does not cover the requested periods around the reorganisation. Demand growth and backlog accumulation remain untested.
E5	Observation	Manager via C2: Manager, C2: description of the available tracker export	The supplied export is not a matched seasonal-campaign comparison and cannot verify missed seasonal deadlines or campaign comparability.
E6	Fact (record)	Manager via C2: Manager, C2: reproduced aggregate project-tracker export	The tracker records a nine-day median wait for director approval and eleven days in legal review across all rounds. Legal review elapsed time does not distinguish active review, waiting and repeated rounds. The reported total median is 31 days.
E7	Fact (record)	Manager via C2: Manager, C2: reproduced historical comparison from project tracker	In the export's earlier comparison, director approval waiting was one day and legal review three days. Brief-to-first-draft and build-to-live stage medians were unchanged. This weighs against a uniform slowdown across all stages, without establishing comparable campaign scope.
E8	Observation	legal counsel via C3: Legal counsel, C3: firsthand description of review availability	Legal counsel reports that marketing reviews have one scheduled day each week alongside claims responsibilities. This supports a shared-resource constraint but does not establish how much campaign delay the schedule causes.
E9	Fact (record)	legal counsel via C3: Legal counsel, C3: reproduced marketing legal-review queue record	The reproduced queue record shows elapsed time before first comments and frequent returns. It does not distinguish waiting from active review or identify why submissions were returned.
E10	Observation	legal counsel via C3: Legal counsel, C3: description of the supplied record's coverage	Counsel identifies material limits: the record cannot reconstruct recent campaign paths, separate work from waiting or identify the blocking party.
E11	Observation	legal counsel via C3: Legal counsel, C3: firsthand account of disclaimer review	Counsel reports a changed disclaimer requirement and case-by-case markup. This provides an alternative to a uniform team slowdown: some review requirements have changed since the earlier comparison.
E12	Observation	legal counsel via C3: Legal counsel, C3: firsthand account of review guidance	Counsel reports no written marketing checklist. Together with case-by-case disclaimer markup, this supports investigating unclear review criteria, but does not establish that criteria are unavailable through other channels or that this causes the recorded returns.

	Type	Source	Summary
E13	Observation	campaign manager via C4: Campaign manager, C4: firsthand experience routing campaigns	The campaign manager corroborates waiting at director approval and legal review. This is a general firsthand account, not a dated campaign trace or a measurement of working hours.
E14	Observation	campaign manager via C4: Campaign manager, C4: general estimate of active work	The campaign manager estimates active campaign work separately from waiting. The estimate is not supported by campaign-level timing records and cannot establish how much turnaround is recoverable.
E15	Observation	campaign manager via C4: Campaign manager, C4: firsthand account of legal returns	The campaign manager reports repeated disclaimer revisions while the required wording is unclear to the production team. This supports a specific rework mechanism, but does not establish whether guidance exists elsewhere or how frequently this occurs.
E16	Observation	campaign manager via C4: Campaign manager, C4: explicit scope limitation	The account does not supply the requested recent approval histories, reasons for director involvement, chasing responsibilities or authority limits.
E17	Observation	Manager via C5: Manager, C5: description of available tracker reporting	The manager cannot supply the requested group breakdown from the available report. Campaign-mix differences remain untested; this is not evidence that all campaign groups have deteriorated equally.
E18	Fact (record)	Manager via C5: Manager, C5: reproduced aggregate tracker comparison; duplicate of E6 and E7	The manager reproduces the same tracker figures already recorded in E6 and E7. They support the existing director-approval waiting finding but provide neither independent corroboration nor new evidence about campaign comparability. Legal-review elapsed time still combines waiting, active review and repeated rounds.
E19	Observation	legal counsel via C6: Legal counsel, C6: scope of available evidence	Counsel supplies aggregate information rather than the requested recent review-slot account. This does not establish whether other work displaced a scheduled marketing review.
E20	Fact (record)	legal counsel via C6: Legal counsel, C6: reproduced legal-review queue record	This repeats the queue record in E9, not an independent measurement. It establishes elapsed time to first comments and submission returns, but not active review time or reasons for return.
E21	Observation	legal counsel via C6: Legal counsel, C6: firsthand account of review availability	Counsel confirms that marketing and claims share the same reviewer, with marketing review restricted to Thursdays. This repeats E8 rather than independently corroborating it.
E22	Observation	legal counsel via C6: Legal counsel, C6: firsthand account of disclaimer review	Counsel repeats the changed disclaimer requirement and case-by-case application already reported in E11. The additional necessary work remains unquantified.
E23	Observation	legal counsel via C6: Legal counsel, C6: firsthand account of review guidance	Counsel again reports no written marketing checklist. This repeats E12 and is consistent with the campaign manager's account of guessing disclaimer wording and receiving repeated returns.
E24	Observation	Manager via C7: Manager, C7: description of evidence available	The manager supplies recollections of operational reporting, not the requested scorecard or performance-review records. This does not establish that those records or incentives do not exist.
E25	Observation	Manager via C7: Manager, C7: operational reporting recalled from memory	The manager recalls an approval queue and a typical waiting interval. The population, timing definition and underlying records are unspecified. This is consistent with approval waiting but cannot be directly compared with the tracker's director-approval median.
E26	Observation	Manager via C7: Manager, C7: operational reporting recalled from memory	The recalled completion counts repeat the earlier output comparison rather than provide independent evidence. They do not measure incoming demand or establish what performance is rewarded.
E27	Observation	Manager via C7: Manager, C7: scope and limitations of supplied information	The manager explicitly identifies the reporting-period mismatch and confirms that the supplied information does not answer the incentives question. H11 remains open.

	Type	Source	Summary
E28	Observation	Manager via C7: Manager, C7: firsthand account of approval responsibilities and availability	The manager describes a centralized approval remit and substantial meeting demand. The account does not establish whether the spending threshold also applies to creative approvals, whether these are the director approvals recorded in the tracker, or whether meetings cause the waiting. Busyness alone does not establish an execution effect.
E29	Observation	Manager via C8: Manager, C8: scope of supplied approval evidence	The supplied record covers an aggregate three-month period, not the requested recent decisions. It cannot identify the causes of individual approval waits.
E30	Fact (record)	Manager via C8: Manager, C8: reproduced workflow approval log	The approval log directly records recurring director-approval waiting and Friday batch decisions. It does not establish that batching caused the waits or that all items were campaigns.
E31	Observation	Manager via C8: Manager, C8: firsthand account of approval remit	The manager clarifies that the spending threshold does not exempt low-spend creative from their approval. They report that this creative-approval remit dates from removal of the management layer. This does not establish whether another person has delegated approval authority.
E32	Observation	Manager via C8: Manager, C8: firsthand context and explicit evidence limits	The manager reports meeting demand but explicitly cannot link it to the pending decisions or identify alternative approvers. Meeting load alone does not establish an execution effect.