Give every handoff an owner.

Reconstructed professional example / generic workflow

At Statkraft, I worked on process modelling in ARIS and workshops with process owners. My earlier EY experience included business-process and internal-control work. This generic service-request example was reconstructed for the portfolio. It does not reproduce a Statkraft or EY process, client finding or internal document.

The question

A service team receives work through email and informal messages. Requests may move to delivery before the scope is complete. The demonstration asks how to make the normal path, decision points and exceptions explicit without adding unnecessary administration.

Illustrative current state

01	Request arrives
02	Coordinator asks for missing details
03	Team lead assigns work
04	Delivery starts
05	Scope questions return to the coordinator

How I would run discovery

Walk through one normal case and one exception with the process owner. Identify the trigger, required inputs, actual decisions, systems of record and handoffs. Separate observed steps from assumptions and proposed changes. Return the current-state map for validation before designing the future process.

Proposed future state

01	Capture request in one queue
02	Check required fields
03	Owner approves scope and priority
04	Assign delivery owner
05	Deliver and record acceptance

Keep exceptions visible

Incomplete request: return to the requester with missing fields and an owner. Urgent request: record who authorises an exception before work starts. Scope change: pause the affected commitment until the accountable owner accepts the change. No silent bypasses or automatic approvals.

Turn the map into a working agreement

Reconstructed professional example / generic workflow

Illustrative ownership and control register

Checkpoint	Accountable role	Evidence
Required inputs complete	Coordinator	Checklist in request record
Scope and priority agreed	Team lead	Approval and rationale
Delivery owner accepts	Delivery lead	Assigned owner and due date
Scope change accepted	Team lead	Change entry with decision
Work accepted and closed	Requester	Acceptance recorded

What should be automated

Required-field checks, routing rules and reminders are candidates for simple rules once responsibilities are agreed. AI may help draft a request summary, but a person should approve scope and priority. The map establishes what a system must support; it is not proof that any integration has been built.

What the client receives

A validated current-state map, a future-state map, a process narrative, an ownership/control register, an open-questions list and implementation requirements. A simple flow diagram is sufficient for this example; formal BPMN can be used where the client needs that notation.

Acceptance and measurement

Ask each owner to confirm their inputs, decision and output. Test the proposed workflow with a complete request, an incomplete request, an urgent request and a scope change. Then measure missing-input rework and unowned requests against a baseline. This portfolio does not claim historical reductions.

What this demonstrates

Connecting stakeholder discovery, process documentation and control awareness. The professional background is documented in career sources; the specific workflow, register and recommendations are newly reconstructed.