



Project X No Fluff Project Assessment

Project X

Project reference	PROJECT-X
Client	Not supplied
Location	Not supplied
Assessment date	2026-07-20
Assessment status	Final

Overall Project Condition High Risk The ten categories were equally weighted. The project has a clear target but weak evidence, immature readiness and limited delivery certainty.	Obeng Project Type Questionable Confidence: Provisional. The intended outcome is clear but the full delivery method is not. Diagnostic knowledge articles are designed while triage, assignment and other implementation components remain in draft.	Outcome Clarity Mostly clear The target is specific and measurable, but the baseline and benefit-measurement controls are weak.
Governance Effectiveness Weak Executive sponsorship exists, but measurement governance, delivery ownership and stage-gate controls are not established.	Organisational Readiness Not demonstrated Training and operational-readiness arrangements are still being drafted and no readiness evidence was supplied.	Delivery Certainty Low Configuration is underway, but critical design, ownership, testing and readiness information is incomplete.
Timeline Realism At risk The planned go-live is 31 October 2026, but major delivery and readiness components remain in draft.	Evidence Strength Weak No documents were reviewed. The baseline relies on judgement-based exclusions and solution testing had no pass criteria.	

No Fluff Project Intelligence

Executive Summary

Project X is a High Risk implementation. The intended outcome is clear, but the delivery method, operational-readiness controls and supporting evidence are not sufficiently mature to provide confidence that the four-hour target will be achieved by the planned go-live date.

Core message

- The project has a measurable outcome, an identified sponsor, an approved budget and a planned go-live date.
- The baseline is not reliable enough for benefits assurance because repeat faults, major outages and outliers were excluded using individual judgement without a documented rule.
- Diagnostic knowledge articles have only been tested through a walkthrough, with no pass criteria or live operational validation.
- Triage, assignment, data migration, integrations, training and operational readiness are still being drafted while configuration is underway.
- Leadership should not treat the four-hour target or 31 October 2026 go-live as confirmed until measurement rules, delivery ownership, solution design and readiness gates are established.

Principal concerns

- Weak baseline governance and limited evidence strength.
- Critical triage and assignment changes are not yet defined.
- Operational readiness, training, migration and integration planning remain immature.
- The delivery lead and detailed accountability structures were not identified.
- The remaining schedule may drive rushed configuration, testing or deployment.

Positive conditions

- The business outcome is stated as a reduction in average fault-resolution time from six hours to four hours.
- The scope has been reported as agreed.
- Reg has been identified as executive sponsor.
- A budget of £200,000 has been reported as approved.
- Twenty-five diagnostic knowledge articles have been reviewed by four engineers.
- The four-hour target has been reported as accepted.

Appoint a single accountable delivery lead, approve a defensible fault-resolution baseline, complete the triage and assignment designs, define measurable acceptance criteria and establish a formal readiness gate before confirming the 31 October 2026 go-live.

Assessment confidence	Provisional
Evidence sufficiency	Low. The assessment is based on user statements and no supporting project documents, plans, test evidence, governance records or operational data extracts were reviewed.

Conditions for reduced risk

Risk can reduce when the baseline is independently reproducible, critical process designs are approved, live-scenario testing demonstrates measurable improvement, delivery ownership is confirmed and operational-readiness evidence supports the go-live decision.

SAMPLE

Project Snapshot

Project reference	PROJECT-X
Project name	Project X
Sector	Maintenance operations
Current stage	Configuration

Project description

Implementation of System for a maintenance organisation to reduce the average time taken to resolve faults.

Assessment scope

Assessment of outcome clarity, delivery conditions, implementation readiness and the credibility of the target to reduce average fault-resolution time from six hours to four hours.

Additional project information

Planned Go Live Date	2026-10-31
Approved Budget	£200,000
Executive Sponsor	Reg
Operations Manager	Farouk

SAMPLE

Headline Measures

Overall Project Condition: High Risk

Measure	Overall Project Condition
Value	46
Rating or status	High Risk
Interpretation	The ten categories were equally weighted. The project has a clear target but weak evidence, immature readiness and limited delivery certainty.
Scope	Overall assessment

Obeng Project Type: Quest

Measure	Obeng Project Type
Value	Quest
Rating or status	Quest
Interpretation	Confidence: Provisional. The intended outcome is clear, but the full delivery method is not. Diagnostic knowledge articles are designed, while triage, assignment and other implementation components remain in draft.
Scope	Overall assessment

Outcome Clarity: Mostly clear

Measure	Outcome Clarity
Value	4
Rating or status	Mostly clear
Interpretation	The target is specific and measurable, but the baseline and benchmark-measurement controls are weak.
Scope	Module

Scope Stability: Partially controlled

Measure	Scope Stability
Value	3
Rating or status	Partially controlled
Interpretation	Scope is reported as agreed, but several critical components remain in draft.
Scope	Module

Stakeholder Alignment: Partially aligned

Measure	Stakeholder Alignment
Value	3
Rating or status	Partially aligned
Interpretation	A sponsor is named and the target is reported as accepted, but formal agreement by each stakeholder group was not evidenced.
Scope	Module

Governance Effectiveness: Weak

Measure	Governance Effectiveness
Value	2
Rating or status	Weak
Interpretation	Executive sponsorship exists, but measurement, governance, delivery ownership and stage-gate controls are not established.
Scope	Module

Organisational Readiness: Not demonstrated

Measure	Organisational Readiness
Value	1
Rating or status	Not demonstrated
Interpretation	Training and operational readiness arrangements are still being drafted and no readiness evidence was supplied.
Scope	Module

Delivery Certainty: Low

Measure	Delivery Certainty
Value	2
Rating or status	Low
Interpretation	Configuration is underway, but critical design, ownership, testing and readiness information is incomplete.
Scope	Module

Technical Complexity: Insufficiently understood

Measure	Technical Complexity
Value	2
Rating or status	Insufficiently understood
Interpretation	Data migration and integration are still being drafted, so complexity and dependency exposure cannot yet be controlled.
Scope	Module

Timeline Realism: At risk

Measure	Timeline Realism
Value	2
Rating or status	At risk
Interpretation	The planned go-live is 31 October 2026, but minor delivery and readiness components remain in draft.
Scope	Module

Decision Velocity: Mixed

Measure	Decision Velocity
Value	3
Rating or status	Mixed
Interpretation	Scope, sponsor, budget and target decisions have been reported, but ownership and acceptance controls remain unresolved.
Scope	Module

Evidence Strength: Weak

Measure	Evidence Strength
Value	1
Rating or status	Weak
Interpretation	No documents were reviewed. The baseline relies on judgement-based exclusions and solution testing had no pass criteria.
Scope	Module

Outcome Clarity

Module status: Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether the required business result is specific, measurable and supported by a credible baseline.

Score 4/5. The project has a clear target to reduce average fault-resolution time from six hours to four hours. The target is useful, but confidence is reduced because the baseline excluded significant fault categories without a documented rule.

Outcome assessment

The intended result is measurable, but the current six-hour baseline is not yet suitable for formal benefits assurance because exclusions were based on individual judgement.

Module findings

FND-001	Measurable business outcome The project has a stated objective to reduce average fault-resolution time from six hours to four hours. The project has a clear basis for prioritisation and benefits tracking, provided the measurement method is corrected.
FND-002	Baseline is not reproducible Repeat faults, major outages and outliers were excluded from the six-hour baseline using Farouk's judgement without a written classification or exclusion rule. The reported baseline may not represent operational performance and cannot be independently reproduced or defended.

Module risks

RSK-001	Benefits baseline may be misleading Benefits may be overstated, challenged or impossible to verify after go-live. Recommend and approve the baseline using written inclusion, exclusion and segmentation rules.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-001	Replace the current baseline with an approved, reproducible fault-resolution measurement method. The current exclusion method is judgement-based and may distort both the starting point and reported benefits. Immediate
---------	---

Decisions required

DEC-001	Approve the definitive fault-resolution KPI, baseline population, exclusions, segmentation and reporting method. Immediate and before further benefits claims are made The project will continue using a baseline that may not be credible or reproducible.
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-002	Define, approve and rerun the fault-resolution baseline using written measurement rules. A reproducible baseline that accurately supports benefits tracking and leadership decisions. Immediate
---------	---

Scope Stability

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether the agreed scope is sufficiently defined and controlled.

Score 3/5. Scope is reported as agreed, and diagnosis is supported by designed knowledge articles. However, triage, assignment and other implementation components remain in draft.

Scope assessment

Agreement at headline level is positive, but scope control is not demonstrated until critical process designs and acceptance boundaries are documented.

Module findings

FND-003	Scope agreed but solution definition incomplete The project scope is reported as agreed, but several components needed to deliver the outcome remain in draft. Configuration may proceed against incomplete requirements and create rework, delay or reduced benefit.
FND-005	Triage and assignment changes are not yet defined. Triage and assignment are intended improvement areas, but their design was reported as still being drafted. The project may implement System without changing the process delays that materially contribute to fault-resolution time.

Module risks

RSK-002	System may not reduce the end-to-end process delays. The four-hour target is missed despite system implementation. Complete the end-to-end process design and test it against representative live fault scenarios.
---------	--

Recommendations

REC-002	Complete and approve the end-to-end designs for triage, assignment and diagnosis before further configuration is started as viable. The target depends on process change, not simply system installation. Immediate
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-003	Complete and approve the triage, assignment and diagnosis process designs. A defined end-to-end operating method that directly addresses the causes of fault-resolution delay. Immediate
---------	--

Stakeholder Alignment

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether sponsors, operations, engineers and IT support the outcome, scope and delivery approach.

Score 3/5. Reg is identified as sponsor, scope is reported as agreed and the four-hour target is reported as accepted. The stakeholder groups providing formal acceptance were not identified and no approval record was reviewed.

Alignment assessment

Headline support appears present, but formal acceptance, delivery accountability and stakeholder ownership are not evidenced.

Module findings

FND-007	Sponsor, budget and key dates are established Reg is identified as sponsor, a budget of £200,000 is reported as approved and the planned go-live date is 1 October 2026. The project has a visible leadership anchor and commercial boundary, subject to confirmation through governance records.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-004	Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate
---------	---

Decisions required

DEC-002	Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT. Immediate Critical systems will continue without clear accountability or integrated control.
---------	--

Baseline actions

ACT-001	Appoint and communicate a single accountable delivery lead. Clear ownership for the integrated plan, decisions, dependencies, reporting and delivery assurance. Immediate
---------	---

Governance Effectiveness

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess sponsorship, accountability, decision rights, controls and stage-gate discipline.

Score 2/5. Sponsorship exists, but the delivery lead was not identified, baseline rules were not governed and no formal go-live criteria were provided.

Governance assessment

The project has executive sponsorship but lacks the operating controls required to turn sponsorship into reliable delivery assurance.

Module findings

FND-002	Baseline is not reproducible Repeat faults, major outages and outages were excluded from the six-hour baseline using Farouk's judgement without a written classification or exclusion rule. The reported baseline may not represent operational performance and cannot be independently reproduced or defended.
FND-007	Sponsor, budget and key dates are established Reg is identified as sponsor, a budget of £200,000 is reported as approved and the planned go-live date is 31 October 2026. The project has a visible leadership anchor and commercial boundary subject to confirmation through governance records.

Module risks

RSK-004	Go-live date drives rushed delivery Defects, disruption, rework, delayed benefits or an unplanned postponement. Use an evidence-based readiness gate and permit the date to change if mandatory conditions are not met.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-004	Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate
REC-006	Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone. The current date is not supported by sufficient design, testing, migration, integration or readiness evidence. Before approval

Decisions required

DEC-002	Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT. Immediate Critical workstreams will continue without clear accountability or integrated control.
DEC-003	Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them. Before formal go-live approval The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.

Baseline actions

ACT-001	Appoint and communicate a single accountable delivery lead. Clear ownership for the integrated plan, decisions, dependencies, reporting and delivery assurance. Immediate
---------	---

ACT-007	Run a formal readiness and go-live gate against approved criteria. An evidence-based decision on whether the solution, people, data, integrations and support arrangements are ready. Before approval
ACT-008	Confirm or revise the go-live decision and activate post-go-live benefits tracking. A controlled deployment decision and transparent measurement of movement from the approved baseline toward four hours. Before approval

SAMPLE

Organisational Readiness

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether people, processes, training, support and operational controls are ready for adoption.

Score 1/5. Training and operational-readiness arrangements are still being drafted. No readiness criteria, adoption plan, support model or completion evidence was supplied.

Readiness assessment

Operational readiness is not demonstrated and is currently the weakest delivery condition.

Module findings

FND-006	Operational readiness is immature User training and operational-readiness arrangements are still being drafted. Users may be unable or unwilling to adopt the new process at go-live, reducing service performance and increasing disruption.
---------	---

Module risks

RSK-003	Operational adoption failure Fault resolution slows, workarounds increase and service performance deteriorates. Create and evidence a role-based training, support, adoption and operational-readiness plan.
---------	--

Recommendations

REC-005	Create a role-based operational-readiness plan covering training, support, adoption, process ownership and transition. Readiness is not demonstrated and is a direct threat to service performance at go-live. Before next stage
REC-006	Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone. The current date is not supported by sufficient design, testing, migration, integration or readiness evidence. Before approval

Decisions required

DEC-003	Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them. Before formal go-live approval The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-006	Complete the data migration, integration, training and operational-readiness plans with owners, milestones and acceptance evidence. Controlled completion of the work required for a safe and adoptable deployment. Before next stage
ACT-007	Run a formal readiness and go-live gate against approved criteria. An evidence-based decision on whether the solution, people, data, integrations and support arrangements are ready. Before approval

Delivery Certainty

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether the delivery approach, ownership, plan, testing and controls support a predictable result.

Score 2/5. Configuration is underway, but critical process designs, delivery ownership, acceptance criteria and readiness controls are incomplete.

Delivery assessment

The project is configuring before the complete delivery method and acceptance evidence are established. That creates avoidable rework and go-live risk.

Module findings

FND-003	Scope agreed but solution definition incomplete The project scope is treated as agreed, but several components needed to deliver the outcome remain in draft. Configuration may proceed against incomplete requirements and create rework, delay or reduced benefits.
FND-005	Triage and assignment changes are not yet defined Triage and assignment are intended improvement areas, but their design was reported as stable. The project may implement System without changing the process delays that materially contribute to fault-resolution time.
FND-009	Schedule is not yet supported by delivery evidence Configuration is underway and go-live is planned for 31 October 2026, while several critical workstreams remain in draft. The project may either miss the date or protect the date by reducing design, testing or readiness quality.

Module risks

RSK-002	System may not reduce the principal process delays The four-hour target is missed despite system implementation. Complete the end-to-end process design and test it against representative live fault scenarios.
RSK-004	Go-live date drives rushed delivery Defects, disruption, rework, delayed benefits or an unplanned postponement Close on evidence-based readiness gate and permit the date to change if mandatory conditions are not met.

Recommendations

REC-002	Complete and approve the end-to-end designs for triage, assignment and diagnosis before further configuration is treated as stable. The target depends on process change, not simply system installation. Immediate
REC-004	Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate
REC-006	Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone. The current date is not supported by sufficient design, testing, migration, integration or readiness evidence. Before approval

Decisions required

DEC-002	Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT. Immediate Critical workstreams will continue without clear accountability or integrated control.
---------	--

DEC-003	Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them. Before formal go-live approval The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-001	Appoint and communicate a single accountable delivery lead. Clear ownership for the integrated plan, decisions, dependencies, reporting and delivery assurance. Immediate
ACT-003	Complete and approve the triage, assignment and diagnosis process designs. A defined end-to-end operating method that directly addresses the causes of fault-resolution delay. Immediate
ACT-004	Define measurable acceptance criteria for triage, assignment, diagnosis and diagnostic knowledge articles. Objective evidence that the configured process performs as intended. Before approval
ACT-007	Run a formal readiness and go-live gate against approved criteria. An evidence-based decision on whether the solution, people, data, integrations and support arrangements are ready. Before approval
ACT-008	Confirm or revise the go-live decision and activate post-go-live benefits tracking. A controlled deployment decision and transparent measurement of movement from the approved baseline toward four hours. Before approval

SAMPLE

Technical Complexity

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess the level of technical dependency, integration, migration and solution uncertainty.

Score 2/5. Data migration and integration are still being drafted. No architecture, interface inventory, data-quality assessment or dependency analysis was reviewed.

Technical assessment

Technical complexity cannot yet be reliably assessed because migration and integration remain at draft stage.

Module findings

FND-005	Triage and assignment changes are not yet defined Triage and assignment are intended improvement areas, but their design was reported as still being drafted. The project may implement System without changing the process delays that materially contribute to faster resolution time.
---------	--

Module risks

RSK-005	Migration and integration complexity is underestimated Scheduled delays, additional cost, unreliable records or service disruption. Complete the architecture, interface inventory, data assessment, migration rehearsal and dependency plan.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-002	Complete and approve the end-user design for triage, assignment and diagnosis before further configuration is treated as stable. The target depends on process change, not simply system installation. Immediate
REC-004	Appoint a single accountable person lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate

Baseline actions

ACT-006	Complete the migration, integration, training and operational-readiness plans with owners, milestones and acceptance evidence. Controlled completion of the work required for a safe and adoptable deployment. Before next stage
---------	--

Timeline Realism

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether the planned timescale reflects remaining work, dependencies and readiness requirements.

Score 2/5. The go-live date is defined, but the assessment found no detailed schedule, resource plan or stage-gate evidence. Several critical workstreams remain in draft.

Timeline assessment

The date is an intention, not yet a controlled forecast. Leadership should require evidence of design completion, testing and readiness before reconfirming it.

Module findings

FND-009	Schedule is not yet supported by delivery evidence Configuration is not ready and go-live is planned for 31 October 2026, while several critical workstreams remain in draft. The project may either miss the date or protect the date by reducing design, testing or readiness quality.
---------	--

Module risks

RSK-003	Operational adoption failure Fault resolution slows, workarounds increase and service performance deteriorates. Create and evidence a robust training, support, adoption and operational-readiness plan.
RSK-004	Go-live date drives rushed delivery Defects, disruption, rework, delayed benefits or an unplanned postponement. Use an evidence-based readiness gate and permit the date to change if mandatory conditions are not met.

Recommendations

REC-004	Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate
REC-006	Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone. The current date is not supported by sufficient design, testing, migration, integration or readiness evidence. Before approval

Decisions required

DEC-003	Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them. Before formal go-live approval The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-006	Complete the data migration, integration, training and operational-readiness plans with owners, milestones and acceptance evidence. Controlled completion of the work required for a safe and adoptable deployment. Before next stage
ACT-007	Run a formal readiness and go-live gate against approved criteria. An evidence-based decision on whether the solution, people, data, integrations and support arrangements are ready. Before approval

ACT-008

Confirm or revise the go-live decision and activate post-go-live benefits tracking. | A controlled deployment decision and transparent measurement of movement from the approved baseline toward four hours. | Before approval

SAMPLE

Decision Velocity

Module status: Partially Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether decisions are made quickly enough by clear owners using adequate evidence.

Score 3/5. Important headline decisions have been reported, including sponsor, scope, budget, target and go-live date. Delivery ownership, measurement governance and go-live authority remain unclear.

Decision assessment

Decisions have been made at headline level, but the evidence and ownership required for fast operational decisions are not yet visible.

Module findings

FND-007	Sponsor, budget and key dates are established Reg is identified as sponsor, a budget of £200,000 is reported as approved and the planned go-live date is 31 October 2026. The project has a visible leadership anchor and commercial boundary, subject to confirmation through performance records.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-004	Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan. Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status not sufficiently clear for leadership control. Immediate
---------	---

Decisions required

DEC-001	Approve the definitive fault-resolution KPI, baseline population, exclusions, segmentation and reporting method. Confirm no and benefit further benefits claims are made The project will continue using a baseline that may not be reliable or reproducible.
DEC-002	Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT. Immediate Critical workstreams will continue without clear accountability or integrated control.
DEC-003	Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them. Before formal go-live approval The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.

Baseline actions

ACT-001	Appoint and communicate a single accountable delivery lead. Clear ownership for the integrated plan, decisions, dependencies, reporting and delivery assurance. Immediate
ACT-002	Define, approve and rerun the fault-resolution baseline using written measurement rules. A reproducible baseline that accurately supports benefits tracking and leadership decisions. Immediate
ACT-008	Confirm or revise the go-live decision and activate post-go-live benefits tracking. A controlled deployment decision and transparent measurement of movement from the approved baseline toward four hours. Before approval

Evidence Strength

Module status: Assessed

Purpose: Assess whether conclusions, targets and delivery claims are supported by reliable and reproducible evidence.

Score 1/5. The baseline used 250 records over two months, but excluded repeat faults, major outages and outliers based solely on the Operations Manager's judgement. Knowledge articles were walked through without pass criteria. No project documents were reviewed.

Evidence assessment

The current evidence is insufficient for a reliable benefits case or go-live assurance decision.

Module findings

FND-002	Baseline is not reproducible Repeat faults, major outages and outliers were excluded from the six-hour baseline using Farouk's judgement without a written classification or inclusion rule. The reported baseline may not represent operational performance and cannot be independently reproduced or defended.
FND-004	Knowledge articles have limited validation Twenty-five diagnostic knowledge articles were reviewed by four engineers in a walkthrough, but no pass criteria were defined and no live fault scenarios were evidenced. The articles may appear acceptable in review but fail to improve diagnosis speed or quality in live operation.
FND-008	Evidence base is insufficient to project documents, data extracts, plans, approval records, test results or readiness evidence were reviewed Leadership conclusions remain provisional and cannot yet support a robust approval or assurance decision.

Module risks

RSK-001	Benefits baseline may be misleading Benefits may be overstated, challenged or impossible to verify after go-live. Recommend and approve the baseline using written inclusion, exclusion and segmentation rules.
---------	---

Recommendations

REC-001	Replace the current baseline with an approved, reproducible fault-resolution measurement method. The current exclusion method is judgement-based and may distort both the starting point and reported benefits. Immediate
REC-003	Run a controlled live-scenario pilot using representative fault types and measurable pass criteria. Walkthrough approval does not demonstrate operational performance or improvement. Before approval

Decisions required

DEC-001	Approve the definitive fault-resolution KPI, baseline population, exclusions, segmentation and reporting method. Immediate and before further benefits claims are made The project will continue using a baseline that may not be credible or reproducible.
---------	---

Baseline actions

ACT-002	Define, approve and rerun the fault-resolution baseline using written measurement rules. A reproducible baseline that accurately supports benefits tracking and leadership decisions. Immediate
ACT-004	Define measurable acceptance criteria for triage, assignment, diagnosis and diagnostic knowledge articles. Objective evidence that the configured process performs as intended. Before approval
ACT-005	Run a representative live-scenario pilot and record performance against the approved criteria. Evidence that the new process can reduce fault-resolution time without degrading quality or control. Before approval

SAMPLE

Findings Register

Finding	Type	Severity	Statement	Consequence
Measurable business outcome	Strength		The project has a stated objective to reduce average fault-resolution time from six hours to four hours.	The project has a clear basis for prioritisation and benefits tracking, provided the measurement method is corrected.
Baseline is not reproducible	Control weakness	High	Repeat faults, major outages and outliers were excluded from the six-hour baseline using Farouk's judgement without a written classification or exclusion rule.	The reported baseline may not represent operational performance and cannot be independently reproduced or defended.
Scope agreed but solution definition incomplete	Concern	Medium	The project scope is reported as agreed, but several components needed to deliver the outcome remain in draft.	Configuration may proceed against incomplete requirements and create rework, delay or reduced benefit.
Knowledge articles have limited validation	Evidence gap	High	Two self-funded diagnostic knowledge articles were reviewed by four engineers in a walkthrough, but no pass criteria were defined and no live fault scenarios were evidenced.	The articles may appear acceptable in review but fail to improve diagnosis speed or quality in live operation.
Triage and assignment changes are not yet defined	Risk indicator	High	Triage and assignment are intended improvement areas, but their design was reported as still being drafted.	The project may implement System without changing the process delays that materially contribute to fault-resolution time.
Operational readiness is immature	Risk indicator	High	User training and operational-readiness arrangements are still being drafted.	Users may be unable or unwilling to adopt the new process at go-live, reducing service performance and increasing disruption.
Sponsor, budget and key dates are established	Strength		Reg is identified as sponsor, a budget of £200,000 is reported as approved and the planned go-live date is 31 October 2026.	The project has a visible leadership anchor and commercial boundary, subject to confirmation through governance records.
Evidence base is insufficient	Evidence gap	High	No project documents, data extracts, plans, approval records, test results or readiness evidence were reviewed.	Leadership conclusions remain provisional and cannot yet support a robust approval or assurance decision.

Finding	Type	Severity	Statement	Consequence
Schedule is not yet supported by delivery evidence	Risk indicator	High	Configuration is underway and go-live is planned for 31 October 2026, while several critical workstreams remain in draft.	The project may either miss the date or protect the date by reducing design, testing or readiness quality.
Project is a Quest	Concern	Medium	The desired result is clear, but the method for reliably achieving it is only partly defined.	The project needs controlled experimentation, rapid validation and explicit learning rather than treating delivery as routine configuration.

SAMPLE

Risk Register

Risk	Cause	Event	Consequence	Rating	Required response
Benefits baseline may be misleading	The six-hour baseline excludes repeat faults, major outages and outliers using undocumented individual judgement.	The project reports improvement against a baseline that does not represent full operational performance.	Benefits may be overstated, challenged or impossible to verify after go-live.	High	Recalculate and approve the baseline using written inclusion, exclusion and segmentation rules.
System may not reduce the principal process delays	Triage and assignment are intended improvement areas but remain in draft.	The configured solution does not materially improve triage speed, assignment quality or diagnostic flow.	The four-hour target is missed despite system implementation.	High	Complete the end-to-end process design and test it against representative live fault scenarios.
Operational adoption failure	Training and operational-readiness arrangements are still being drafted.	Engineers and operations teams are not ready to use the new process effectively at go-live.	Fault resolution slows, workarounds increase and service performance deteriorates.	High	Create and evidence a role-based training, support, adoption and operational-readiness plan.
Go-live date drives rushed delivery	The 31 October 2026 date is set while critical design, testing, migration, integration and readiness work remains incomplete.	The project compresses time, bypasses necessary controls and protects the planned date.	Delays, disruption, rework, delayed benefits or an unplanned postponement.	High	Use an evidence-based readiness gate and permit the date to change if mandatory conditions are not met.
Migration and integration complexity is underestimated	Data migration and integration are still being planned and no technical evidence was reviewed.	Unexpected data-quality, interface or dependency problems emerge late.	Schedule delay, additional cost, unreliable records or service disruption.	High	Complete the architecture, interface inventory, data assessment, migration rehearsal and dependency plan.

Issue Register

Issue	Description	Current consequence	Resolution
No documented baseline exclusion rule	The current six-hour baseline excludes significant categories based on Farouk's judgement rather than an approved measurement method.	The baseline cannot be independently reproduced or confidently used for benefits assurance.	Approve written inclusion, exclusion, segmentation and calculation rules and rerun the baseline.
No pass criteria for knowledge-article testing	Twenty-five articles were reviewed by four engineers, but no pass criteria or measurable test outcomes were defined.	The walkthrough provides opinion-based feedback but no evidence that diagnosis time or quality will improve.	Define measurable acceptance criteria and test the articles using representative fault scenarios.
Delivery accountability is incomplete	The delivery lead was not identified and the status of key workstreams is described only as being drafted.	Leadership cannot see clear ownership, sequencing, dependency control or reliable forecast information.	Name the accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated plan with owners, milestones, dependencies and evidence requirements.

SAMPLE

Recommendations

Recommendation	Reason	Priority
Replace the current baseline with an approved, reproducible fault-resolution measurement method.	The current exclusion method is judgement-based and may distort both the starting point and reported benefits.	Immediate
Complete and approve the end-to-end designs for triage, assignment and diagnosis before further configuration is treated as stable.	The target depends on process change, not simply system installation.	Immediate
Run a controlled live-scenario pilot using representative fault types and measurable pass criteria.	Walkthrough approval does not demonstrate operational performance or improvement.	Before approval
Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan.	Ownership, sequencing, dependencies and status are not sufficiently clear for leadership control.	Immediate
Create a role-based operational-readiness plan covering training, support, adoption, process ownership and transition.	Readiness is not demonstrated and is a direct threat to service performance at go-live.	Before next stage
Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone.	The current date is not supported by sufficient design, testing, migration, integration or readiness evidence.	Before approval

SAMPLE

Decisions Required

Decision	Owner	Timing	Consequence of delay
Approve the definitive fault-resolution KPI, baseline population, exclusions, segmentation and reporting method.	Reg	Immediate and before further benefits claims are made	The project will continue using a baseline that may not be credible or reproducible.
Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT.	Reg	Immediate	Critical workstreams will continue without clear accountability or integrated control.
Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them.	Reg	Before formal go-live approval	The calendar date may override evidence of design, testing and operational readiness.

SAMPLE

Baseline Action Plan

Seq.	Action	Intended outcome	Priority	Suggested owner	Indicative timing
1	Appoint and communicate a single accountable delivery lead.	Clear ownership for the integrated plan, decisions, dependencies, reporting and delivery assurance.	Immediate	Reg	Within five working days
2	Define, approve and rerun the fault-resolution baseline using written measurement rules.	A reproducible baseline that accurately supports benefits tracking and leadership decisions.	Immediate	Operations Manager with project assurance support	Within ten working days
3	Complete and approve the triage, assignment and diagnosis process designs.	A defined end-to-end operating method that directly addresses the causes of fault-resolution delay.	Immediate	Delivery lead with Operations, engineers and IT	Before configuration baseline approval
4	Define measurable acceptance criteria for triage, assignment, diagnosis and diagnostic knowledge articles.	Objective evidence that the configured process performs as intended.	Before approval	Delivery lead with Operations Manager and engineering representatives	Before system and user acceptance testing
5	Run a representative live-scenario pilot and measure performance against the approved criteria.	Evidence that the new process can reduce fault-resolution time without degrading quality or control.	Before approval	Delivery lead with maintenance engineers	Before go-live readiness review
6	Complete the data migration, integration, training and operational-readiness plans with owners, milestones and acceptance evidence.	Controlled completion of the work required for a safe and adoptable deployment.	Before next stage	Delivery lead	Before readiness-gate entry
7	Run a formal readiness and go-live gate against approved criteria.	An evidence-based decision on whether the solution, people, data, integrations and support arrangements are ready.	Before approval	Reg with independent project assurance	Before 31 October 2026 go-live approval

Seq.	Action	Intended outcome	Priority	Suggested owner	Indicative timing
8	Confirm or revise the go-live decision and activate post-go-live benefits tracking.	A controlled deployment decision and transparent measurement of movement from the approved baseline toward four hours.	Before approval	Reg	At the go-live decision point

SAMPLE

Evidence, Assumptions and Limitations

Evidence reviewed

- Current average fault-resolution time reported as six hours, with a target of four hours.
- Baseline reported as an average of 250 fault records over two months.
- Repeat faults, major outages and outliers were excluded based on Farouk's judgement, with no written rule.
- Diagnostic knowledge articles have been designed.
- Twenty-five articles were reviewed by four engineers in a walkthrough with no pass criteria.
- Scope is reported as agreed and Reg is identified as executive sponsor.
- The project is currently in configuration.
- Planned go-live is 31 October 2026, approved budget is reported as £200,000, the four-hour target is reported as accepted and remaining workstreams are being drafted.
- Triage, assignment and diagnosis were identified as the process areas expected to improve.

Evidence gaps

- No approved baseline calculation, inclusion, exclusion or segmentation rules were reviewed.
- No live-scenario test results or pass criteria were reviewed.
- No integrated plan, milestone schedule, dependency or resource plan was reviewed.
- No governance document naming the delivery lead, decision rights or workstream owners was reviewed.
- No analysis was provided showing how improvements in triage, assignment and diagnosis will reduce average resolution time by two hours.
- No formal approval record was reviewed showing which stakeholder groups accepted the four-hour target.

Assumptions

- Farouk's stated role of 'Ops manager' is interpreted as Operations Manager.
- The ten diagnostic categories are equally weighted because no alternative weighting was supplied.
- The reported £200,000 is the total approved project budget.

Project unknowns

- Client or organisation name.
- Lead contact and accountable delivery lead.
- Detailed completion status of configuration, process design, migration, integration, training and readiness.
- Technical architecture, integration inventory, data quality and migration complexity.
- Which operations, engineering and IT authorities formally accepted the four-hour target.
- Implementation-team capacity, supplier commitments and resource availability.

Limitations

- The assessment is based solely on a short diagnostic interview and no supporting project evidence was reviewed.
- No public organisational context was reviewed because the organisation was not named.
- Schedule realism was assessed without a detailed plan, resource profile or dependency analysis.

Missing Information

Missing field or information	Effect
Client or organisation name	Mandatory organisational attribution remains unavailable.
Lead contact and accountable delivery lead	Ownership and report handover cannot be assigned to a named project contact.
Approved baseline method and source-data extract	The six-hour starting position cannot be verified.
Integrated project plan and workstream status	The likelihood of achieving the planned go-live cannot be tested.
Technical design, migration and integration evidence	Technical complexity and dependency risk remain uncertain.
Training, adoption and operational-readiness plan	The organisation's ability to operate successfully at go-live is not demonstrated.
Formal stakeholder acceptance record for the four-hour target	Target ownership and alignment across operations, engineers and IT are not confirmed.

SAMPLE