D3 / FINAL REVIEW / 20 APRIL 2027

A return needs a route. And a named next owner.

Prepared by Nina Solis, Caldris Advisory, for Owen Mercer and the Maren House operations team.

20 / 20	19 / 20	1
Pilot cases had an owner	Complete at first check	Held for missing evidence

Recommendation

Retain the four-field intake routine at the existing site for a further 30 days. Keep the hold rule and daily exception review. Defer software expansion until the operating evidence is stronger.

Basis: RET-120, INT-01, INT-02, WS-02 and PILOT-20. All evidence is synthetic. No measured financial benefit is claimed.

01 / BASELINE

The gaps overlap. Count them once.

20%
Missing owner

30%
Missing photo evidence

40%
At least one of the two

Baseline measure	Result	What it means
Named-owner gap	24 / 120	The sampled record did not identify the next owner.
Condition-evidence gap	36 / 120	Required photo evidence not recorded as present.
Overlap	12 / 120	Subtract this overlap when counting unique affected cases.
Decision duration	Median 11 days	Elapsed decision time; not staff effort.
Handling effort	4,500 minutes / 75 hours	Recorded processing time across the 120 records.

Unique affected cases = 24 + 36 − 12 = 48. The sample does not prove why any individual delay occurred.

02 / OPERATING DESIGN

One intake record. Four clear routes.

Step	Owner	Required evidence / action
1 / Receive	Returns team	Traceable case ID and condition-evidence status.
2 / Triage	Named returns owner	Choose resale, refurbish, vendor credit or recycle under existing policy.
3 / Hold exceptions	Tom Ives	Hold incomplete records; safety concerns use the existing escalation route.
4 / Review daily	Tom + Leah	Check overdue next actions and return blocked cases only after evidence is complete.

Decision rights

The routine makes ownership explicit. It does not authorise a refund, safety release or supplier claim. Maren retains those permissions and controls. Caldris recommends the workflow and records the evidence.

Why this design

INT-01 describes split evidence and a shared queue. INT-02 identifies a usable hold area and daily review. WS-02 confirms the four existing routes. The design responds to those observations without adding an untested system.

03 / PILOT RESULTS

The exception was visible before release.

95%	100%	0
First-check completeness	Named owner coverage	Recorded unsafe releases

What happened

P-07 lacked condition evidence at its first check. Tom placed it on hold, requested the missing photo and rechecked it before release. The other 19 records met the intake requirements at first check. All 20 had a named next owner.

What this supports

The synthetic pilot demonstrates the intended control sequence and exception handling. It does not prove a cycle-time reduction, cash saving or general safety outcome. Historic and pilot samples differ, and the pilot has only 20 cases.

Keep the measurement honest

Report adherence and exceptions first. Measure a fresh 40-case sample after 30 days before deciding whether wider rollout is justified.

04 / NEXT 30 DAYS

Close the engagement. Keep ownership clear.

Action	Owner	Due	Completion evidence
Maintain daily exception check	Tom Ives	From 26 Apr	Named owner and next check on every held case
Review 40 fresh cases	Leah Grant	21 May	Completeness and exception summary with source IDs
Decide continue / revise / stop	Owen Mercer	24 May	Written decision using the new sample
Review software need	Owen + Leah	After 24 May	Specific unresolved constraint, not a generic automation brief

Handover boundary

Caldris supplies the routing guide, data dictionary, pilot register and final report. Owen’s authored acceptance is dated 22 April; handover is held 23 April. The residual operating actions remain with Maren and do not extend the consultancy automatically.