

Project Review: Resolve Interfaces Before Release

Todd Jerome Jenkins | v1.0 | Reviewed October 9, 2026 | Discussion + field checks

Why this matters

A project can look complete within each discipline while the connections between them remain unresolved. A review should make those gaps visible before implementation. Bring the people who understand the affected work and leave with decisions, restrictions and evidence that can be followed.

Objective: Review a proposed release with affected roles and resolve consequential interface questions through the required authority.

Key hazards or failure points

Missing disciplines; incompatible revisions; silent disagreement; unclear decision authority; meeting attendance treated as approval; an action assigned but not closed.

Practical controls

- State the proposed decision and provide current documents before the review. Identify affected users and technical roles whose input is needed. Give them a realistic opportunity to examine the information and raise concerns.
- Compare boundaries between activities: inputs, outputs, access, support and responsibility transfers. Invite contrary information and record unresolved differences. A majority preference cannot override technical requirements or required approval.
- Give each action an owner, due point and closure evidence. Separate items that prevent release from later follow-up. The designated authority determines disposition under the governing process; meeting minutes alone do not authorize work.

Verify It in the Field

Use a paper example of a handoff. Have both sides identify the revision, expected condition and responsible role. Compare their answers with the controlling records; log disagreement rather than smoothing it into a general statement of agreement.

For one consequential review comment, trace the response to its supporting evidence and authorized disposition. Record reviewer, source, actual finding and time. An email promising correction leaves the required closure pending.

Before release, compare outstanding actions with the applicable acceptance requirements. Confirm that changes reached affected documents and users. Keep required field checks separately pending until performed; technical acceptance does not establish installed protection.

Stop and reassess

Hold the affected release for missing required representation, conflicting technical bases, an unresolved safety condition or absent approval. Obtain the needed review, verify closure and communicate restrictions before implementation. Reopen the decision when a later change invalidates its basis.

Ask the crew

1. Which connection between our work and another activity needs review?
2. What evidence closes this comment?
3. Who can authorize release, and what remains held?

Use the task plan and required specialist decisions before exposure.

Sources: DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol. 2, pp. 66, 67; OSHA — Communication and Coordination.

Free next step: [JHA/JSA planning & field-verification worksheet](#)

Expanded guidance and separate forms: toddjeromejenkins.com/toolbox-talks/project-review-interfaces-before-release

Based on DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol. 2 (June 2009). No claim to authorship or copyright ownership of original U.S. Government work. Todd Jerome Jenkins adaptation; no government endorsement implied.