

From request to result

A practical guide to coordinated AI work

Teamwright

9 October 2026

ABSTRACT

People, AI agents, and connected tools work best when the outcome, context, and review points are clear. This fictional example demonstrates the Teamwright document style without making claims about a live workflow.

Work that people can follow

Teamwright is an AI workforce platform where people, AI agents, and connected tools work together. It brings conversations, tasks, workflows, shared knowledge, and approvals into one workspace, helping teams turn requests into usable results.

A request is the beginning. Useful work also needs relevant context, a visible owner, and a result that people can inspect. The example below shows how those pieces can connect.

Illustrative example. Names and content in this document are fictional. The sequence is a design example, not a promise of current product functionality.

An example: the weekly customer brief

A team wants a short brief covering customer feedback and open follow-up items. Riley asks for a draft. A research agent works from the sources supplied by the team. Morgan reviews the proposed result where the workflow requires it.



Illustrative workflow: request, context, execution, review where required, and result.

Define the outcome

Write a request people can evaluate: "Prepare a one-page customer brief with the main themes, supporting sources, and open questions." This makes the output and its boundaries clear.

Bring the right context

Include the source notes, the period covered, and the audience. The draft should cite the supplied material rather than filling gaps with invented facts.

Review the proposed result

Review facts and unresolved questions. An approval in this example applies to this output; it does not mean all actions across Teamwright require approval.

A clear working agreement

Responsibilities in this fictional example

STEP	RESPONSIBLE ACTOR	EXPECTED OUTPUT
Request	Riley, team member	Outcome, audience, source scope
Prepare	Research agent	Draft with source references
Review	Morgan, reviewer	Feedback or decision where required
Use	Team	Reviewed brief and next steps

What to check

1. The summary matches the source material.
2. Every material statement has support.
3. Unresolved information is labeled.
4. Proposed external actions identify the target and consequence.
5. A person can inspect the result without reading the entire activity history.

| *Good oversight starts with work people can understand.*

Example draft format

Outcome: Weekly customer brief
 Sources: Supplied notes, 5-9 October
 Owner: Riley
 Review: Morgan, where this workflow requires it
 Open questions: List missing information explicitly

A visible activity trail records observable actions. It is not a claim to expose private model reasoning. Use clear labels such as **Draft**, **Needs review**, and **Complete** rather than a color alone.¹

Put the result to work

A useful brief should make the next decision easier. It can contain a summary, supporting sources, and a short list of actions the team may consider.

Example decision: Morgan requests a source for one theme before the team uses the brief. The agent updates the draft and identifies the remaining open question.

For product information, see [Teamwright](#). This sample is an example of document styling and should not be published as a customer story.

¹ Status labels shown here are design examples. Validate vocabulary and state transitions against the application before implementation.