

NotebookLM Prompts for Business Operations

Strategy

Define goals and
KPIs



Processes

Standardize
workflows and SOPs

Technology

Automate and
integrate systems

Performance

Measure, analyze,
improve

Prompt A: The Strategic Knowledge Base Auditor

Use this when a user uploads a messy folder of random documents and needs to figure out what is actually useful.

STEP 1: Deduction of the Main Purpose

Role: You are a lead data analyst and strategic knowledge base curator.

First, thoroughly review all uploaded sources. Based on their content and synergy, define in 1-2 sentences the main business/project purpose of this entire notebook. Use this deduced purpose as the primary lens for all subsequent steps and evaluations.

STEP 2: Critical Source Audit with Visual Tagging

Process the output as a vertical list of structured blocks for each source in the exact format below. Do NOT use tables.

Rules for visual title tagging: Choose an emoji based on a strict evaluation of its contribution to the main purpose:

- 💎 for a score of 10 (Absolute foundation and irreplaceable core document)
- 🟢 for a score of 8 to 9 (Key and highly useful sources)
- 🟡 for a score of 4 to 7 (Supporting context and operational documents)
- 🔴 for a score of 1 to 3 (Informational clutter for immediate deletion)

Format:

[Emoji] [Score: X/10] [Exact original name of the uploaded file]

Proposed name: [Clear and concise name reflecting the actual content]

Source type: [e.g., strategic plan, legal analysis, notes]

Contribution to purpose: [1-2 punchy sentences evaluating its usefulness]

Redundancy: [List any specific overlap with other sources, or write "None"]

STEP 3: Identified Gaps

Considering exclusively the deduced main purpose, summarize in a maximum of 3 short bullet points what key information, data, or documents are missing from the current source mix for its 100% successful execution.

Prompt B: The Precision Timeline Builder

Ideal for legal cases, project management retrospectives, or tracking public relations shifts.

Provide a comprehensive chronological timeline of events regarding [Insert Topic Here] based strictly on the uploaded materials.

Create a detailed table with the following columns:

1. Date (Identify the date of the ACTUAL event, not the date the article/source was published)
2. Event Description (A thorough explanation of what happened)
3. Source Reference (Specific citation to the document)
4. Brief Context (Why this event is critical to the overall timeline)

After the table, provide a 2-paragraph synthesis summarizing the major shifts, escalation points, or trends visible across this timeline.

Prompt C: The RFP / Proposal Synthesizer

Perfect for sales and business development teams.

Act as a Senior Proposal Writer. I have uploaded the new RFP requirements along with our company's past successful proposals, case studies, and standard operating procedures.

Task 1: Identify and map which specific RFP requirements directly align with our existing capabilities based on the sources.

Task 2: Draft preliminary responses for the top 3 most heavily weighted requirements. Use auto-cited evidence exclusively from our past case studies and proposal documents.

Task 3: Identify any capability gaps where our uploaded documentation fails to address a specific RFP requirement, highlighting where we need to develop net-new content.

Prompt D: Deep Dive Custom Podcast Persona (The Critical Review)

Use the new Audio Overview customization capabilities to force the AI hosts to act as critical reviewers rather than generic podcasters.

Custom Episode Instructions: The hosts of this Audio Overview are not doing a standard summary. They are acting as highly critical, meticulous business consultants conducting a harsh review of the uploaded strategic plan (or document).

The episode must feel conversational but rigorous. The hosts must:

1. Go through the document section by section with a fine-toothed comb.
2. Read long, direct quotes from the text, followed by immediate critique of the logic or feasibility of those statements.
3. Adopt a debate format where Host A supports the document's vision, and Host B aggressively challenges the underlying assumptions based on the provided data.