EVIDENCE DESK / A METHOD IN FIVE ARTIFACTS

Policy is a promise. Practice is the test.

Policy-to-practice analysis for organizations facing consequential change.

Read the rule. Follow the consequence.

Connect the intended benefit to the written obligation, decision-maker, cost allocation, and correction route. Translate the analysis into tools people can understand and use.

01 ### The source register

Know which layer of the record supports each claim.

02 ### The change matrix

Distinguish a new duty, discretion, relocation, and an unresolved gap.

03 ### The accountability map

Trace permission through performance and correction.

04 ### The annotated clause

Separate what the wording supports from interpretation and inquiry.

05 ### The decision brief

Name the choice, options, evidence, and next action.

SAMPLE STATUS

These are fresh illustrative samples of an analytical method. Identities, places, source titles, dates, section numbers, and original records have been withheld.

WORK SAMPLE / 01

The source register

A citation is useful only when the source's status and limits travel with it.

REFERENCE	SOURCE LAYER	WHAT IT SUPPORTS
S-01	Strategic intent Adopted goal	The benefit the policy is meant to deliver. A goal alone does not establish an enforceable duty.
S-02	Existing rule Baseline to verify	What is required now. Check amendments and incorporated controls.
S-03	Proposed text Version to confirm	The language under consideration. A draft is a proposal, not an adopted rule.
S-04	Companion control Applicability to trace	Where another safeguard may operate. A moved rule needs a destination and effective date.
S-05	Implementation record Gap in this sample	How a duty is applied and checked. A missing record is a question to resolve.

THE READING RULE

Keep the promise, current obligation, proposed change, and predicted result in separate columns.

Add the controlling version, source location, access status, and verification limits in a live engagement. These sample references deliberately do not link to original case records.

WORK SAMPLE / 02

The change matrix

Read the change across the whole system. A shorter document can still carry a substantial policy choice.

ISSUE	ILLUSTRATIVE CHANGE	QUESTION TO RESOLVE
Evidence duty	Current: must provide an impact statement. Proposed: reviewer may request one.	What triggers the request, and how is the reason recorded?
Continuing protection	A safeguard moves to companion controls. Retention, scope, and timing require verification.	Where is the duty now, when does it apply, and who enforces it?
Cost allocation	A capacity report is required. The sample wording does not assign upgrade costs.	Who pays, under what binding mechanism, and what remains uncertain?

WHAT THE MATRIX MAKES VISIBLE

Label editorial changes, substantive choices, retained protections, relocated protections, and unresolved evidence separately.

A retained provision is not a new rollback. A relocated safeguard needs its controlling destination. A projected benefit needs a measure. These distinctions keep the analysis proportionate to its evidence.

WORK SAMPLE / 03

The accountability map

Follow a permission from approval to performance - and from a failed promise to a correction.

01	02	03	04	05
Permission	**Evidence**	**Decision**	**Performance**	**Correction**
What becomes possible?	What must be shown?	Who decides, with what reasons?	Who checks the continuing duty?	What happens when it fails?

ROLE	ACCOUNTABILITY TO TRACE
Permission holder	Responsible for stated duties, evidence, and assigned costs.
Decision-maker	Responsible for the determination, conditions, reasons, and review record.
Affected people	Need usable information, a route to raise evidence, and a defined correction process.

THE TEST

Can someone trace the benefit, obligation, responsible party, measure, and remedy without relying on an unwritten assurance?

A conceptual map of generic roles. Scope the applicable authority and review process in the actual engagement.

WORK SAMPLE / 04

The annotated clause

An obligation to submit a plan and an obligation to fund it are different commitments.

ILLUSTRATIVE WORDING / S-03

The project owner **must submit** a continuity plan. The reviewer **may require** dedicated funding.

TEXT	The sample requires a plan and gives the reviewer discretion over funding.
INTERPRETATION	A plan alone may leave delivery dependent on resources that are not secured by this clause.
OPEN QUESTION	What criteria trigger dedicated funding, and who carries the cost if the owner cannot deliver?

A PRECISE REQUEST

Identify the binding funding mechanism, the responsible party, and the review route. If another rule supplies them, show the exact destination.

Illustrative wording; generic reference. No original clause or project-specific finding.

WORK SAMPLE / 05

The decision brief

Give the reader a clear choice, the evidence needed to make it, and a specific next step.

THE DECISION

Which evidence duty and accountability route should the policy require?

EVIDENCE STATUS	DECISION IMPLICATION
What the sample supports	The proposed wording shifts an evidence requirement to reviewer discretion.
What remains open	Whether companion controls restore the duty, and how the discretion will be exercised.

OPTIONS TO EXAMINE

1. Retain a mandatory evidence duty.
2. Use discretion with published triggers and written reasons.
3. Verify equivalent scope and timing in companion controls.

> THE NEXT ACTION
>
> Request the controlling version, complete the rule crosswalk, assign an answer owner, and publish the response before the decision point.

The question beneath the work

What do people need to understand, ask, decide, or do differently when this policy becomes real? Pair technical clarity with practice around that moment.