

A COORDINATION DIAGNOSTIC FOR HIGH-CONSEQUENCE LAUNCHES

THE EXPLICITNESS TEST

EXECUTE YOUR INTENTIONS, LLC

WHY THIS EXISTS

Most organizational failures are not caused by bad decisions. They are caused by decisions that were never made explicit. Risk rarely announces itself. It migrates quietly through launches, integrations, escalations, and commitments - carried by people until it surfaces as cost, damage, or blame.

This diagnostic is not motivational.

It is not a framework to install.

It is a mirror. Answer it privately.

Do not debate the questions.

Notice where certainty ends.

ABOUT THIS TEST

This should only take about 5-10 minutes.

Do not answer aspirationally.

“Unsure” is not a sign of failure.

This is meant for your eyes only; feel free to download and print.

Use it as a signal of the system you are in.

FIRST, IS THIS RIGHT FOR YOU?

I'm not here to waste your time. Let's get aligned.

This diagnostic applies to organizations coordinating launches or major commitments where:

- multiple teams must align before readiness can be confirmed
- timing, scope, or exposure creates pressure to “keep moving”
- launch decisions are treated as execution problems rather than governance questions
- responsibility for readiness, delay, or stopping is assumed rather than explicitly held
- risk often becomes visible only after the launch is underway

If your organization does not coordinate launches or commitments with cross-functional risk or consequence, this diagnostic is likely not relevant.

GET STARTED

Answer as honestly as you can. Place an X under the column that fits.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Ownership & Authority			
I can name who owns readiness , not delivery, for our next major launch or commitment.			
That person has the authority to delay, rescope, or stop the launch if readiness criteria are not met.			
Ownership of readiness is documented and understood beyond a single individual.			
Explicit Commitments			
The criteria for “ready” are written down in plain language.			
Those criteria were agreed to before execution began.			
Decision-makers signed off on these criteria explicitly, not implicitly.			

	Yes	No	Unsure
Decision Integrity			
When risk is raised, it reliably returns to the person who can change scope, timing, or investment.			
Tradeoffs are named as decisions, not absorbed quietly by teams.			
We can trace major outcomes back to conscious choices, not momentum.			
Governance vs Heroics			
Success does not depend on someone “stepping up”, staying late, or absorbing friction.			
If the key individual disappeared for 30 days, execution would still hold.			
Stability is produced by structure, not stamina.			
Signal & Truth			
Status is reported by obligation or outcome, not by department or role.			
Bad news travels as fast as good news.			
There is a defined place where uncomfortable truth can be named without escalation theater.			
Drift Detection			
We notice misalignment before it shows up in customers, regulators, or the board.			
Early signals are validated, not minimized.			
Silence is not confused with alignment.			
Consequence Awareness			
Everyone involved understands what happens if commitments are missed.			
The cost of delay, failure, or partial readiness is explicit.			
Responsibility for consequences is clear *before* the outcomes land.			
Totals			

THE RESULTS

If 'Yes' clearly outweighs 'No' & 'Unsure', your system is likely holding.

If not, consider these may be occurring in your organization:

- Risk is already migrating.
- Accountability is already diffused.
- Any current stability is being held by people; not the system.

*AI will likely amplify that situation if the organization is replacing roles with it.

IMPORTANT TO NOTE.

Clarity does not force action.

It returns agency.

Once something is explicit:

- Someone chooses to own it.
- Or the system accepts the consequence.

Both are legitimate.

What is not legitimate is pretending the choice does not exist.