

CLAUDE SKILLS

What your five skills actually produce.

Every sample below was generated by running the real skill on one shared, fictional construction project — Northgate Retail Centre. Not mockups: genuine, downloadable outputs.

Your five stage-one skills · one coherent project · every file real

Core daily

MINUTES OF MEETING

Field	Content
Meeting Title	Project Team Meeting (PTM) #13
Project	Northgate Retail Centre (3-level retail + mixed-use, ~42,000 m ²) — Month 9 of 22
Date	09 Jul 2026
Time	10:00 – 11:45 (1 hr 45 min)
Location	Site Project Office, Meeting Room 1 / MS Teams (hybrid)
MOM Reference	NRC/MOM/2026/013
Prepared by	Daniel Cross, Project Director, Apex Project Management
Distribution	All attendees + Meridian Land management copy

ATTENDEES

S.N.	Name	Company / Role	Email	Attendance
1	Daniel Cross	Apex Project Management, Project Director (Chair)	daniel.cross@apexpm.com	Present
2	Maria Santos	Apex Project Management, Design Manager	maria.santos@apexpm.com	Present
3	James Okafor	Apex Project Management, Construction Manager	james.okafor@apexpm.com	Present
4	Priya Nair	Studio Arc, Lead Architect	priya.nair@studioarc.com	Present

meeting-minutes

Say "write up the minutes"

Formatted Minutes of Meeting for Project Team Meeting PTM #13 — attendees, a previous-actions review that threads forward, numbered discussion items and a colour-coded actions summary.

- Every action has a named owner and a specific due date — no "the team", no vague dates.
- Disputes recorded with both positions attributed by name (the \$180k claim vs the ~\$70k Apex disputes).
- Live Word dropdown controls in the remarks and priority columns; validated OOXML, 4 clean pages.

Download sample →

Project Status Review: Executive Summary

Project: Northgate Retail Centre, brownfield mixed-use development (3 levels, ~42,000 m²)
Client / Developer: Meridian Land
Prepared by: Daniel Cross, Project Director, Apex Project Management | 11 Jul 2026
Reporting point: Month 9 of 22 | For: Meridian Land Senior Management
Next milestone: Project Team Meeting PTM #14 in 6 days (17 Jul 2026)

1. Executive Summary

Northgate is 44% complete against a 47% plan at Month 9, a 3-point slip. Two causes: FormWorks is two weeks late on the Level 3 transfer slab design, which sits on the critical path, and wet weather ate most of last month's float. The slip is real but recoverable if the transfer slab design lands this week and the pour is resequenced. Two commercial items need direction now: a \$180k Cornerstone waterproofing variation of which we dispute ~\$70k, and the façade subcontract award, which is in final evaluation and holding up a long-lead package.

Key risks: transfer slab design delay pushing the pour and consuming the last of programme float; an unagreed \$70k in the waterproofing variation; façade award slipping past PTM #14 and delaying procurement of a long-lead package.

Immediate actions: FormWorks to issue transfer slab design by 15 Jul; Apex to close the waterproofing quantum by 21 Jul; façade award recommendation to Meridian by 16 Jul, ahead of PTM #14.

Risk if no action: The transfer slab pour slips beyond the last of programme float, converting a 3-point reporting slip into a hard delay to structural topping-out and every

executive-summary-report

Say "give me an ex summary"

A decision-ready executive summary for the client's senior management at Month 9 — the 3-point progress slip, root causes, the variation dispute and the façade award, with numbered actions.

- Leads with the "so what", then an amber risk callout and a "so what" line after every data table.
- Shows the commercial working (~\$110k agreed / ~\$70k disputed) rather than just quoting a total.
- 3 tight A4 pages with a clean sign-off block.

Download sample →

MOM Priority Distiller — Northgate PTM #13

Distilled 11 Jul 2026. Source: Project Team Meeting #13 minutes, Northgate Retail Centre.

Northgate Retail Centre | PTM #13 | 27 Jun 2026 | Project Team Meeting | Apex PM-led

1. Priority actions

R e f	Action	Owner	Due	Status	Priority
1	Issue transfer-slab (Level 3) structural design to enable pour — 2 weeks late, now on the critical path	Form Works (Tom Whittield)	13	OVERDUE	CRITICAL
3			20		
4			22		
2			26		

mom-priority-distiller

Say "distil the MOM / what do I chase"

PTM #13 distilled into a prioritised action table, decisions log, risk flags, a watch-list and a pre-brief for the next meeting.

- Status logic worked against today's date: critical items read OVERDUE, near-term items DUE THIS WEEK.
- Sorted overdue → critical → high, with carryover, cost-impact and owner flags applied.
- Doubles as a meeting pre-brief for PTM #14.

[Download sample →](#)

MD

Document Review — Cornerstone VR-021, Revised

Basement Waterproofing (~\$180k)

Second-pair-of-eyes assessment for Daniel Cross (Project Director, Apex PM) ahead of PTM #14. Document under review: Cornerstone Construction Variation Request VR-021, "Revised Basement Waterproofing System — Northgate Retail Centre," dated this month. Cost Bureau (QS) has assessed and disputes ~\$70k of the ~\$180k claimed.

Headline: This variation is not fit for approval as submitted. There is a genuine change buried in here — a real design revision to the basement tanking that Cornerstone didn't originate — but the claim as presented mixes that legitimate change with re-measured quantities, day-rate padding, and a programme-delay figure that has no evidence behind it. Cost Bureau's ~\$70k dispute is the right instinct but it's under-cooked; on the numbers below there's closer to \$75–95k that Cornerstone has to substantiate before you sign anything. Do not settle a lump sum in PTM #14. Split it: agree the part that's proven, reject or park the rest.

The key issues (in order of severity)

1. Critical — the claim conflates a design change with a re-measure, and doesn't separate the two

The variation is framed as a single ~\$180k "revised waterproofing" change. But read the breakdown and it's really three different things wearing one number.

document-review

Say "review this / anything off"

A sceptical review of the ~\$180k basement-waterproofing variation — unbundles the claim into legitimate change vs re-measure vs padding, and arms you with sharp challenge questions.

- Exposes where the disputed ~\$70k hides, tied to the real project facts.
- Ends with seven pointed questions to ask before approving anything.
- Flags the natural next steps (a formal letter, an exec summary, an email to the QS).

[Download sample →](#)

MD

To: Tom Whitfield (Structural Lead, FormWorks Engineering); Priya Nair (Lead Architect, Studio Arc)

MD

Cc: Maria Santos (Design Manager, Apex PM); James Okafor (Construction Manager, Apex PM)

Subject: Northgate - Level 3 Transfer Slab Design Overdue (2 weeks) + Facade Interface

Hi Tom, Priya,

Following up on the Level 3 transfer slab design. It was due two weeks ago and we still don't have the issued package. That slab is on the critical path for the pour, and the delay is now the main driver of this month's programme slip (44% actual against 47% planned).

Tom, can you let us have a recovery plan for the transfer slab design? We need the outstanding deliverables, a realistic reissue date, and a note on anything you're waiting on from our side or from Studio Arc to close it out.

email-drafter

Say "**draft an email to...**"

A firm-but-professional chase to the architect and structural lead — pressing for a transfer-slab recovery plan, coordinating the façade interface, and locking a call before the next PTM.

- Facts and the ask carry the pressure, not cold language; collaborative framing, no "you must".
- Chase structure: what was expected/when → impact → what's needed by when, with dated asks.
- No padding, no buzzwords — a searchable subject line and one live figure from the project.

Download the draft (Word) →