

CLEAR Review & Learning Guide

A practical agenda for reviewing an outcome as a decision, not a status report.

Created by Anshul Lalit and Ania Mendoz | Free to use | CC BY-SA 4.0

Working release 0.1. Use for structured practice and review. This resource does not replace domain obligations or establish that CLEAR has completed cross-industry validation.

THE REVIEW CONTRACT

A review is useful only if evidence can change a decision.

Agree the decision owner, participants, evidence cut-off, material guardrails, and available decisions before the meeting. Invite affected stakeholders and domain specialists in proportion to the consequence, uncertainty, and professional obligations.

Decision owner	Who can continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, or retire?
Evidence owner	Who can explain provenance, definitions, missingness, and limitations?
Affected voice	Who experiences benefit, burden, exclusion, or unintended effects?
Domain review	Which safety, legal, clinical, engineering, security, accessibility, or other expertise is mandatory?
Decision record	Where will the evidence, disagreement, decision, rationale, and next trigger be retained?

60-MINUTE REVIEW AGENDA

00-05 / Reconfirm	Read the outcome, scope, horizon, objective, guardrails, and decision to be made.
05-15 / Evidence quality	Check definitions, baseline, coverage, missingness, changes in method, and known limitations.
15-25 / Outcome pattern	Examine primary and supporting evidence, distribution, qualitative evidence, and counter-evidence.
25-35 / Contribution	Challenge assumptions, alternative explanations, external context, and the influence of interventions.
35-45 / Responsibility	Review guardrails, unintended effects, gaming responses, burdens, and excluded groups.
45-55 / Decide	Select an allowed decision, name required action and authority, and record dissent.
55-60 / Commit	Confirm owner, timing, evidence changes, next review, and immediate escalation.

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

Inspect the evidence before interpreting the result.

- Has the indicator definition, population, source, collection method, or baseline changed?
- What is missing, delayed, estimated, manually classified, or vulnerable to reclassification?
- Does the evidence represent the outcome or merely activity, output, compliance, or documentation?
- What does the distribution show across groups, sites, assets, channels, severities, or operating modes?
- What qualitative evidence helps interpret meaning, experience, implementation, or causality?
- What observation would contradict progress, and did reviewers actively look for it?
- Could teams improve the measure while the intended condition worsens?

CONTRIBUTION QUESTIONS

- Which intervention or contextual change plausibly contributed, through what mechanism?
- Which critical assumption is most uncertain, and what evidence changed confidence in it?
- What alternative explanation could produce the same observed result?
- Did the owner have meaningful influence, or should accountability or escalation change?
- Which effects may appear later than the current review horizon?

Ask how success might be manufactured or displaced.

Gaming	Reclassification, denominator changes, clock stopping, selective inclusion, superficial completion, suppressed reporting.
Displacement	Work, cost, risk, delay, emissions, or burden moved to another team, group, supplier, channel, or period.
Exclusion	Complex cases, vulnerable groups, rare failure modes, or inconvenient evidence removed from scope.
Trade-off	Speed gained through poorer quality, safety, privacy, security, accessibility, equity, cost, or sustainability.
Lagging harm	Short-term improvement conceals recurrence, reversals, maintenance debt, fatigue, or delayed adverse effects.

ESCALATE IMMEDIATELY WHEN

- ☐ A non-negotiable legal, safety, clinical, security, or ethical obligation is breached
- ☐ The evidence plan cannot detect a foreseeable material harm
- ☐ The accountable owner lacks meaningful influence and no escalation route exists
- ☐ The measure is being manipulated or material results are being suppressed
- ☐ Affected stakeholders are exposed to new material burden without review

DECISION RECORD

Leave a traceable conclusion, not meeting minutes.

Decision	Continue / adapt intervention / revise evidence / revise outcome / escalate / pause / stop / retire
Evidence considered	
Evidence quality and limitations	
Assumptions strengthened or weakened	
Guardrail or unintended-effect findings	
Dissent or unresolved question	
Owner, action, and due date	
Next date or event trigger	

FACILITATION RULE

Do not convert uncertainty into false confidence. Record what is known, inferred, contested, and still unknown - then make the most responsible decision available.

SELECTED FOUNDATIONS

- OECD, Effective Results Frameworks for Sustainable Development (2024).
- UK Government, Magenta Book (updated 2026).
- NIST SP 800-55 Vol. 1, Measurement Guide for Information Security (2024).
- UK HSE HSG254, Developing Process Safety Indicators.
- See clearoutcomes.org/research for direct links and scope notes.