

DECISIONFLOW

Decision & Risk Register

Product decision history, planning assumptions, risk controls and phase gate

Phase 2 - Plan

Product	DecisionFlow
Document code	DF-P2-07
Version	2.0
Status	Final Public Portfolio Edition — Historical Planning Baseline
Author	Min Thu Kyaw
Date	July 2026

Evidence statement

This public portfolio edition distinguishes actual evidence, assumed continuity steps, simulated case-study outcomes, targets, and recommendations. Simulated customers, commercial results, benchmarks, incidents, quotations, and later-lifecycle outcomes are illustrative and must not be interpreted as results from a live commercial product. Evidence labels are retained throughout the package to support transparent and responsible interpretation.

Document Control

Purpose	Preserve the rationale behind major decisions, make uncertainty explicit and govern readiness to enter development.
Primary audience	Product leadership, engineering leadership, AI/ML, security, delivery owners and stakeholders.
Related documents	All Phase 2 planning documents.
Review cadence	Update when scope, evidence, architecture, metrics or major decisions change.
Approval state	Historical phase-gate outcome: Conditional Go to Develop.

Revision History

Version	2.0	Owner	Change
1.0	July 2026	Min Thu Kyaw	Restructured Phase 2 planning package; consolidated and standardized source artifacts.

Contents

- 1. Product Decision Log
- 2. Planning Assumption Register
- 3. Integrated Risk Register
- 4. Phase Gate Review
- 5. Evidence-Based Gate Interpretation
- 6. Decision Review Triggers

Product Decision Log

Purpose

The Product Decision Log captures significant product, AI, UX, and technical decisions made during the Planning phase.

Its purpose is to:

- Document the reasoning behind important decisions.
- Maintain historical context.
- Improve stakeholder alignment.
- Reduce repeated discussions.
- Support future roadmap decisions.

Every decision includes the problem, alternatives considered, rationale, expected impact, and review trigger.

Decision Framework

Each decision follows the structure below.

Field	Description
Decision ID	Unique identifier
Category	Product, AI, UX, Technical, Business
Decision	Final decision made
Alternatives	Other options considered
Rationale	Why this option was selected
Expected Impact	Anticipated outcome
Owner	Decision owner
Status	Final Public Portfolio Edition — Historical Planning Baseline

PD-001 — Product Positioning

Category

Product Strategy

Decision

DecisionFlow will position itself as an AI Decision Intelligence Platform rather than an AI meeting assistant.

Alternatives Considered

- AI Meeting Assistant
- AI Note-Taking Tool
- Meeting Summary Generator

Rationale

Decision intelligence focuses on customer outcomes rather than documentation, providing stronger differentiation.

Expected Impact

- Clear market positioning.
- Stronger value proposition.
- Better alignment with enterprise customers.

Status: Approved

PD-002 — MVP Scope

Category

Product

Decision

The MVP will focus on transcript upload and post-meeting analysis rather than live meeting assistance.

Alternatives Considered

- Live transcription
- Real-time meeting assistant
- Hybrid approach

Rationale

Transcript-based analysis reduces technical complexity while validating the primary customer problem.

Expected Impact

- Faster MVP delivery.
- Lower implementation risk.
- Better focus on core value.

Status: Approved

PD-003 — Human Review Workflow

Category

AI

Decision

All AI-generated decisions require user review before becoming organizational knowledge.

Alternatives Considered

- Automatic publishing
- Confidence-based auto approval
- Human approval

Rationale

User trust is more important than automation during the MVP stage.

Expected Impact

- Higher trust.
- Lower hallucination risk.

- Better AI feedback data.

Status: Approved

PD-004 — AI Model Strategy

Category

AI

Decision

Use a model-agnostic architecture with external LLM providers.

Alternatives Considered

- Single proprietary model
- Self-hosted open-weight model
- Multi-model routing

Rationale

A model-agnostic architecture minimizes vendor lock-in and allows future optimization.

Expected Impact

- Flexibility.
- Lower migration cost.
- Easier experimentation.

Status: Approved

PD-005 — Primary Success Metric

Category

Product Analytics

Decision

Use Verified Decisions Created per Active Team per Week as the North Star Metric.

Alternatives Considered

- Meetings Uploaded
- Monthly Active Users
- Action Items Created

Rationale

Verified decisions best represent customer value rather than feature usage.

Expected Impact

- Better product prioritization.
- Clear success measurement.
- Alignment across teams.

Status: Approved

PD-006 — Knowledge Storage Strategy

Category

Architecture

Decision

Store only approved AI outputs as organizational knowledge.

Alternatives Considered

- Store all AI outputs
- Store only transcripts
- Store approved outputs

Rationale

Separating AI drafts from verified knowledge improves search quality and user confidence.

Expected Impact

- Higher knowledge quality.
- Improved trust.
- Better long-term search results.

Status: Approved

PD-007 — Platform Strategy

Category

Product

Decision

Launch as a responsive web application.

Alternatives Considered

- Native mobile application
- Desktop application
- Web application

Rationale

Primary users complete post-meeting work on desktop devices. A web application accelerates validation while supporting future expansion.

Expected Impact

- Faster delivery.
- Lower development cost.
- Easier iteration.

Status: Approved

PD-008 — AI Output Format

Category

AI

Decision

Require structured JSON responses from the LLM.

Alternatives Considered

- Free-form text
- Markdown
- Structured JSON

Rationale

Structured outputs improve validation, persistence, analytics, and integration reliability.

Expected Impact

- Fewer parsing errors.
- Better automation.
- Cleaner downstream processing.

Status: Approved

PD-009 — Search Strategy

Category

Product

Decision

Search only approved decisions during the MVP.

Alternatives Considered

- Search transcripts
- Search AI drafts
- Search approved decisions

Rationale

Users primarily want trusted organizational knowledge, not unverified AI suggestions.

Expected Impact

- Higher search quality.
- Reduced confusion.
- Better information retrieval.

Status: Approved

Decision Register Summary

ID	Decision	Category	Status
----	----------	----------	--------

ID	Decision	Category	Status
PD-001	Product Positioning	Product	Approved
PD-002	MVP Scope	Product	Approved
PD-003	Human Review Workflow	AI	Approved
PD-004	Model Strategy	AI	Approved
PD-005	North Star Metric	Analytics	Approved
PD-006	Knowledge Storage	Architecture	Approved
PD-007	Web-First Platform	Product	Approved
PD-008	Structured AI Output	AI	Approved
PD-009	Search Approved Knowledge	Product	Approved

Governance

Major product decisions will be reviewed when:

- Customer research contradicts assumptions.
- AI quality metrics fall below targets.
- Significant technical constraints emerge.
- Market conditions change.
- Enterprise customer requirements evolve.

Each revised decision will reference the previous version to preserve historical context.

Summary

The Product Decision Log documents the reasoning behind the most important planning decisions for DecisionFlow. By capturing alternatives, rationale, and expected outcomes, it creates transparency, supports future roadmap discussions, and provides a durable record of strategic thinking. This artifact strengthens collaboration across product, design, engineering, and AI teams while making future decisions more informed and consistent.

Planning Assumption Register

ID	Assumption	Impact if false	Validation approach	Priority
PA-01	Target users will upload or paste transcripts before integrations exist	Low activation	Prototype and pilot onboarding	Critical
PA-02	Decision and action extraction creates more value than summaries alone	Weak differentiation	Concept tests and workflow comparison	Critical
PA-03	Mandatory review is acceptable for important outputs	Review abandonment	Usability testing and review-time analysis	High
PA-04	Approved decision search drives repeat use	Low retention	Pilot search tasks and cohort usage	High

ID	Assumption	Impact if false	Validation approach	Priority
PA-05	Representative AI quality can reach release thresholds	Core feasibility risk	Annotated evaluation dataset and holdout testing	Critical
PA-06	Inference cost supports a viable SaaS model	Poor unit economics	Cost-per-meeting instrumentation and pricing tests	High
PA-07	Product/engineering teams are a viable beachhead	Slow acquisition	Recruitment, interviews and beta commitments	High

Integrated Risk Register

ID	Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation / control	Owner	Trigger
R-01	Hallucinated or unsupported decision	Medium	High	Evidence spans, schema checks, mandatory approval	AI lead	Hallucination > threshold
R-02	Important decisions missed	Medium	High	Recall evaluation, ambiguity labels, user feedback	AI lead	Recall below gate
R-03	Cross-tenant data exposure	Low	Critical	Tenant authorization, tests and threat model	Engineering	Any isolation failure
R-04	Review fatigue	Medium	High	Prioritized queue, bulk actions, save progress	Product/UX	Review abandonment rises
R-05	Inference cost or latency too high	Medium	High	Async processing, routing and token controls	Engineering/AI	Cost or p95 exceeds budget
R-06	Weak pilot adoption	Medium	High	Focused onboarding and customer success cadence	Product	Activation/retention below floor
R-07	Scope creep	Medium	High	MVP freeze and decision-log approval	Product	Unplanned features enter sprint
R-08	Provider outage or model regression	Medium	High	Retries, abstraction, regression suite and fallback	Engineering/AI	Failure or quality regression
R-09	Privacy or retention mismatch	Medium	Critical	Consent, deletion propagation and provider controls	Security/Product	Customer or legal requirement unmet

Phase Gate Review and Go/No-Go Decision

Purpose

The Phase Gate Review is the final checkpoint of the Planning phase. Its purpose is to verify that DecisionFlow has sufficient strategic alignment, reviewed requirements, technical readiness, and organizational support before entering the Develop phase.

Rather than approving feature completion, this review evaluates whether the team has reduced uncertainty enough to begin implementation with confidence.

Phase Objective

The objective of Phase 2 was to transform the product concept into a draft executable delivery plan.

Success is measured by answering the following questions:

- Do we know what we are building?
- Do we know why customers need it?
- Do we know how success will be measured?
- Do we know how it will be built?
- Is the team aligned on priorities and execution?

Gate Review Categories

The review evaluates readiness across six dimensions:

- Product Strategy
- User Experience
- AI Readiness
- Engineering Readiness
- Business Readiness
- Delivery Readiness

Product Strategy Review

Checklist Item	Status
Product Vision Approved	Needs evidence
Product Strategy Approved	Needs evidence
Product Requirements Document Complete	Needs evidence
MVP Scope Defined	Needs evidence
Success Metrics Defined	Needs evidence
North Star Metric Established	Needs evidence
Roadmap Approved	Needs evidence

Outcome

The product direction is clearly defined and aligned with business objectives.

User Experience Review

Checklist Item	Status
Information Architecture Complete	Needs evidence
User Flows Validated	Needs evidence

Checklist Item	Status
Interactive Prototype Available	Needs evidence
Core User Journey Reviewed	Needs evidence
MVP Workflow Confirmed	Needs evidence

Outcome

The end-to-end user experience has been designed in an interactive prototype and remains scheduled for representative usability testing.

AI Readiness Review

Checklist Item	Status
AI Strategy Approved	Needs evidence
Prompt Strategy Defined	Needs evidence
Output Schema Finalized	Needs evidence
Human Review Workflow Designed	Needs evidence
Evaluation Metrics Defined	Needs evidence
AI Quality Targets Established	Needs evidence

Outcome

The plan defines measurable AI quality standards and a proposed evaluation process.

Engineering Readiness Review

Checklist Item	Status
Technical Architecture Approved	Needs evidence
Functional Requirements Complete	Needs evidence
Non-Functional Requirements Complete	Needs evidence
API Strategy Defined	Needs evidence
Data Model Identified	Needs evidence
Technical Risks Documented	Needs evidence

Outcome

The draft provides technical guidance for implementation and architecture review.

Business Readiness Review

Checklist Item	Status
Target Users Confirmed	Needs evidence
Value Proposition Validated	Needs evidence
Success Metrics Approved	Needs evidence
Pilot Customer Plan Defined	Needs evidence
Release Strategy Approved	Needs evidence

Outcome

Business objectives and customer validation plans are documented; pilot evidence remains outstanding.

Delivery Readiness Review

Checklist Item	Status
Product Backlog Prioritized	Needs evidence
Sprint Plan Prepared	Needs evidence
Definition of Ready Established	Needs evidence
Definition of Done Established	Needs evidence
Risk Register Completed	Needs evidence
Delivery Strategy Approved	Needs evidence

Outcome

The plan contains a prioritized draft backlog and an execution framework for delivery-team review.

Risk Assessment

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Status
AI accuracy below target	Medium	High	Human review and continuous evaluation	Mitigated
Scope creep	Medium	High	MVP scope freeze and backlog governance	Mitigated
Third-party AI service	Low	High	Provider abstraction and	Mitigated

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Status
outage			retry strategy	
Pilot adoption slower than expected	Medium	Medium	Customer onboarding and feedback program	Monitoring
Infrastructure cost growth	Medium	Medium	Usage monitoring and prompt optimization	Monitoring

Source Readiness Self-Assessment

Area	Weight	Score
Product Strategy	20%	20
User Experience	15%	15
AI Readiness	20%	19
Engineering Readiness	20%	19
Business Readiness	10%	10
Delivery Readiness	15%	15

Source self-assessment: 98 / 100 (unverified; evidence required)

Outstanding Items

The following items remain outstanding and require explicit ownership or acceptance:

- Collect additional interview data from pilot customers.
- Expand the AI evaluation dataset.
- Finalize branding and visual identity.
- Complete future integration specifications.
- Refine pricing and commercialization strategy.

These activities will continue alongside MVP development.

Go/No-Go Decision Matrix

Criteria	Result
Product strategy approved	Needs evidence
MVP scope agreed	Needs evidence
Technical architecture reviewed	Needs evidence
AI evaluation framework defined	Needs evidence
Product backlog prioritized	Needs evidence
Delivery plan approved	Needs evidence

Criteria	Result
Major risks documented	Needs evidence
Executive stakeholder alignment	Needs evidence

Decision

Conditional Go

DecisionFlow may move from the Plan phase to the Develop phase after outstanding evidence gates are satisfied or explicitly accepted.

The team has established:

- A defined customer problem hypothesis.
- A clearly defined MVP scope.
- A proposed measurable success framework.
- A reviewable technical architecture.
- A structured AI evaluation plan.
- A prioritized draft product backlog.
- A proposed delivery strategy.

Remaining uncertainties must be addressed through evidence-gated development and do not justify expanding scope.

Lessons Learned During Planning

The Planning phase produced several key insights:

- Customers value decision intelligence more than generic meeting summaries.
- Human review is essential for building trust in AI-generated outputs.
- Limiting MVP scope increases the likelihood of rapid validation.
- Success depends on measurable AI quality, not only feature delivery.
- Designing evaluation and governance early reduces implementation risk.

These learnings will guide prioritization and experimentation during development.

Exit Criteria

Phase 2 is considered complete when:

- All required planning artifacts are approved.
- Development backlog is ready for Sprint 0.
- Engineering environment setup begins.
- Design assets are available for implementation.
- AI evaluation benchmarks are prepared.
- Stakeholders approve the transition to development.

Handover to Phase 3 – Develop

The following deliverables are handed over to the development team:

- Product Requirements Document (PRD)
- Success Metrics Framework
- North Star Metric

- Product Strategy
- AI Strategy
- MVP Definition
- Product Backlog
- Functional & Non-Functional Requirements
- AI Evaluation Plan
- Information Architecture
- User Flows
- Interactive Prototype
- Technical Architecture
- Product Roadmap
- Delivery Strategy

These artifacts provide a draft blueprint for implementation review.

Summary

The Planning phase has organized the DecisionFlow product concept into a draft delivery plan. The package covers product strategy, AI planning, UX design, technical architecture, backlog definition and delivery preparation. With a conditional Go recommendation, DecisionFlow can enter Phase 3 - Develop only after the outstanding evidence gates are satisfied or explicitly accepted; remaining assumptions should then be tested through working software, iterative delivery and user feedback.

Evidence-Based Gate Interpretation

Current portfolio status

The source phase-gate checklist marks multiple areas complete. For an honest portfolio artifact, completion should mean that an evidence link exists: approved design, tested prototype, benchmark result, reviewed architecture, estimated backlog, recruited pilot or signed stakeholder decision. Unsupported checkmarks should be changed to Planned or In Review before external presentation.

Decision Review Triggers

- Customer evidence contradicts the current problem or beachhead assumptions.
- AI evaluation fails a release threshold or produces material regressions.
- Security, privacy, compliance or provider constraints change.
- MVP scope, success metric, data strategy or review policy changes.
- A roadmap expansion is proposed before its evidence gate is met.