

Explained answers and review notes

Compare this reference with your saved attempt. Equivalent wording is acceptable when it preserves the sources, authority, scope and traceability. These are authored reference answers, not actual AI output or measured learner results.

The first review

Claim	Assessment	Reason and source
QUEUED to PENDING	Supported	SYN-01 v1 explicitly supplies this mapping.
SETTLED to COMPLETE	Supported	SYN-01 v1 explicitly supplies this mapping.
REJECTED to FAILED	Supported	SYN-01 v1 explicitly supplies this mapping.
HELD to FAILED	Unsupported	SYN-02 v1 proves HELD occurs. SYN-01 does not map it; SYN-04 records a suggestion, not approval.
Retry HELD three times	Unsupported	SYN-03 v1 concerns another operation. SYN-04 does not approve a retry rule.

The judgement that matters

Retain the three supported mappings for review. Reject the unsupported additions and ask for decisions. Before DEC-01, the absence of a HELD mapping does not establish that HELD must mean failure or manual review. The latter becomes supported only after the decision card arrives.

SYN-04 is useful because it shows where the unsupported additions came from. Meeting notes can faithfully record an unapproved suggestion. Accuracy of transcription and authority to decide are different checks.

Why this draft is not enough for delivery

A complete-looking mapping conceals unresolved behaviour. Formatting or confident prose does not make it safe to implement. Keep the gap visible rather than inventing a default.

Questions and decision authority

ID	Question and accountable route	State after DEC-01
Q-01	What must happen when the source state is HELD? Seek a decision from the authorised contract owner.	Answered within this slice by DEC-01.
Q-02	What retry policy, queue-failure behaviour and handling of other unexpected states apply? Route to operations and technical owners for an authorised decision.	Open. No decision or reliable expected outcome is supplied.

The decision record

Field	Reference entry
Decision	DEC-01 v1, later decision card
Authority	Contract owner explicitly authorised within the exercise
Rule	When the source state is HELD, emit no target payment_status and route the record to manual review. The review item must contain the source-record ID, original state and reason Unmapped legacy state.
Evidence	SYN-02 v1 shows HELD exists; DEC-01 supplies its treatment
Related work	Closes Q-01; supports R-02 v1 and T-04 to T-06
Limits	Does not close Q-02 or approve the learner requirement wording

On a real assignment, establish the authority basis and retain the actual decision record. The fictional card is not a reusable approval for another project. A project role, seniority or AI assertion alone is insufficient.

Do not hide the remaining gap

Use a handover note such as: The documented slice covers three approved mappings and the supplied HELD exception. Retry, queue-failure handling and other unexpected states await Q-02. Full implementation or release approval cannot be inferred from this exercise.

Requirements and expected checks

R-01 v1 Approved mapping set

The mapping service shall map QUEUED to PENDING, SETTLED to COMPLETE and REJECTED to FAILED.

Source: SYN-01 v1. Review status: Draft for review. Linked checks: T-01, T-02 and T-03.

R-02 v1 HELD exception

When the source state is HELD, the mapping service shall emit no target payment_status and shall create a manual-review item containing source-record ID, original state and reason Unmapped legacy state.

Sources: SYN-02 v1 and DEC-01 v1. Review status: Draft for review. Linked checks: T-04, T-05 and T-06.

ID and trace	Input or action	Expected outcome
T-01 / R-01 v1	PAY-001: QUEUED	payment_status PENDING
T-02 / R-01 v1	PAY-002: SETTLED	payment_status COMPLETE
T-03 / R-01 v1	PAY-003: REJECTED	payment_status FAILED
T-04 / R-02 v1	PAY-004: HELD is processed	No target payment_status is emitted; manual review is required.
T-05 / R-02 v1	Inspect the resulting review item	Contains PAY-004, HELD and reason Unmapped legacy state.
T-06 / R-02 v1	Process PAY-004 with source state HELD; inspect emitted target-status output	No payment_status value is emitted. PENDING, COMPLETE or FAILED each fails this check. Separately verify the review item through T-05.

All six checks: Not executed. PAY-001 to PAY-004 are invented test fixtures. T-06 asserts the absence of every target status, not only FAILED. It does not introduce an operator-blocking feature. Checks for Q-02 remain blocked because the expected behaviour has not been decided.

Keep the chain visible

Evidence or event	Analysis record	Downstream link
SYN-01 v1	Three approved mappings retained	R-01 v1 to T-01, T-02 and T-03
SYN-02 v1	HELD exists; its treatment unknown	Q-01 until DEC-01 is supplied
SYN-03 v1 and SYN-04 v1	Retry and failure proposals lack authority	Q-02 remains open; rejected DRAFT-01 assertions retained
DEC-01 v1	HELD manual-review treatment approved for the slice	Q-01 closed; R-02 v1 to T-04, T-05 and T-06

A usable change record

Event	Change and reason
First review	Preserve DRAFT-01 v0 and the first-attempt claim assessment. Reject the HELD mapping and retry rule; open Q-01 and Q-02.
Decision arrives	Add DEC-01 v1 with its authority and scope. Close Q-01 only. HELD-to-FAILED is now contradicted by DEC-01, rather than merely unsupported. The retry count remains unsupported and open under Q-02.
Revised deliverable	Retain R-01 v1. Add R-02 v1 and T-04 to T-06. Keep Q-02 visible in the handover.
Later real changes	If an authorised decision changes a requirement, record the old and new item versions and affected check IDs. This exercise supplies no further decision.

Using the toolkits

Capture notes and decisions in FSF-04; keep requirements in FSF-05 and checks in FSF-06. FSF-09 holds the mapping and FSF-11 connects the records. Complete users can use GOV-02 as the decision register; Starter users can retain the FSF-04 decision table. Use the same IDs and versions throughout. A populated link is not evidence that a requirement is correct or a test has passed.

Review AI assistance and learning

A sensible AI role

AI may split the draft into claims, organise notes, suggest questions or challenge the trace. It must not infer that a proposal was approved, invent a missing policy, select a retry count or mark a designed check as executed. A manual review should reach the same source boundaries.

How to assess an actual run

- Give the assistant the exact source versions and draft. Save the input and output references only in a permitted location.
- Compare each output claim and citation with the sources. Record accepted and rejected findings and why.
- Check omissions as well as hallucinations: a model can miss an unsupported rule while avoiding new claims.
- After DEC-01, check that the assistant closes Q-01 but keeps Q-02 open. Check requirement versions and designed-test status.
- Compare manual and assisted work only if both were actually performed. Record time, rework and defects using the same task and criteria; do not infer a speed benefit from one attractive output.

Evidence of a good attempt

The learner can explain why HELD-to-FAILED and three retries were unsupported, identify who must decide, use DEC-01 without widening it, link the resulting requirement to checks and describe what still blocks delivery. Exact wording, a score or an AI-generated polished answer is not the goal.

Apply the method to another brief

Use a small invented change request and separate observations from suggestions. Identify one claim that still needs a decision, record who can authorise it, and write a requirement only as far as the evidence permits. Keep the question open if no decision has been supplied.

Ask a peer to trace your requirement back to the evidence and forward to an acceptance check. Explain one decision without reading this reference. Record what was unclear and revise your work while keeping the original attempt. Do not use confidential project material for informal practice.