Work from the activity and the barrier.

A practical guide to workplace decisions that respect different tasks and preferences without promising productivity or health gains.

Describe the activity that is difficult and the conditions affecting it. Ask the people who use the space what helps, what creates a barrier and which alternatives they would prefer to try. Avoid prescribing one environment for everyone with a diagnosis or assuming a technology can infer a person's needs.

Question	Useful record	Keep out of the FM log
What task needs support?	Activity, time, location and operational constraints	Unnecessary medical or diagnostic detail
What is the barrier?	The relevant noise, lighting, interruption, access or workflow issue	Judgments about a person's capability or motivation
Which options are practical?	Individual preferences, alternatives and responsible specialists	A universal solution assigned to an entire neurotype
How will effectiveness be reviewed?	Agreed trial, private feedback and next decision	Public individual scores or unconsented monitoring

JAN's sample accommodation process supports identifying tasks and barriers, considering options with the individual, implementing agreed arrangements and revisiting effectiveness. It is a flexible process, not a universal formula or proof of improved productivity. [W2]

> Where an individual accommodation is involved, include appropriate HR and accessibility expertise. Facilities should record the agreed environmental action and responsible role, with sensitive information handled through the appropriate restricted process.

Compare options rather than promise a result.

Fictional example: a person needs fewer interruptions for a concentration task.

Option	Potential fit	Tradeoffs to discuss
Access to a quieter work area	May reduce nearby conversations for the agreed task	Availability, routes, booking arrangements and social connection
A change to work timing or location	May avoid the busiest period or environment	Operational coverage, team coordination and individual preference
An agreed equipment or environmental adjustment	May address a specific identified barrier	Compatibility, comfort, safety and specialist review
A change to the task or communication process	May reduce unnecessary interruptions	Service requirements, colleagues and escalation needs

The options are examples for discussion, not recommendations for a particular individual. Agree what will be tried, who will implement it and when feedback will be reviewed. Keep alternatives available if the first arrangement is ineffective or creates a new barrier.

TECHNOLOGY HAS A SUPPORTING ROLE

A booking or facilities workflow can help record an agreed action or route an issue. Collect only the information needed for that purpose. Do not infer diagnoses, rank individuals by presumed neurotype or automatically change environmental settings without an agreed authority and consent process.

> Physical accessibility and individualized employment accommodation are related but different reviews. The U.S. Access Board distinguishes employee-only work areas from common/public spaces; a generic checklist cannot establish compliance for a particular project. [W4]

Agree a trial with a clear review point.

Fictional trial plan: evaluate an arrangement without turning the person into a productivity experiment.

Record field	Fictional entry
Activity and barrier	Concentration work interrupted by nearby conversations during selected periods
Agreed option	Try access to a quieter area for the relevant task, subject to operational arrangements
Implementation owner	Facilities contact coordinates the space; appropriate HR contact manages individual accommodation records
Review evidence	Private feedback on usefulness and any new barriers; confirmation the agreed arrangement was available
Review point and next decision	Illustrative trial: 1-12 November 2026; private review on 13 November. Continue, adapt, try another option or stop with the individual and responsible roles.

For a real record, add actual names and agreed dates. Do not promise reduced stress, higher productivity or energy savings from the arrangement. If a broader workplace study is proposed, define consent, measures, population, baseline and data handling separately before collecting data.

DOCUMENT FACTUALLY AND RESPECTFULLY

Record requests, options considered, decisions, implementation and follow-up. Limit access to sensitive information. JAN's documentation guidance supports keeping necessary medical information separate; this guide does not certify a particular storage arrangement or replace jurisdiction-specific advice. [W3]

Revisit the arrangement when duties, equipment, location, workplace conditions or needs change. Review is part of the process, not evidence that the person or the first option failed. [W2]

Make the building brief reflect real use.

A workplace project should connect stakeholder requirements with the decisions that will be tested and accepted.

Develop a strategic brief around tasks, user requirements and operational constraints. Include stakeholder participation at the points where it can affect design choices. Keep a trace from a requirement to the proposed response, review evidence, accepted decision and post-occupancy question.

Requirement	Design or operational response	Acceptance and review
A workable range of task settings	Options for collaboration, concentration and other identified activities	Users can find and use the agreed settings
Usable access and circulation	Project-specific review by the responsible accessibility team	Required reviews complete; unresolved barriers recorded
Operationally supportable arrangements	Named booking, maintenance and support responsibilities	Staff understand the process and escalation route
Appropriate information handling	Minimum data, clear purpose and restricted sensitive records	Responsible reviewers accept the handling arrangements

The GPA's 2026 Workplace Design Guide supports strategic briefs and stakeholder review in its public-estate context. Its requirements are not automatically a private-sector design code. The decisions and examples here are author synthesis, with no claimed neurotype productivity ranking or universal improvement percentage. [W1]

SOURCES AND SCOPE

[W1] Government Property Agency, Workplace Design Guide. July 2026. Public-estate design and stakeholder context.

[W2] Job Accommodation Network, Sample Accommodation Process. Live guidance reviewed31 October 2026; flexible sample process.

[W3] Job Accommodation Network, Documenting the Accommodation Process. Live guidance reviewed31 October 2026.

[W4] U.S. Access Board, New Construction / Employee Work Areas. Explanatory guide to2010 ADA Standards.