

FUGU GMBH · 360 PROGRAMME REPLY WORKFLOW · 2026

It reads the thread, writes the answer, and then it *waits*.

Across the programmes, 1,600+ people were reached and about a fifth of them wrote back with a real question. Each reply needs the thread's history, the programme's rules and a tone that does not read as automated, and they arrive across weeks while a cohort runs. That is a lot of context to rebuild by hand, several times a day, and none of it is the part that carries the relationship.

BUILT AND OPERATED BY ME · DRAFTS ONLY, NEVER SENDS
OUTLOOK IN, TEAM CHAT FOR APPROVAL, OUTLOOK OUT

1,600+

People reached across the programmes

20%

Of them asked, and every one was answered

10–15

Hours a month returned (est.)

Read, draft, *approve*.



01 • READ

Not everyone gets an answer.

The workflow reads the inbox and drops anything from an address that is not in the programme. Then it rebuilds the conversation from the log rather than trusting the quoted text below the reply.

02 • DRAFT

Context assembled, tone considered.

It reads how the message was meant, retrieves the relevant programme documents, and writes a draft in Outlook. The programme's documents re-index themselves whenever a source file changes.

03 • APPROVE

The workflow stops and asks.

It asks a person in the channel they already work in, and waits for the answer. Nothing leaves until that comes back. This is the whole point, not a safety feature bolted on.

A fifth of them asked. All of them got an *answer.*

1,600+

People reached across the programmes

0

Emails sent without approval

20%

Asked a question; all of them answered

10–15

Hours a month returned (est.)

WHAT IT AUTOMATES, AND WHAT IT REFUSES TO
THE SPLIT IS DELIBERATE, AND IT IS THE ONLY INTERESTING DECISION IN THE WORKFLOW.

- Automated: identifying the sender, rebuilding the thread, retrieving the rules.
- Automated: drafting in the programme's voice, with the history in front of it.
- Not automated: deciding whether that draft is the right thing to say.
- Not automated: sending. The workflow blocks until a person answers.

Every reply that went out was read and approved by a person.

WHERE THE HUMAN SITS

Approval requested in the team chat

The workflow waits, indefinitely

The approval happens where the work already happens rather than in another tool nobody opens. Until it comes back, the draft sits in Outlook unsent. The hours figure is my own estimate and is marked as one; that every single question got an answer is not.

Automate the assembly. Keep the judgement, and the relationship, with the person.