

DELIVERABLES GALLERY

Examine what the supplier will actually produce

These four original fictional miniatures concern one disputed customer-change approval. They illustrate outputs and review questions, not consultant results or contract terms.

Output miniature	What a buyer can examine	What it does not establish
Recommendation: compare three permitted approval records and accounts from the requesting and receiving roles. Two records omit the authorized approver. Recommend clarifying that boundary before buying a course.	Is the sample stated? Are observations separated from interpretation? Which alternatives were considered?	A supported recommendation can still require the sponsor's decision. It does not independently establish the cause of all delays.
Facilitated agreement: the requesting role supplies the approved change reference; the receiving role confirms whether required information is present; unresolved authority goes to the authorized sponsor.	Who participated? Who could approve the agreement? What remains disputed or outside their authority?	A documented conversation does not amend policy or prove that the agreement works in daily work.
Implementation plan: confirm the boundary, prepare the receiving role, try one permitted handoff, record the response and review the attempt with the process owner.	Is each prerequisite real? Who does the work? What happens if the practice opportunity does not occur?	A dated plan does not show implementation or business improvement.
Operating tool: a request record showing work reference, decision needed, authorized owner, due point, response and remaining question.	Can intended users understand it and use it in the approved workflow? What existing record does it replace or supplement?	A completed field does not prove the receiving role accepted the work or that an exception is safe to release.

Read alongside: [Delivery and acceptance](#).

DELIVERY INSPECTION RECORD

Turn the sample into a reviewable requirement

For each proposed output, complete the fields below with the supplier. Use the actual agreement and review owner; this sheet does not determine contractual acceptance.

Output, purpose and intended user

Example or sample supplied, version and scope

Provider work included and internal prerequisites

What the authorized reviewer will examine

What this output cannot prove

Open clarification, owner and next review

PROPOSAL WARNING SIGNS

Ask for clarification before drawing a conclusion

An unclear proposal is a reason to ask specific questions. These cards are not findings about any named provider.

Wording or omission	Useful clarification	Keep the answer visible
"Transform accountability" with no reviewable output	Show one deliverable, intended users and the review process.	Output and review owner, not only the supplier's aspiration.
Guaranteed operating result before investigation	What evidence and conditions support the claim? What alternatives remain possible?	Assumptions and claim still unverified.
Senior presenter, unnamed delivery team	Who will perform discovery, facilitation and follow-up, and what availability is confirmed?	Actual roles, contributors and substitutions still provisional.
Low fee with unstated internal contribution	What preparation, practice, coverage and sponsor time must we supply?	Scope-matched provider fee, internal effort and exclusions.
"Ongoing support" without a boundary	Which activities, access, duration and charges are included?	Defined support and what needs another agreement.
Materials promised without usable access terms	Which formats can authorized internal users retain and use, and where will access continue?	The actual agreed permissions and unresolved questions.
A success story without comparable context	What work, contribution, evidence and limits can be substantiated appropriately?	Case context and remaining uncertainty, not an assumed average result.

Decision after clarification

Use your approved selection process. Record whether the response resolves a required question, changes the scope or leaves a material uncertainty. A score should not conceal missing requirements.

REFERENCE CONVERSATION RECORD

Check relevance and support for a claim

Use a permission-cleared conversation or other appropriately cleared evidence. Do not request private personnel, client or commercial records. The guide linked below already supplies the core reference questions.

Fictional reference response	Interpretation for the new buyer
"We used the same handoff record in two departments. Our sponsor settled the approval boundary before the workshop."	Potentially relevant work example. The sponsor's prior decision is a condition to compare with our own setting.
"I noticed fewer follow-up questions, but we also changed the request system and did not keep a comparable baseline."	Useful reported experience, not an isolated effect of the consultant or a supported percentage reduction.
"The internal owner continued the review. I cannot share private records, but can describe the routine and our contribution."	Respect that limit. Ask a permitted follow-up about what was retained. Do not mark a claimed business result independently verified.

Claim, source, permission and date of conversation

Comparable work, participants and internal conditions

What supports the account, and what remains unverified

Implication for our choice or next clarification

Read alongside: [Reference questions and confidentiality-safe alternatives](#).