

IT Delivery Health Check

Before your next major commitment, an independent, evidence-based answer to one question: should we keep going, change course, or pull back? Backed by what the artifacts actually show — not what the dashboard reports.

The cheapest moment to act is always earlier than it feels.

Executive scan

The problem

A program that looks fine on the dashboard but no longer feels safe to back. Reporting stays stable while confidence quietly erodes.

When to use

Before a major commitment — a funding gate, a release approval, a board decision — where internal evidence alone is not enough to defend the call.

Decision supported

Go forward, change course, or pull back. One clear position you can stand behind.

What you receive

A **Delivery Confidence Signal**, a 30-day plan, and three supporting analyses — see page 4.

Timeframe

2 to 6 weeks. Most reviews complete in 3 to 4 weeks. Scaled to the decision in front of you.

Who commissions

CIO, CTO, or CDO · CFO or investment committee · executive sponsor · board or audit committee.

Most failed programs do not collapse without warning. A migration slips. A vendor misses. A milestone moves quietly. By the time the gap shows up in reporting, the corrective options have narrowed. Issues caught in planning cost roughly **1x** to fix. The same issues caught in late execution cost **8 to 10x** — and usually force a re-baseline or a full recovery.

The failure we address — backing the wrong plan at the next gate

Distressed programs rarely fail because the problem is unknown. They fail because, by the time the problem becomes visible to leadership, the next funding gate or release commitment has already been made — and the cost of being wrong is locked in.

What we prevent

Decision Exposure

The risk of backing a plan at your next gate that the evidence no longer supports. Three months ago you approved the next phase. The program stayed active, reporting stayed green, the team kept going. Today the position is indefensible — and the cost of that delay is locked in. ***This service exists to give you a position you can stand behind before the next commitment, not after.***

Sound familiar?

These are sentences executives say to us in the first ten minutes of a briefing. Any one of them — present across two or more reporting cycles — is reason to commission an independent view. Three or more is rarely a coincidence.

"The dashboard says green; my gut says no."

Status keeps coming back stable. The risk pack is being managed. But you would not bet your reputation on the answer if a board member pressed you.

"The same risks keep rolling forward."

Quarter after quarter, the top three risks are the same risks. They get reviewed, owned, mitigated — and never actually close.

"Different teams, different stories."

The project lead, the business owner, and the vendor describe the same milestone in materially different ways. The story no longer adds up.

"Dates I cannot defend at the board."

The plan says launch in 90 days. You would not commit your reputation to it. And you cannot say that out loud yet.

"Same scope, much more effort."

Daily delivery now needs more escalation, more coordination, more late nights — for the same forward progress.

"A big decision is coming up."

A funding gate, a launch, or a board approval in the next 60 days. You want an independent view in your hand before you make the call.

Why this is hard to see from the inside

Programs rarely fail because the problem is invisible. They fail because the people closest to it cannot surface the full reality fast enough.

01	02	03	04	05
Bad news softens upward	Too committed to question	No one has the full picture	The story stays stable	Oversight crowds out steering
Each layer rounds toward the positive. By the top, the story is no longer the story.	Capital and credibility are spent. The team that built the plan cannot easily walk away from it.	Each forum sees a slice. No slice tells the whole story. No slice gets challenged hard enough.	The program sounds fine in every meeting — even when the underlying conditions are no longer fine.	More meetings, more packs, less clarity. Process becomes the product.

What we test — four questions, led by evidence

We do not assess a program. We answer four questions that determine whether delivery is still credible — and whether the position holds under board-level scrutiny.

1 Can it still land?

Is a viable outcome still achievable under current operating conditions, scope commitments, and resource reality? The core viability question.

2 What is outside your control?

Where are dependencies, vendors, and approvals concentrating risk the program no longer controls?

3 Is real progress happening?

Or is the program being held together by effort, escalation, and workarounds rather than structured delivery?

4 Who decides — and when?

Are the dates still trustworthy, and is decision ownership clear at every level the plan depends on?

Each question is supported by sub-tests across the seven dimensions of Delivery Integrity: delivery viability, dependency containment, execution stability, risk concentration, milestone credibility, commitment realism, decision ownership.

Three methods, every engagement

Evidence-led, system-framed, and built to produce a position that holds in any forum.

We pressure-test the system, not the people

Findings frame the delivery system — plans, sequencing, dependency, ownership — never individuals. That makes the review safe to commission early, when it is most valuable.

We rebuild the real critical path

From your plans, RAID logs, and milestone history we reconstruct the path actually controlling delivery — independent of the official narrative. The story is tested against the evidence.

We talk to the people who know

Confidential, structured interviews with delivery leads, the sponsor, and key vendor counterparts — to surface what artifacts alone will not show.

Scope — scaled to the decision you are facing

The constant: a position you can stand behind, in time to act. The variable: how much of the program needs to be inside the review.

Fast

2 to 3 weeks · one program, one decision

A single critical workstream where a specific gate is in front of you. The fastest path to a clear position.

Multi-stream

3 to 5 weeks · multiple workstreams

When the question reaches across streams, shared dependencies, or delivery layers. The integrated view when problems are no longer confined to one place.

Board-grade

4 to 6 weeks · high-consequence decision

When the decision is large, scrutiny is real, and you need an evidence-backed view structured for board-level review.

What you walk away with

Every output answers one question — in language you can defend at the next gate: *should we go, change, or stop?*

The decision-ready position

Delivery Confidence Signal

A clear position you can stand behind — go forward, change course, or pull back. Backed by the evidence trail you would want on a board pack. Expressed across six decision positions:

- Continue
- Continue with Conditions
- Intervene
- Pause
- Reset
- Escalate for Recovery

30-Day Plan

5 to 10 specific moves to make in the next 30 days — named owners, timing, and exit criteria.

Delivery Integrity View

Where the program is sound, where it is eroding, where it is already broken — mapped to the four questions.

Dependency Exposure Map

The 3 to 5 things outside your direct control that will determine the finish line.

Decision Clarity

If you continue: here is what you are betting. If you intervene: here is what is saved. The least-regret move.

If the situation is bigger than one program — this is one of five Delivery Assurance services. Recovery, governance, portfolio, or vendor concerns connect, but this brief stands alone. Ask, and we will tell you the right place to start.
itdeliveryassurance.com/services

Who commissions this review

CIO, CTO, or CDO

"I suspect the program is not as healthy as the dashboard says."

CFO or Investment Committee

"I am funding the next phase — I want confidence I can stand behind first."

Executive Sponsor or SteerCo

"I am being asked to ratify a position I cannot fully validate alone."

Board or Audit Committee

"I need an evidence-based view before a governance decision."

itdeliveryassurance.com

Canada · US