Lending Workflow Delay Audit Kit

Find where the customer waits—even when a task gets faster.

1. Trace one completed journey

Bring an operations owner, a reviewer and the team receiving the handoff. Choose one product and one completed case. Start when the required file is complete; end when the customer response is sent. Record the definition before collecting times.

Use the editable workbook to capture the journey without borrower names, documents, balances or account identifiers. Keep the evidence in approved internal systems; use a non-identifying reference in the worksheet.

2. Separate three kinds of time

Measure	What belongs here
First-pass work	Minutes actively preparing, reviewing or communicating the case the first time.
Rework	Minutes spent correcting or repeating work already attempted. Keep these separate from first-pass work.
Waiting	Elapsed calendar minutes minus first-pass work and rework. Includes queues, batching, nights and weekends.

Use one clock throughout

The workbook uses calendar minutes and UTC timestamps. Enter consecutive, non-overlapping intervals. Record measured zero as 0; leave unknowns blank. Each stage must begin where the previous stage ends. Split a mixed stage if that makes the delay clearer.

For parallel work, do not sum overlapping person-hours and subtract them from elapsed time. Trace non-overlapping intervals along the case journey or analyse the critical path separately.

A quicker memo. The same customer wait.

Fictional timing example. Not a bank result or a Zotta performance claim.

Journey stage	Elapsed min	Work min	Rework min	Wait min
Prepare memo	60	60	0	0
Wait for review	2820	0	0	2820
Review and correct	30	20	10	0
Wait for handoff	30	0	0	30
Send response	10	10	0	0
Total	2950	90	10	2850

What if drafting falls from 60 to 10 minutes?

If review still starts at the same fixed time, the saved 50 minutes become additional waiting. Total turnaround stays at 2,950 minutes—49 hours and 10 minutes. Waiting rises from 2,850 to 2,900 minutes. Task time improves; the customer response does not move.

3. Find the cause of the longest wait

Ask what actually held the case: missing evidence, unclear ownership, a batch schedule, staffing or a system handoff. A long interval alone does not prove the cause. Record the timestamp or internal evidence that supports the explanation.

4. Test one operational change

For example, test a complete-file checklist and a named receiving owner in a limited, approved pilot. Define the hypothesis, accountable team, comparison group, review date and stop condition. Retain required reviews, evidence checks and escalation routes.

Suggested hypothesis: “A complete handoff and an explicit owner will reduce waiting for the next team.” Treat this as a question to test, not a promised result.

Did the whole journey improve?

5. Compare like with like

Use multiple completed cases before and during the pilot. Match product, complexity, file completeness, staffing and clock definitions. Report both sample counts and dates. Compare median total turnaround, waiting and rework; inspect unusually slow cases as well. A single case is useful for diagnosis, not proof of institution-wide improvement.

Before calling the test successful	Evidence / owner / follow-up
Did customer turnaround fall?	Baseline and pilot sample counts, dates and median elapsed minutes.
Was quality maintained?	Cases returned for correction, missing evidence and required reviews completed.
Did delay move to another team?	Downstream waiting, workload and unresolved handoffs.
Can the team repeat the result?	Named owner, documented procedure and a follow-up measurement date.

Use the AI prompt as an analysis aid

Download the accompanying text prompt and use only process timing that your institution permits in the selected AI tool. Remove identifiers and free-text case details. Ask it to distinguish observations from possible causes, expose missing data and propose one test. Verify calculations and recommendations with the process owner.

Record the decision

Change to test: _____
Accountable team: _____ Review date: _____
Required checks retained: _____
Stop condition: _____
Evidence needed before the next decision: _____

Source and scope

Concept: McKinsey, *Global Banking Annual Review 2026: The AI disruption dividend*, 10 November 2026, printed page 10 (PDF page 11). The report illustrates why faster credit-memo preparation can leave a committee queue unchanged. This kit, its timing example and test suggestions are original Zotta editorial work, not a McKinsey tool or endorsement.

Read the original McKinsey report · Download the workbook and AI prompt at Zotta

This operational exercise does not establish legal requirements, certify compliance or describe Zotta product capabilities. Use your institution’s approved controls and specialist review.