WORKFLOWS

Your Drawings Changed. Who Needs to Know?

A drawing revision is only useful when the people responsible for affected work understand what changed and what they need to do about it.

By Mark Klusza · CTO, Inertia Systems, Inc. · November 8, 2026 · 4 min read



Distribution is the first step

I think we sometimes ask too little of a drawing revision process. We publish a new sheet, notify the distribution list, and record that the latest version is available. Those are necessary controls. They do not tell us whether a foreman has adjusted tomorrow's work or whether a purchasing decision made last week now needs attention.

A revision moves through a project that is already in motion. Some work exists only as design intent. Some is being fabricated. Some is installed. The same change can have very different consequences depending on where it lands. That is why a revision should trigger a review of affected work, not simply a notification that another file exists.

Start with the changed scope

Imagine a door opening changes in a corridor. The cloud on the plan tells us where to look, but the project needs to establish what the change means. Does it affect the frame, hardware set, adjacent wall, access control, or a clearance? Is the frame already ordered? Has the wall been laid out? Which inspections might rely on the previous condition?

Those questions should lead to specific records and responsible people. A general email sends everyone searching. A connected revision identifies the affected opening and carries its relationships into the review. The team can then distinguish confirmed impacts from possible impacts that still require judgment.

That distinction matters. Software should not turn every nearby object into a declared change. Proximity can be a useful signal, but it is not proof. The review needs to show why an item was flagged and allow the appropriate person to confirm or dismiss the relationship.

Treat notification as a responsibility

Receiving a notification is different from accepting responsibility for a response. I want to know who must evaluate the change, what decision is required, and when that decision is needed relative to the work.

For procurement, the response might be to verify an order. For the trade partner, it might be to stop fabrication until the revised condition is resolved. For quality staff, it might be to update an upcoming check or determine whether an earlier inspection remains applicable. These are different tasks even when they originate from the same revision.

A useful process records that disposition. Reviewed with no impact is a legitimate outcome when someone has checked the relevant scope. Requiring action is another. Waiting for clarification is another. Each tells the project more than a read receipt ever will.

Keep the previous condition available

Publishing the latest drawing should not destroy the ability to understand earlier work. An installation may have been performed and inspected against a previous authorized release. If a requirement changes afterward, the team needs to know what applied at the time and whether the new direction affects that completed work.

I would preserve the relationship between the record, its governing revision, and the date of the activity. The current project view can still emphasize the latest information while allowing an authorized reviewer to reconstruct the earlier condition.

This is especially important when a change appears minor on paper. A note revision may affect acceptance criteria across many locations without moving a single line. Comparing drawings visually is useful, but the project must also account for changes to notes, schedules, details, and referenced requirements.

Make the field response easy to capture

The crew should be able to open the affected location and see the revised information alongside the response it requires. If the work has already been installed, recording that condition should be straightforward. If material is staged but not installed, that should be visible too.

The aim is to reduce the amount of explanation people must repeat. A field observation should stay connected to the change review, rather than becoming another isolated message that somebody must reconcile later.

For me, that is an important test of connected intelligence. It should help a project follow a change from its source through the decisions and actions it causes. The drawing remains central, but it becomes an entry point into the work rather than the endpoint of document control.

Close the response, not just the transmittal

Before calling a revision fully addressed, I would ask whether the affected teams have evaluated their scope and whether required actions have been completed or explicitly remain open. That does not mean every revision needs a large meeting. It means the effort should match the consequence.

A well-controlled revision process makes the exceptions visible early. The superintendent sees the installation that needs to wait. Procurement sees the order that needs checking. Quality sees the verification that needs to change.

That is the outcome I want: fewer people discovering the consequences of a revision after the work has made those consequences expensive.

What’s Next

Next, I’ll look at the last mile between the VDC office and the jobsite, where useful model information has to become usable field information.

Read online: inertiasystems.com/resources/blog/your-drawings-changed-who-needs-to-know

© 2026 Inertia Systems, Inc. All rights reserved.