



RUNNING EXAMPLE

Following **incident #4** (error spike on 06/05, kill switch triggered), **Lendari** is building the action plan for its agent "**Margaux**". Led by **Camille Roussel** (DDAO — Delegated Decision Agent Officer).

OBJECTIVE

Turn an incident, audit or review into a concrete action plan: **identify root causes, define corrective and improvement actions, prioritize them (Effort × Impact)** and organize their follow-up through to closure.

## 1 🔍 CONTEXT & ROOT CAUSE

AGENT CONCERNED

Margaux — Tier 1 customer service

PERIOD COVERED

Week of 06/03 to 06/05/2026

TRIGGER

Incident #4 — error spike

DESCRIPTION OF THE TRIGGER

Error rate 2.3% > 2% threshold on 06/05 at 08:02. Kill switch armed (ACF-06), agent suspended for 40 min. Logged in the ACF-08 register.

ROOT CAUSE IDENTIFIED

Faulty catalog feed synchronization → false "item unavailable" responses returned to customers. No data freshness safeguard in place.

## 2 🔧 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS IDENTIFIED

ACTION	OWNER	DUE DATE	SUCCESS CRITERION	STATUS
Resync the catalog feed + freshness monitoring	IT / Ops	06/06	0 desync > 15 min	● Done
Prompt safeguard: check real-time availability before reply	C. Roussel	06/08	Error rate < 1%	● In progress
Lower kill switch alert threshold 2% → 1.5%	C. Roussel	06/09	Alert tested OK	● In progress
Replay 30 "false unavailable" cases in validation	L. Fontaine	06/10	100% replayed	● To do
Contact impacted customers (~10% gesture)	L. Fontaine	06/07	100% contacted	● Done

● Done   ● In progress   ● To do   ● Blocked — escalation required



LEVELOperational

DURATION45-60 min

USECorrection / improvement

TRACKToolkit

### 3 CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS

INITIATIVE	EXPECTED BENEFIT	OWNER	DUE DATE
Real-time dashboard: error rate + CSAT	Continuous visibility	IT / Ops	06/15
Systematize weekly review of the ACF-08 register	Early detection	C. Roussel	Recurring
Extend freshness safeguards to all feeds	Overall robustness	IT / Ops	06/30
Draft a reusable post-incident playbook	Greater responsiveness	C. Roussel	06/20

### 4 PRIORITIZATION — EFFORT × IMPACT MATRIX

IMPACT ↑

QUICK WINS  
High impact · Low effort

Prompt safeguard

1.5% threshold

MAJOR PROJECTS  
High impact · High effort

Dashboard

Safeguards on all feeds

IF TIME ALLOWS  
Low impact · Low effort

Post-incident playbook

AVOID  
Low impact · High effort

EFFORT →

TOP 3 PRIORITIES

High impact, reasonable effort.

1

Real-time prompt safeguard — availability check before reply

2

Lower kill switch threshold 2% → 1.5%

3

Real-time dashboard for error rate + CSAT



**RUNNING EXAMPLE**

A plan is only as good as its follow-up: indicators, review frequency and validation by the **DDAO**.

PAGE 3/3

## 5 FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION

REVIEW FREQUENCY

Daily (W1) then weekly

NEXT REVIEW SCHEDULED

06/12/2026

FOLLOW-UP OWNER

Camille Roussel (DDAO)

FOLLOW-UP INDICATORS

Error rate < 1% · CSAT ≥ 4.2 / 5 · 0 catalog desync > 15 min · % of corrective actions completed (target 100% by 06/12).

## 6 VALIDATION

ACTION PLAN OWNER

Léa Fontaine · Customer Service  
Lead

DDAO

Camille Roussel

DATE

06/06/2026

### ✓ BEST PRACTICES

- ✓ SMART actions: one single owner, one due date
- ✓ Measurable success criterion for each action
- ✓ Address the root cause, not only the symptom
- ✓ Regular review until full closure

### ⚠ WATCH-OUTS

- ! Action with no due date or owner = dead action
- ! Too many simultaneous actions: prioritize
- ! Fixing the symptom without the root cause
- ! No follow-up = no real improvement

**Next steps:** log closed actions to the **ACF-08** register, adjust supervision with **ACF-05**, and revise the **ACF-12** **mandate** if thresholds or scope have changed.