

Project X No Fluff Project Assessment

NO FLUFF
Project Management

Project X

PROJECT-X | 2026-07-20

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

Quest

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.

No Fluff Project Intelligence

Executive Overview

High Risk

- 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.

Recommended immediate response

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.

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.

Headline Measures (1)

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

Quest

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.

SAMPLE

Headline Measures (2)

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.

SAMPLE

Headline Measures (3)

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.

SAMPLE

Priority Risks

Benefits baseline may be misleading

Consequence: Benefits may be overstated, challenged or impossible to verify after go-live.

Response: Recalculate and approve the baseline using written inclusion, exclusion and segmentation rules.

System may not reduce the principal process delays

Consequence: The four-hour target is missed despite system implementation.

Response: Complete the end-to-end process design and test it against representative live fault scenarios.

Migration and integration complexity is underestimated

Consequence: Schedule delay, additional cost, unreliable records or service disruption.

Response: Complete the architecture, interface inventory, data assessment, migration rehearsal and dependency plan.

Go-live date drives rushed delivery

Consequence: Defects, disruption, rework, delayed benefits or an unplanned postponement.

Response: Use an evidence-based readiness gate and permit the date to change if mandatory conditions are not met.

Operational adoption failure

Consequence: Fault resolution slows, workarounds increase and service performance deteriorates.

Response: Create and evidence a role-based training, support, adoption and operational-readiness plan.

Recommendations and Decisions

Recommendations

- Replace the current baseline with an approved, reproducible fault-resolution measurement method.
- Complete and approve the end-to-end designs for triage, assignment and diagnosis before further configuration is treated as stable.
- Run a controlled live-scenario pilot using representative fault types and measurable pass criteria.
- Appoint a single accountable delivery lead and publish an integrated delivery plan.
- Make the go-live decision conditional on documented entry and exit criteria rather than the calendar date alone.

Decisions required

- Approve the definitive fault-resolution KPI, baseline population, exclusions, segmentation and reporting method.
- Confirm the accountable delivery lead and governance responsibilities for operations, engineering and IT.
- Approve mandatory go-live conditions and confirm that 31 October 2026 remains conditional on meeting them.

Recommended Next Move

Immediate response

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.

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.

Confirm the accountable delivery lead, approve the baseline measurement method and agree the mandatory conditions for go-live.