

The four rounds, done properly

Copy from these. They are what a careful version of each job looks like.

1 • What the summary should have said

FAITHFUL SUMMARY

"Before publishing an urgent allegation, a designated reviewer must confirm the source record and separate what is verified, what is alleged and what is unknown. Use the minimum personal information necessary — consent to publish one fact is not consent to publish others. Approved digital tools may be used only after data is classified: Red information must never enter a public AI tool, and Amber requires approval and documented minimization. A fluent human must review every translation; machine translation is never the final step. Quotations, legal references, statistics, dates and titles must be checked against the authoritative source, and removed or qualified if they cannot be. The Communications Director approves routine statements; the Executive Director approves anything high-risk or naming a person or institution. If an error is published, we record it, correct it promptly, inform those affected, and review the workflow that allowed it."

It is longer	A faithful summary of a rule-based document usually is. That is not a failure
Every must survived	Go through the original and find each one
The conditions survived	"Must, unless" is not "must"
Nothing was added	No "generally", no "quietly"

2 • What the caption should have said

CORRECTED CAPTION

"The programme reached 412 of 500 planned participants, 82% of plan. Performance varied by site: Lensa, Bulcha and Anfaro all reached 90% or above, while the two Gudeta sites reached 52% and 51%. Mobile outreach reached 83%. No comparison with earlier periods is possible from this table."

The planted error	Mobile outreach is $58 \div 70 = 82.9\%$, printed as 74%. It made performance look worse , which is why nobody challenged it
Why it mattered	It made mobile outreach look like the weak site. The real problem is Gudeta. A decision taken on that caption cuts the wrong thing
76% versus 82%	76% is the average of the six percentages . 82% is the percentage of the totals ($412 \div 500$). Averaging percentages with different denominators is the commonest numerical error in programme reporting — Gudeta site 2, with 45 places, counts as much as Lensa with 120
Two inventions	"The weakest performance of any site" is false on the table's own figures. And there is no previous quarter in the table at all

3 • The six-point translation check

1	Meaning and scope — does it say the same thing, about the same people?
2	Must, may, should — has the strength of any obligation changed?
3	Names, dates, titles, numbers and currency — one by one

4	Technical, legal and rights terminology
5	Tone, and anything that could increase risk to someone
6	Who reviewed it, and are they named?

In the two sentences you translated, the thing to find is the negative — "what we do not yet have". A dropped or softened negative reverses the sentence, and it is the single most common serious translation error. Check the 15,000 and the 4 August too.

4 • The notes, done properly

Decisions

- The second intake starts in **Bulcha and Anfarro**, because those sites are settled. Agreed by the team.

Actions

What	Who	By when
Chase the bank about the slow grant transfers	Kebede	This week
Check whether the new Gudeta venue holds, then decide on Gudeta	UNASSIGNED	NO DATE
Draft the intake criteria	UNASSIGNED	Before the board meets

Raised, but not an action

- There is still no follow-up support after the start-up grant. Hirut raised it again. **This is a concern, not a decision — do not let it become an action nobody owns.**

The two UNASSIGNED lines are not failures of the tool. They are the real gaps in the meeting, and it found them in nine seconds. "Draft the intake criteria" is exactly the item that would otherwise have gone missing.