

creatorhq.

THE COMPLETE FREE WORKBOOK

Clear updates. Real commitments.

Three complete messages.
Keep the facts intact.

Requested is not confirmed.

Status, delay and correction / Recipient checks / Ten worked answers

EDITION 2.0 / SEPTEMBER 2026

A practical workbook, not a promise of results.

Inside the workbook

Turn a fictional event brief into useful client updates, separate pending requests from confirmed facts and verify the correction reaches its recipient.

1. Establish what is actually agreed	3
2. Choose the recipient before the wording	4
3. Draft a useful status update	5
4. Explain a delay without inventing a rescue	6
5. Correct the record and verify the handoff	6
6. Ten checks and reference answers	7
Sources and next practice	8

How to use this workbook

Turn an uncertain event update into a message the client can act on. This complete free workbook includes a fictional brief, three finished messages, a correction trail, a reusable drafting prompt and ten reference answers. Nothing in the exercise requires a paid AI account, an email address or access to another workbook.

Edition 2.0. Reviewed September 18, 2026. All names, messages and events below are invented. The event date is in the future only to make the practice packet easy to follow; it is not a real booking. Dates and times use UTC throughout. Adapt communication procedures to your own approved service agreements. This is an administrative exercise, not legal or emergency-response advice.

1. Establish what is actually agreed

The planner, Morgan, is preparing the Harbor Small-Business Showcase for client owner Avery. It is October 20 at 12:00 UTC. A polished sentence is not evidence that an arrangement exists. Separate an approved fact, a request and an unanswered question before asking AI to write anything.

The six-fact source packet

ID	Confirmed fact	Evidence in this fictional packet
F1	Event is October 24, 18:00-21:00 UTC	Brief B3, approved by Avery October 18
F2	One room at Harbor Hall is booked	Venue confirmation H7, October 18
F3	Current approved guest count is 60	Brief B3; no automatic headcount buffer
F4	Catering service is scheduled for 19:00	Caterer confirmation C2, October 19
F5	Avery alone approves cost and scope changes	Approval register A1
F6	Morgan must send the next status update by October 21, 12:00	Communication plan P1

The packet contains two requests, neither approved. Request Q1 asks for 72 guests instead of 60. Morgan needs venue capacity confirmation, catering availability, a revised quote and Avery's approval before changing the guest count. Request Q2 asks whether a backup caterer is available. Morgan has sent an availability enquiry but received no acceptance or quote. There is no standby contract, replacement booking or price guarantee.

Requested does not mean confirmed. The current approved guest count remains 60.

Do not add twelve extra meals just because the larger number appears in the latest message. Recency does not establish authority. Keep the request visible without silently replacing the baseline. For this exercise, Q1 and Q2 both have an owner, Morgan, and a review time of October 21 at 10:00. That review time is a planner task, not a promise that suppliers will respond by then.

2. Choose the recipient before the wording

A single master document may contain information that different recipients should never receive. Create a client-facing summary separately from the restricted operating file. The fictional permission register below is part of the exercise, not a claim that a software setting guarantees confidentiality.

Recipient	Authorized material	Excluded material
Avery, client owner	Status, costs and approval requests	Other clients' details
Casey, client assistant	Approved event time and guest count	Supplier prices and change approval
Caterer lead	Approved service time and approved aggregate meal counts	Full guest list and unrelated supplier contacts
Morgan, planner	Operating packet for this event	Unrelated client records

Use aliases in an AI exercise. Do not paste real guest names, contact lists, accessibility requests or payment details into an unapproved service. For a real event, your organization must decide what processing and sharing are permitted. This workbook provides no blanket permission to upload information.

Google Drive distinguishes Viewer, Commenter and Editor access. Folder permissions can also affect the files within them. If you use Drive, inspect both the file and its parent folder; do not assume a restrictive-looking file label overrides broader inherited access. A viewer may be able to download by default. These are reasons to minimize what you include, not merely to choose a different role. See the [official sharing reference](#).

A reusable message record

Record: message ID; source version; purpose; named recipient; excluded information; decision requested; decision owner; response deadline; planner's next action; reviewer; send time; delivery evidence; acknowledgement evidence. Leave a field unknown when there is no evidence. A send receipt is not the recipient's agreement.

For the first update: M1 / B3 / status and two pending requests / Avery / no guest-level data / no immediate approval requested / Avery owns later changes / next update October 21 at 12:00 / Morgan checks suppliers at 10:00 / Morgan reviews / not sent yet / unknown / unknown.

3. Draft a useful status update

The client needs a short baseline, the unresolved issues and the next action. They do not need a paragraph of unsupported reassurance. Draft in plain language. Use exact dates instead of "tomorrow" when the message may be forwarded or read in another time zone.

Finished message M1: status

Subject: Harbor Showcase - confirmed details and two pending requests

Hi Avery,

The current plan is Harbor Hall, October 24, 18:00-21:00 UTC, with 60 approved guests and catering at 19:00.

The request to increase attendance to 72 is still pending. I am checking the venue capacity, catering availability and revised cost; I will send those details for your approval before changing the plan.

I have also asked a backup caterer about availability. No backup booking or price is confirmed. I will review both requests on October 21 at 10:00 and send your next status update by 12:00 UTC that day, even if an answer is still outstanding.

No action is required from you until I provide the proposed changes. Morgan

Drafting prompt you can reuse

Use the supplied fact packet and recipient permissions only. Draft an update to the named client owner. Separate confirmed facts from pending requests. Preserve every date, time, count and approval owner. State the planner's next action without promising a supplier response. Do not invent a backup, discount, capacity, guarantee or automatic follow-up. After the draft, list the fact IDs supporting each factual sentence and every unresolved question. Do not send anything.

The expected support map is F1-F4 for the baseline; Q1 and F5 for the guest-count request; Q2 for the unconfirmed backup; F6 plus the stated review task for the next update. The greeting and sign-off need no factual source. If the model changes "asked" to "secured," reject that sentence even if it sounds more confident.

Try a second pass that shortens the message by a third without removing the pending status or the next update time. Compare both versions against the packet, not against each other. Two drafts can repeat the same invented claim.

4. Explain a delay without inventing a rescue

Now use a new, separate scenario. It is October 24 at 17:10. Caterer message C3 reports an estimated service start of 19:20 instead of 19:00 and explicitly says the estimate is not yet guaranteed. No revised timeline has been approved. The backup enquiry still has no acceptance. Morgan owns an immediate feasibility check and promises an update to Avery by 17:30. Do not carry this scenario back into the October 20 status message.

Finished message M2: delay notice

Subject: Catering timing change - decision pending

Hi Avery,

At 17:10 UTC the caterer reported an estimated 19:20 service start, twenty minutes later than the approved 19:00. That estimate is not yet confirmed.

I am checking the impact on the run sheet and whether the caterer can confirm a workable arrival and service sequence. No replacement caterer is booked. I have not changed the approved program or authorized additional costs.

I will update you by 17:30 UTC with the available options and any decision that needs your approval. If the supplier has not answered by then, I will state that clearly. Morgan

The message records the size of the change, the uncertainty and the next action. It does not say the event is "fully covered." If a real situation creates an immediate safety issue, use the responsible venue and emergency procedures; a drafting tool is not a substitute for them.

Before sending, check the proposed recipient and whether the client assistant also needs a limited operational update. Do not forward the entire internal discussion simply because the assistant is involved in the event. Prepare a separate message with only the authorized details.

5. Correct the record and verify the handoff

Return to October 20. In this alternative practice branch, Morgan mistakenly sent M0 at 12:05 saying "72 guests are confirmed and the backup is on standby." That conflicts with B3 and Q2. The error needs a direct correction, not a silent edit of the shared document.

Finished message M3: correction

Subject: Correction to my 12:05 Harbor Showcase update

Hi Avery,

My 12:05 message was incorrect on two points. The approved guest count is 60, not 72. The increase to 72 is a request awaiting capacity, catering and cost checks and your approval.

I also described a backup caterer as being on standby. I have only sent an availability enquiry; no backup booking or price is confirmed. Please use this correction in place of those two statements. The event remains October 24, 18:00-21:00 UTC at Harbor Hall.

Please acknowledge this correction so I can confirm we are working from the same information. Your next scheduled update remains October 21 by 12:00 UTC. I am sorry for the confusion. Morgan

Fictional handoff ledger at October 20, 13:00

Message	Sent	Delivery evidence	Recipient acknowledgement
M0, incorrect	12:05	Mail service accepted 12:05	None
M3, correction	12:15	Mail service accepted 12:15	Avery replied "understood" at 12:25
Limited assistant update	12:30	Mail service accepted 12:30	None

Two messages remain without acknowledgement; that does not mean they failed delivery. Only M3 has an explicit acknowledgement in the packet. Keep M0 in the audit trail marked superseded. Keep the receipt for M3 alongside it. If the message bounced, use a verified alternative contact route and record the result; do not mark the original as delivered merely because the alternative worked.

For reuse, copy the record fields from chapter 2. Add a "supersedes" field and a short reason for any correction. After the event, review which requests repeatedly lacked owners or evidence. Improve the intake form instead of asking AI to write increasingly forceful reminders. Measure response time from actual timestamps and define whose response counts before reporting a percentage.

6. Ten checks and reference answers

1. What count belongs in the October 20 baseline? **60**, supported by F3 and B3. The unapproved request is 72.
2. How many additional guests were requested? **12**, calculated as 72 minus 60. This is not permission to order twelve meals.
3. Who can approve scope or cost changes? **Avery**, under F5. Casey's access does not grant approval authority.
4. Is a backup booked? **No**. Q2 records an enquiry with no acceptance or quote.
5. What update is due even if suppliers do not respond? **October 21 by 12:00 UTC**. Morgan can report that an answer is outstanding.

6. What is the delay in the separate October 24 scenario? **20 minutes**, from 19:00 to the estimated 19:20.
7. May M2 promise service at 19:20? **No**. C3 explicitly labels that time an estimate.
8. What must be corrected in M0? **The confirmed count of 72 and the claimed standby backup**. The correct count is 60 and backup status is unconfirmed.
9. How many ledger messages have acknowledgement evidence? **One of three**, M3. Sending, mail-service acceptance and human acknowledgement are different states.
10. May the assistant receive the full supplier-cost packet? **No under this exercise's permission register**. Send only the authorized operational summary.

Complete the exercise once without AI, then compare an AI-assisted draft. Your acceptance test is factual accuracy, recipient fit and a clear next action. A friendly tone is valuable, but it cannot make an unsupported promise true.

Sources and next practice

- [Google Drive sharing permissions](#): roles and inherited sharing; checked September 18, 2026. The practice recipient register is original and separate from software permissions.
- [CreatorHQ AI Agent Workbench](#): optional companion practice for checking drafts; no tool subscription is required here.
- [CreatorHQ event timelines](#): separate member workbook for schedule arithmetic. Every communication exercise and answer in this workbook is already complete and free.