

How I Use NotebookLM Before a Board Discussion

Juan Beltran | Revised 2 October 2026

Listening to a research summary helps me get oriented. The board paper still needs claims traced to their sources and judgment I can explain.

Before a board discussion, I uploaded a long industry report to NotebookLM and listened to an audio overview on a morning run. It helped me arrive with better questions. It did not make me ready to defend every claim in the report.

That distinction determines whether this kind of tool improves research or simply makes an incomplete reading feel complete. A coherent conversation is easy to remember. It is also easy to mistake for a faithful account of what the sources establish.

I use it to get oriented, compare material and find passages worth inspecting. The next step is still to open the documents. A board paper has to make its evidence and assumptions visible to someone who was not on my run.

Give the research a question

Uploading everything in a folder is tempting. A smaller, purposeful collection is easier to reason about. I start with the decision: what does the audience need to choose, and what would change that choice?

For example, an executive considering a service expansion might need to understand customer demand, delivery constraints and the cost of supporting exceptions. A broad industry outlook can provide context, but it cannot establish the company's own demand or readiness. The source collection should make that distinction clear.

Before uploading, check permission to use the material in the chosen account. Keep the original publication details and versions. A revised internal forecast and an earlier published report may use similar language while answering different questions. Losing their dates and status makes the synthesis harder to check.

Google's [current official notebook guide](#) describes source-based answers, citations and audio overviews, and warns that the system can make mistakes. The help page currently uses the name Gemini Notebook. I use the familiar NotebookLM name here to discuss the research habit, rather than offer a feature or subscription guide.

The relevant capability is help with material I supply. That does not mean the supplied material is complete, current or correct. A grounded answer can faithfully repeat a weak source.

Separate extraction from interpretation

Here is a hypothetical example. A market report forecasts increasing demand for low-carbon construction materials. A supplier presentation describes an available product. An internal capacity note says a plant may need an upgrade before it can serve the proposed segment.

Ask the notebook to identify the passages that support each statement, keeping the documents separate. Then inspect the cited passages. Does the market forecast concern the same geography? Does the product specification cover the customer's application? Does “may need an upgrade” reflect a decision, a concern or an unfinished assessment?

Only then ask what the documents suggest together. The conclusion might be that the opportunity merits a small customer test, while delivery readiness remains unresolved. That is an interpretation. It should not be dressed up as a direct quotation from the report.

Keep three headings in the research notes: what the source says, what you infer, and what remains unknown. The tool can help populate them, but I decide where each statement belongs. If it cannot locate support, I leave the question open rather than polish the answer until it sounds settled.

Use listening to find questions

Audio is useful when I need an initial map of unfamiliar material. It can help me notice a theme or remember a question to pursue. It is a poor place to verify a number, a qualification or the exact wording of a commitment.

After listening, write down the claims that would matter if they were wrong. Those become the reading priorities. The most interesting line in a summary may be a forecast whose assumptions deserve closer attention, or a confident explanation built from only one source.

For a board discussion, my questions usually become more useful when they concern the missing connection: what has to be true for this industry trend to help our business? Which part of the recommendation is supported by our own data? What would make us wait?

A second audio summary is rarely the best answer to those questions. Sometimes I need the finance owner, the original analyst or the operational team. Research tools can expose a gap without being able to fill it.

Trace the consequential claims

Before using a statement in a memo, open the original source and read around the cited passage. Check the date, population, unit and important caveats. A percentage concerning respondents to a survey should not become a percentage of all companies. A scenario should not become the expected outcome.

If sources disagree, preserve the disagreement long enough to understand it. They may define the market differently, use different dates or rely on different assumptions. Asking for one tidy answer can hide the reason the evidence differs.

When a claim cannot be verified, there are three honest choices: remove it, qualify it, or turn it into a question for further work. The convenience of a ready-made sentence is not a fourth choice.

For material I will share, I cite the original document and relevant section. The notebook is part of my preparation; it is not the origin of a market fact. Where the conclusion is my judgment, I state the assumptions that connect the facts to the recommendation.

Turn research into a decision people can inspect

The final memo should be shorter than the research collection. It needs the decision, the main evidence, the unresolved assumptions and the consequence of being wrong. It should also tell the reader what additional work would materially improve the choice.

In the hypothetical expansion example, that might mean a small customer test before committing to capacity. The memo would explain which evidence supports demand, what remains uncertain about delivery, who will resolve it and what decision follows. A well-produced industry summary alone cannot do that.

I do not need a tool to sound authoritative on my behalf. I need help finding my way through material so I can take responsibility for a recommendation. That is why the morning run was useful: it gave me questions worth sitting down with afterwards.

If I finish the research feeling more certain but unable to show where the certainty came from, I have more reading to do.

Reading worksheet

Use these questions with the essay. Record your own evidence and the next decision; the examples in the essay do not supply a result for your organization.

1. Which source set is authoritative for this question, and what is missing?

2. Do the cited passages support the conclusion in their original context?

3. Which conflicting evidence or omitted limitation should the reader see?

4. Who owns the decision and the final statement of what the evidence means?

Sources and scope

A personal research reflection plus a hypothetical service-expansion example. The official Google guide supports only the tool capabilities described; the workflow recommendations are author judgment.

No comparative error-rate study or productivity measurement is asserted. Product branding and features can change; this essay focuses on research practice rather than subscription specifications.

Google. [Learn about Gemini Notebook](#). Current official description of source-based notebook answers, citations, audio overviews and possible mistakes.

[Read the current article](#)