ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE · FICTIONALIZED PROJECT · NOT A CLIENT CASE STUDY

THE TECH MANAGER'S PLAYBOOK

Project Delivery Health Audit

Evidence-backed delivery visibility for software projects

Prepared for	Illustrative Software Company (fictionalized)
Project	Project Atlas — Customer Portal Release
Assessment date	29 August 2026
Prepared by	M. Mohammad · The Tech Manager's Playbook
Report version	v1.1 · Illustrative Sample

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONALIZED PROJECT

This report assesses the project evidence supplied for delivery visibility and control. It is not a technical, security, legal, financial, regulatory, or employee-performance audit and does not certify project success.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE

This report uses a fictionalized software-delivery scenario to demonstrate the Project Delivery Health Audit methodology. It is not based on a real client engagement and should not be treated as customer proof or a testimonial.

1. Executive Delivery Health Brief

Independent assessment of the project position represented by the evidence supplied for review.

RAG RECOMMENDATION	OBSERVED HEALTH	EVIDENCE COVERAGE	EVIDENCE CONFIDENCE	PRIORITY FINDINGS
AMBER	**57/100 At Risk**	**94% 33 of 35 checkpoints supported**	**73% Moderate**	**0 / 4 / 2 Critical / Material / Watch**

Executive assessment

Evidence: The project retains an 18 September release target and the current executive status is Green. The supplied plan shows UAT planned for 4 September, while UAT-environment readiness is dated 6 September. The SSO dependency and export-scope decision are overdue; the data extract remains date-sensitive. The test summary shows 68% of UAT cases prepared and 14 open defects, including two high-severity items.

Inference: The release remains potentially recoverable, but current schedule confidence is overstated. The project is consuming contingency through unresolved dependencies, decisions and validation readiness without an approved reforecast.

Management conclusion: Leadership should treat the project as Amber until the critical prerequisites are closed or a revised forecast demonstrates sufficient recovery margin.

Leadership needs to know	The 18 September release is still potentially recoverable, but current Green reporting overstates confidence because key dependencies, an overdue scope decision and UAT-readiness evidence are not reconciled to the forecast.
Immediate attention	1) Confirm SSO, data-extract and UAT-environment dates. 2) Close the export-scope decision. 3) Reforecast UAT/release

	and reset RAG using current evidence.
30-day objective	Establish one evidence-backed weekly control view that connects forecast, RAID, decisions/dependencies, actions and release readiness.
Delivery outlook	Exposed but recoverable — provided the overdue decision/dependencies are resolved within the next 7 days and the forecast is revalidated.

RAG rationale

AMBER. No evidence reviewed proves that the 18 September release has already failed or is unrecoverable, so a Red recommendation is not supported. However, four Material findings affect forecast credibility, dependency/decision control, risk response and scope/acceptance readiness. Evidence coverage is high at 94%, while evidence confidence is Moderate at 73% because several material contradictions and two NE checkpoints reduce certainty. The Green headline should therefore be replaced by an Amber position with explicit recovery triggers.

2. Delivery Health Scorecard

Scores represent the observed strength of delivery control in the evidence reviewed. Evidence coverage is shown separately so missing information is not converted into an artificial failure score.

Dimension	Weight	Score	Evidence coverage	Executive interpretation
1. Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	20%	55/100	100%	Baseline exists, but forecast confidence is reduced by late prerequisites and no approved recovery reforecast.
2. Risk & Issue Control	15%	60/100	100%	Risks are visible and prioritized; ownership and dated responses are inconsistent on material exposure.
3. Decision & Dependency Control	15%	55/100	100%	Material items are identifiable but aging and escalation are not reliably protecting the schedule.
4. Scope & Requirements Integrity	15%	65/100	100%	Core scope is coherent; one overdue scope decision and two acceptance gaps remain material.
5. Action & Accountability Control	10%	62/100	80%	Actions are captured and mostly owned, but overdue follow-through and closure evidence need tighter control.
6. Quality & Release Readiness	10%	56/100	80%	Validation evidence exists, but readiness is compressed and formal release-decision criteria are not yet evidenced.
7. Reporting & Evidence Integrity	15%	50/100	100%	Traceability is reasonable, but Green status does not reconcile material dependency/readiness contradictions.

Systemic themes

- Reporting is lagging the underlying control evidence: the Green headline is more confident than the current dependency, risk and readiness position.

- Decision and dependency aging is consuming schedule contingency and increasing pressure on UAT and release readiness.
- Core control mechanisms exist, but follow-through is inconsistent: issues are visible before they are consistently owned, escalated and converted into dated recovery actions.

3. How to Read This Assessment

The audit separates what is known from what is interpreted or unavailable. This distinction is central to the reliability of the report.

Evidence	Directly observable fact supported by the project material reviewed.
Inference	Professional interpretation derived from evidence; not presented as confirmed fact.
Missing Information	Information required for a stronger conclusion but not available in the submitted evidence. Missing information is not automatically a failure.
Contradiction	Materially inconsistent claims across evidence sources that cannot be reconciled from the submitted material.
Evidence Confidence	A separate 2/1/0 judgment on whether supporting evidence is direct/current/relevant/consistent (2), partial/dated/indirect/single-source (1), or missing/materially contradictory (0). Bands: High 80–100%, Moderate 60–79%, Low 40–59%, Insufficient <40%.

Finding severity

Critical	Immediate or near-term threat to a major delivery commitment, release, decision, or management understanding requiring prompt intervention.
Material	Control weakness that materially reduces delivery confidence or increases the probability of delay, rework, scope failure, unmanaged risk, or poor management decisions.
Watch	Early warning, localized weakness, emerging trend, or inconsistency that warrants attention but does not currently justify Material severity.

Scoring note

A checkpoint score and a finding severity answer different questions. Low scores do not automatically generate findings, and findings should be consolidated where several symptoms share one underlying control problem.

4. Priority Findings

The following consolidated findings materially change the management view of the project and drive the corrective actions in this report.

ID	Severity	Finding	Dims	Delivery implication	Priority action
F-01	Material	Current Green status and 18 September forecast are not sufficiently supported by the underlying delivery evidence.	1, 3, 6, 7	Leadership may delay corrective decisions because the headline status does not communicate the actual level of schedule and readiness exposure.	Reconcile the forecast to current dependency, backlog and UAT-readiness evidence; publish an explicit Amber rationale until the exposure is resolved or a recovery position is evidenced.
F-02	Material	Release-critical decisions and	1, 3, 5	UAT may start late or with incomplete	Set accountable decision/dependency

ID	Severity	Finding	Dims	Delivery implication	Priority action
		dependencies are aging without firm recovery dates or consistently effective escalation.		prerequisites, increasing the probability of rework and release-date movement.	owners, committed resolution dates and escalation thresholds; reforecast immediately if any required-by date cannot be met.
F-03	Material	High risk and issue exposure is visible, but ownership and dated response actions are not consistently complete.	2, 5, 7	Known threats may remain visible without being converted into timely management action, allowing preventable schedule or quality impact.	Assign one accountable owner, dated mitigation and escalation condition to every high/material risk and active issue; review these weekly against the forecast.
F-04	Material	Unresolved scope and acceptance details on release-critical work create avoidable rework and acceptance exposure.	4, 6	The project is exposed to late rework, disputed acceptance or additional schedule pressure during UAT.	Close the export-scope decision and resolve acceptance notes before affected work enters final validation; record any resulting scope/date trade-off explicitly.
F-05	Watch	Overdue action aging indicates follow-through latency on cross-team commitments.	3, 5	If the pattern continues, lower-level commitments may convert into schedule-critical blockers.	Add aging visibility to the weekly review and automatically escalate material actions that miss one agreed due date without a revised commitment.
F-06	Watch	Release decision evidence is not yet complete enough to support a defensible go/no-go position.	6, 7	Without explicit criteria, late release decisions may become subjective or inconsistent with unresolved quality and dependency exposure.	Define the go/no-go decision authority, minimum readiness criteria and residual-risk acceptance record before the release readiness review.

Management interpretation

The findings are connected rather than independent. The project has sufficient artifacts to see the real delivery position, but unresolved decisions/dependencies and inconsistent follow-through are not yet being translated into the forecast and executive status. The primary control problem is therefore not lack of information; it is incomplete conversion of available evidence into timely management decisions and an updated delivery position.

5. Detailed Findings

Each finding below separates direct evidence from professional inference, delivery consequence and recommended management action.

F-01 MATERIAL — Current Green status and 18 September forecast are not sufficiently supported by the underlying delivery evidence.

Evidence: The status report remains Green and retains the 18 Sep release. The milestone plan places UAT start on 4 Sep but UAT environment readiness on 6 Sep. SSO and data dependencies remain open, and the test summary shows 68% case preparation with two high-severity defects open. (E-02, E-03, E-06, E-08, E-10)

Inference: The release may still be recoverable, but the current management position overstates schedule confidence and does not adequately account for prerequisite and readiness exposure.

Delivery implication: Leadership may delay corrective decisions because the headline status does not communicate the actual level of schedule and readiness exposure.

Recommended action: Reconcile the forecast to current dependency, backlog and UAT-readiness evidence; publish an explicit Amber rationale until the exposure is resolved or a recovery position is evidenced.

Timing / owner: Within 3 business days · Delivery Lead / Project Manager

Affected dimensions: 1, 3, 6, 7

F-02 MATERIAL — Release-critical decisions and dependencies are aging without firm recovery dates or consistently effective escalation.

Evidence: The export-scope decision is overdue from 21 Aug. SSO configuration is overdue from 25 Aug. The client data extract remains due 1 Sep without a confirmed contingency, and related actions recur across weekly notes. (E-03, E-06, E-07, E-10)

Inference: Schedule compression is accumulating around UAT because unresolved external inputs and decisions are consuming contingency without a corresponding reforecast.

Delivery implication: UAT may start late or with incomplete prerequisites, increasing the probability of rework and release-date movement.

Recommended action: Set accountable decision/dependency owners, committed resolution dates and escalation thresholds; reforecast immediately if any required-by date cannot be met.

Timing / owner: Immediate / within 7 days · Sponsor + Delivery Lead

Affected dimensions: 1, 3, 5

F-03 MATERIAL — High risk and issue exposure is visible, but ownership and dated response actions are not consistently complete.

Evidence: The RAID log identifies material dependency, scope and quality exposure. Three material entries/actions lack either a named accountable owner or a dated mitigation step, and two issues recur without clear closure. (E-05, E-07)

Inference: Risk identification is functioning, but response control is weaker than the quality of the risk record itself.

Delivery implication: Known threats may remain visible without being converted into timely management action, allowing preventable schedule or quality impact.

Recommended action: Assign one accountable owner, dated mitigation and escalation condition to every high/material risk and active issue; review these weekly against the forecast.

Timing / owner: Within 7 days · Project Manager / Risk owners

Affected dimensions: 2, 5, 7

F-04 MATERIAL — Unresolved scope and acceptance details on release-critical work create avoidable rework and acceptance exposure.

Evidence: The export-functionality scope decision remains unresolved. Two release-critical backlog items retain acceptance notes requiring clarification while implementation is still active. (E-04, E-06, E-09)

Inference: Late clarification could change implementation or UAT expectations after remaining schedule contingency has already been reduced.

Delivery implication: The project is exposed to late rework, disputed acceptance or additional schedule pressure during UAT.

Recommended action: Close the export-scope decision and resolve acceptance notes before affected work enters final validation; record any resulting scope/date trade-off explicitly.

Timing / owner: Within 7 days · Product Owner / Sponsor

Affected dimensions: 4, 6

F-05 WATCH — Overdue action aging indicates follow-through latency on cross-team commitments.

Evidence: Five actions are overdue and two have rolled forward through more than one weekly cycle. (E-07)

Inference: The action mechanism exists, but normal follow-up is not reliably closing cross-team items before they become dependencies or escalations.

Delivery implication: If the pattern continues, lower-level commitments may convert into schedule-critical blockers.

Recommended action: Add aging visibility to the weekly review and automatically escalate material actions that miss one agreed due date without a revised commitment.

Timing / owner: Within 14 days · Project Manager

Affected dimensions: 3, 5

F-06 WATCH — Release decision evidence is not yet complete enough to support a defensible go/no-go position.

Evidence: No formal go/no-go criteria or residual-risk acceptance record was supplied, and the release gate has not yet occurred. (E-08, E-10)

Inference: This is not evidence that release control has failed, but the decision basis should be defined before the release window narrows further.

Delivery implication: Without explicit criteria, late release decisions may become subjective or inconsistent with unresolved quality and dependency exposure.

Recommended action: Define the go/no-go decision authority, minimum readiness criteria and residual-risk acceptance record before the release readiness review.

Timing / owner: Within 14 days · Sponsor + QA Lead + Delivery Lead

Affected dimensions: 6, 7

6. Risks, Weak Signals, Decisions & Dependencies

6.1 Top delivery risks and weak signals

Ref	Signal / risk	Evidence basis	Potential impact	Owner / response	Status
R-01	SSO configuration dependency remains overdue	E-03, E-06	May delay integrated validation and compress UAT	Client IAM owner; confirm date and contingency	Open
R-02	Client data extract delivery remains date-sensitive	E-06	Late data may reduce UAT realism or delay test execution	Client data owner; confirm 1 Sep delivery	Open
R-03	Two high-severity defects remain open	E-08	Could affect acceptance/readiness if not resolved or consciously accepted	QA Lead / engineering owners	Open
R-04	Eleven stories carried over; seven release-critical incomplete	E-04	Remaining work may compress validation and defect-fix time	Delivery Lead; reforecast remaining work	Monitored
R-05	Export feature scope remains unresolved	E-06, E-09	Late decision may create rework or acceptance conflict	Sponsor / Product Owner	Open

6.2 Decision and dependency bottlenecks

Ref	Type	Open item	Required by	Delivery impact	Required management action
DD-01	Decision	Confirm export-functionality scope for release	21 Aug 2026 (overdue)	May alter build and acceptance work	Sponsor to make/record decision; quantify impact
DD-02	Dependency	Client SSO configuration available for integrated test	25 Aug 2026 (overdue)	Blocks complete authentication validation	Confirm committed delivery and escalation path
DD-03	Dependency	Production-like client data extract for UAT	1 Sep 2026	May delay realistic UAT execution	Confirm delivery or approve representative fallback
DD-04	Dependency	UAT environment ready for execution	4 Sep 2026	Current plan shows readiness on 6 Sep, after planned start	Reconcile plan and reset UAT start if required

7. Missing Information & Contradictions

These items constrain confidence in the assessment. They are not automatically scored as failures; they are shown because they affect what can be concluded safely.

7.1 Missing information

ID	Information missing	Why it matters	Conclusion constrained	Recommended follow-up
MI-01	Formal UAT sign-off authority	Acceptance ownership affects	Who has final authority to	Name the accountable sign-off

ID	Information missing	Why it matters	Conclusion constrained	Recommended follow-up
		closure and escalation.	accept the release.	role before UAT exit.
MI-02	Approved recovery/capacity position for carry-over work	Remaining work is concentrated near UAT.	Whether the current team can recover without schedule trade-offs.	Document recovery assumptions or reforecast.
MI-03	Formal release go/no-go criteria and residual-risk acceptance	Required for evidence-based release decision.	Whether readiness will be judged consistently.	Define criteria and decision authority before readiness review.
MI-04	Confirmed production-environment readiness date	Release requires non-code operational prerequisites.	Whether final deployment prerequisites align to 18 Sep.	Provide release-readiness confirmation/date.

7.2 Unresolved contradictions

ID	Conflicting evidence	Sources	Delivery consequence	Resolution required
C-01	Executive status is Green/on track while the delivery evidence shows overdue SSO, unresolved scope decision and compressed UAT readiness.	E-02 vs E-03, E-06, E-08	May understate current delivery exposure and delay intervention.	Reconcile RAG and forecast to current source evidence.
C-02	Status states UAT is on track for 4 Sep, while the milestone plan shows UAT environment readiness on 6 Sep.	E-02 vs E-03	The stated UAT start is not supported by the current prerequisite date.	Confirm actual environment date and revise UAT/forecast accordingly.

8. Reporting & Evidence Integrity

This section answers whether leadership can reasonably rely on the current management view of the project.

Status accuracy & cross-artifact consistency	Exposed — Headline Green status does not fully reconcile overdue dependencies, UAT readiness and open high exposure.
RAG rationale	Weak — RAG rationale is too brief to explain why material exposure remains compatible with Green.
Evidence traceability	Generally reliable — Most major claims can be traced to current source artifacts, although summary claims such as 70% complete need clearer reconciliation.
Missing information & contradictions	Exposed — Two material contradictions and four information gaps require explicit management follow-up.
Management decision utility	Partial — Report is concise, but leadership must infer required decisions and the consequence of unresolved dependencies.

What leadership can rely on

Leadership can rely on the existence of the 18 September release baseline, the current backlog position, the listed material risks/issues, the open decision/dependency set, and the reported UAT/defect status. These claims are supported by current artifacts and can be traced to source evidence.

What should be treated cautiously

Treat the Green RAG, the assertion that UAT is on track for 4 September, and the unchanged 18 September forecast cautiously. These positions are either contradicted by current prerequisite dates or insufficiently reconciled to remaining work, open dependencies and validation readiness.

9. 30-Day Corrective Action Plan

The following actions address the priority control gaps identified in this assessment and are sequenced around the current delivery window.

Priority	Action	Why now	Owner	Target	Evidence of completion	Linked finding
1	Confirm and escalate SSO, data extract and UAT-environment dependencies.	These are direct prerequisites to planned UAT.	Delivery Lead	31 Aug 2026	Committed dates, owners and escalation path recorded	F-01, F-02
2	Close the export-functionality scope decision.	The decision is already overdue and affects release-critical work.	Sponsor / Product Owner	1 Sep 2026	Decision recorded with scope/date consequence	F-02, F-04
3	Reforecast UAT and 18 Sep release using current remaining work and dependencies.	Current Green forecast is not adequately supported.	Project Manager	2 Sep 2026	Updated plan with assumptions and variance rationale	F-01
4	Reset RAG rationale to reflect current evidence and explicit triggers.	Leadership needs a decision-ready view of exposure.	Project Manager	2 Sep 2026	Status report reconciles risks, dependencies, readiness and forecast	F-01
5	Complete owners, mitigation dates and escalation conditions for all material risks/issues.	Known exposure is not consistently converted into action.	Project Manager / Risk owners	3 Sep 2026	RAID entries contain owner, action, due date and escalation trigger	F-03
6	Resolve remaining release-critical acceptance notes before final validation.	Late ambiguity creates rework and acceptance risk.	Product Owner / BA Lead	4 Sep 2026	Acceptance criteria updated and approved for affected items	F-04
7	Add overdue-action aging and escalation to the weekly control review.	Repeated carry-over indicates follow-through latency.	Project Manager	7 Sep 2026	Weekly review highlights aged actions and escalations	F-05
8	Define release go/no-go criteria, authority and residual-risk record.	Needed before the release decision window.	Sponsor / QA Lead / Delivery Lead	11 Sep 2026	Approved readiness criteria and decision record template	F-06

Suggested sequencing

0–7 days: stabilize the forecast by resolving overdue decisions/dependencies, reforecasting UAT/release and aligning RAG to evidence. 8–14 days: tighten risk/action ownership, acceptance clarity and release decision criteria. 15–30 days: verify that the revised weekly control view is operating consistently and that aged actions/risks no longer drift without escalation.

10. Evidence Reviewed & Assessment Basis

10.1 Evidence reviewed

Evidence ID	Artifact	Period / version	Use in assessment	Notes
E-01	Project Brief & Release Objective	v3 · 20 Aug 2026	Scope baseline; commitments; acceptance context	Defines 18 Sep release objective and release outcomes.
E-02	Weekly Executive Status Report	28 Aug 2026	Trajectory; RAG; reporting integrity	Reports Green, 70% complete, UAT on track and no critical dependency impact.
E-03	Milestone & Release Plan	27 Aug 2026	Trajectory; dependencies; release readiness	Shows UAT start 4 Sep, UAT environment ready 6 Sep, release 18 Sep.
E-04	Backlog Export	28 Aug 2026	Progress; scope; requirements	Shows 11 carry-over stories and 7 release-critical stories

Evidence ID	Artifact	Period / version	Use in assessment	Notes
				incomplete.
E-05	RAID Log	28 Aug 2026	Risk and issue control	Contains high dependency, quality and scope exposures; ownership/mitigation gaps visible.
E-06	Decision & Dependency Log	28 Aug 2026	Decision/dependency control	Export-scope decision overdue; SSO and data dependencies remain open.
E-07	Weekly Meeting Actions	21 & 28 Aug 2026	Action/accountability; escalation	Five overdue actions; two repeated across weekly cycles.
E-08	Test & UAT Readiness Summary	28 Aug 2026	Quality and release readiness	68% UAT cases prepared; 14 open defects including 2 high severity.
E-09	Requirements & Acceptance Pack	v5 · 26 Aug 2026	Scope, requirements and acceptance	Most acceptance criteria defined; two release-critical items still have unresolved notes.
E-10	Steering Review Notes	28 Aug 2026	Forecast; escalation; management view	Sponsor continues to expect 18 Sep; no replan or formal recovery baseline approved.

10.2 Assessment basis

- Assessment covers one active software-delivery project and the evidence supplied for review.
- Seven diagnostic dimensions are assessed using the approved weighted rubric; checkpoints use a 0–4 score or NE (Not Evidenced).
- NE is excluded from health scoring. Applicable checkpoints with insufficient evidence reduce evidence coverage instead of being scored as failures.
- Evidence confidence is scored separately using 2 = direct/current/relevant/consistent, 1 = partial/dated/indirect/single-source, and 0 = missing/materially contradictory. This illustrative sample totals 51/70 = 73%, which is Moderate confidence.
- Findings are based on evidence plus clearly separated professional inference. Contradictions and missing information are surfaced independently.
- The RAG recommendation is a reviewer judgment informed by observed health, evidence coverage, evidence confidence, finding severity/imminence, contradictions, and delivery consequence.

11. Scope, Limitations & Follow-Up

Scope limitations

- This is a project delivery health assessment, not an audit of the organization, PMO maturity, technical architecture, code quality, security posture, regulatory compliance, finances, or individual employee performance.
- The assessment relies on evidence supplied by the client and does not independently validate source-system completeness or authenticity.
- Conclusions reflect the project position observable from the submitted evidence at the assessment date. Subsequent events may change the position.
- No external benchmark is implied unless explicitly cited. Scores indicate observed project-control strength within this methodology, not percentile performance against other organizations.
- Recommendations are delivery-management guidance and do not constitute legal, financial, security, medical, or regulatory advice.

Async follow-up

One async clarification round is included for questions about the evidence basis, interpretation or recommended actions in this report. The follow-up clarifies this assessment; it does not add new project scope, technical investigation or a second audit cycle.

Recommended reassessment trigger

Recommended trigger: reassess the delivery position after the UAT/release reforecast and dependency reset, or at the formal release-readiness gate if that occurs first. A reassessment is not included in this illustrative sample and would be separately agreed in a live engagement.

Appendix. Diagnostic Score Detail

Checkpoint-level detail is included in this illustrative sample to demonstrate evidence traceability, confidence handling and NE treatment. In a live delivery, this appendix is included only when it improves client decision value.

Checkpoint	Dimension	Score	Confidence	Evidence refs	Observation	Classification
1.1	Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	3	2	E-01, E-03	Current release baseline and 18 Sep target are identifiable and consistent in the plan, but the status report does not reflect all current constraint dates.	Evidence
1.2	Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	2	0	E-02, E-04	Status reports 70% complete; backlog evidence shows 11 carry-over stories and 7 release-critical stories still incomplete. Progress is visible but the stated completion position is not well reconciled.	Evidence / Contradiction
1.3	Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	2	1	E-02, E-03, E-06, E-08	18 Sep forecast remains unchanged despite overdue dependencies, compressed UAT preparation and open high-severity defects.	Evidence / Inference
1.4	Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	2	2	E-03, E-06, E-08	UAT and release milestones depend on SSO, data extract and environment readiness; at least two prerequisites are late or later than the current plan assumes.	Evidence
1.5	Delivery Trajectory & Commitments	2	2	E-02, E-07, E-10	Variance is discussed and actions exist, but no approved reforecast or recovery baseline is recorded.	Evidence
2.1	Risk & Issue Control	3	2	E-05, E-07	Major delivery threats are visible in the RAID log and meeting notes, including dependency, quality and scope risks.	Evidence
2.2	Risk & Issue Control	3	2	E-05	Risks are differentiated by impact/likelihood and high exposures are identifiable, with some rating rationale gaps.	Evidence
2.3	Risk & Issue Control	2	2	E-05, E-07	Three material risks/actions lack either a named accountable owner or a dated mitigation step.	Evidence
2.4	Risk & Issue Control	2	2	E-05, E-07	Two issues recur across weekly notes	Evidence

Checkpoint	Dimension	Score	Confidence	Evidence refs	Observation	Classification
					without clear closure or escalation outcome.	
2.5	Risk & Issue Control	2	0	E-02, E-05, E-06	Known high exposure is not fully reflected in the Green RAG or delivery forecast.	Evidence / Contradiction
3.1	Decision & Dependency Control	3	2	E-06, E-07	Open decisions and dependencies are visible and traceable across the log and meeting actions.	Evidence
3.2	Decision & Dependency Control	2	2	E-06	The export-scope decision is overdue and one external dependency lacks a confirmed committed delivery date.	Evidence
3.3	Decision & Dependency Control	2	2	E-06, E-07, E-10	Overdue decisions are repeatedly discussed but escalation has not produced a firm resolution date.	Evidence
3.4	Decision & Dependency Control	2	2	E-03, E-06	Material SSO, data extract and UAT-environment dependencies are identified, but ownership/date certainty is incomplete.	Evidence
3.5	Decision & Dependency Control	2	1	E-02, E-03, E-06	Dependency deterioration has not yet resulted in an evidence-backed reforecast.	Evidence / Inference
4.1	Scope & Requirements Integrity	3	2	E-01, E-04, E-09	Release scope is identifiable and most committed outcomes reconcile across project brief, backlog and requirements pack.	Evidence
4.2	Scope & Requirements Integrity	3	2	E-04, E-09	Most release-critical stories have usable acceptance criteria; two high-priority items still contain unresolved acceptance notes.	Evidence
4.3	Scope & Requirements Integrity	2	2	E-06, E-09	Export-functionality scope change remains unresolved and its schedule impact has not been formally accepted.	Evidence
4.4	Scope & Requirements Integrity	2	1	E-04, E-09	Backlog remains generally aligned to the release goal, but carry-over work and added scope are compressing the priority set.	Evidence / Inference
4.5	Scope & Requirements Integrity	3	1	E-09, E-10	Acceptance route is broadly defined through UAT and sponsor approval, although the final sign-off authority is not explicit in the supplied pack.	Evidence / Missing Information

Checkpoint	Dimension	Score	Confidence	Evidence refs	Observation	Classification
5.1	Action & Accountability Control	3	2	E-07	Material follow-up actions are captured consistently in weekly meeting records.	Evidence
5.2	Action & Accountability Control	3	2	E-07	Most material actions have named owners and due dates.	Evidence
5.3	Action & Accountability Control	2	2	E-07	Five actions are overdue; two have rolled forward for more than one weekly cycle.	Evidence
5.4	Action & Accountability Control	2	2	E-07, E-10	Repeated reminders are visible, but escalation of overdue external actions is inconsistent.	Evidence
5.5	Action & Accountability Control	NE	0	E-07	The submitted records do not provide enough completion evidence to assess whether closed actions consistently achieved the intended outcome.	Missing Information
6.1	Quality & Release Readiness	3	2	E-08, E-09	UAT approach and acceptance criteria exist for most release-critical scope, with limited gaps.	Evidence
6.2	Quality & Release Readiness	2	2	E-08	68% of planned UAT cases are prepared; remaining preparation is concentrated close to the planned UAT start.	Evidence
6.3	Quality & Release Readiness	2	2	E-08	Fourteen defects remain open, including two high-severity items; disposition is recorded but one high-severity fix date is not firm.	Evidence
6.4	Quality & Release Readiness	2	0	E-03, E-08	UAT environment readiness is shown after the planned UAT start, creating a readiness dependency conflict.	Evidence / Contradiction
6.5	Quality & Release Readiness	NE	0	E-08, E-10	No formal go/no-go criteria or residual-risk acceptance record was supplied; the release gate has not yet occurred.	Missing Information
7.1	Reporting & Evidence Integrity	2	0	E-02, E-03, E-05, E-06, E-08	The Green status and on-track narrative do not fully reconcile with overdue dependencies, UAT readiness and open risk evidence.	Evidence / Contradiction
7.2	Reporting & Evidence Integrity	2	2	E-02, E-05, E-06	RAG rationale is brief and does not explain why known high exposures remain compatible with Green.	Evidence
7.3	Reporting & Evidence Integrity	3	2	E-02, E-03, E-04, E-05, E-06, E-08	Most material management claims	Evidence

Checkpoint	Dimension	Score	Confidence	Evidence refs	Observation	Classification
					can be traced to current source artifacts, despite several unsupported summary statements.	
7.4	Reporting & Evidence Integrity	1	0	E-02, E-03, E-06, E-08	Two material contradictions and several missing control details are not acknowledged in the executive status view.	Evidence / Contradiction
7.5	Reporting & Evidence Integrity	2	1	E-02, E-10	Reporting is concise but requires leadership to infer the consequence of dependencies, overdue decisions and release-readiness gaps.	Evidence / Inference

Sample disclosure

All project names, dates, artifacts and findings in this report are fictionalized for methodology demonstration. No customer result, testimonial or real engagement outcome is implied.