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# Article summary:

1. The AFE to MBU prototype/corridor process is not always followed, particularly when customer demands require tighter interactions.

2. There is a blurry line between MBU corridor and MBU prototype work items.

3. Joe proposes adding labels to all work items to distinguish between Prototype and Features, allowing for better scheduling by the PDT.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an overview of the current process for the AFE to MBU prototype/corridor, as well as a proposed solution from Joe to add labels to all work items in order to distinguish between Prototype and Features. While this proposal may be beneficial in terms of scheduling by the PDT, it does not address any potential biases or one-sided reporting that may be present in the article. Additionally, there is no evidence provided for any of the claims made in the article, nor are any counterarguments explored or risks noted. As such, it is difficult to assess the trustworthiness and reliability of this article without further information on these points.

# Topics for further research:

* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor bias
* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor one-sided reporting
* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor risk assessment
* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor scheduling
* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor labeling
* AFE to MBU prototype/corridor trustworthiness
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