

Decision Practice

Operator Work Sample

Before You Add R&D Capacity

ACTIVE PUBLIC PROOF

FICTIONAL WORKED EXAMPLE

"We sell the receipt that proves you made the decision and the math that proves what it cost you to wait."

Prepared by Josh Merchlinski | Decision Practice, LLC

Version 2026-08-05 v2

What this work sample demonstrates

I reconciled a small export pack into a traceable evidence register rather than relying on a narrative summary.

I tested five competing explanations: true shortage, shared constraint, excessive simultaneous work, readiness or physics, and governance waiting after readiness.

I classified only one item as decision latency, built banded waiting economics with explicit assumptions, mapped the authority path, and drafted a versioned decision receipt.

The artifact preserves unknowns and alternative explanations. It does not force every delay into the Decision Practice thesis.

Safe-to-share provenance

The workflow, classification rules, judgment controls, and receipt design are the work sample. All company names, people, dates, facts, exports, and economic values are fictional and illustrative.

This is not a client result and not a written output from the 30-minute no-files diagnostic. The no-files diagnostic remains live only, with no files and no written output.

No credentials, integration, write-back, implementation, coaching, or stakeholder chasing is represented.

1. Operator brief

FICTIONAL COMPOSITE CASE | NORTHLINE MOTION SYSTEMS

Product commitment	Release the NLM-7 industrial smart actuator base model to customer pilot.
Visible symptom	The latest pilot target is eight weeks later than the prior commitment. Shared experts report overload. Roadmap priorities have reopened repeatedly.
Intervention decision	Hire four generalist engineers, outsource environmental testing, narrow active variants, or combine the moves.
Operator question	Is the missed commitment primarily a true shortage, a shared-resource constraint, too much simultaneously active work, readiness or physics, or work that is ready but waiting for a decision?
Boundary	Read-only. Exports in. Versioned artifacts out. Diagnosis only.

Hands-on work performed

01	Reconciled 10 fictional export-level evidence items and recorded what each source did and did not prove.
02	Separated nominal and allocated capacity from effective throughput clues.
03	Tested five alternatives and preserved disconfirming evidence.
04	Evaluated four gates for decision eligibility rather than treating all waiting as decision latency.
05	Built low, base, and high weekly waiting exposure for the one eligible decision, including a double-counting check.
06	Mapped closer, forum, exception path, and what stops instead, then drafted a ready-to-sign receipt.

Initial story versus evidence-backed result

View	Statement	Operator disposition
Initial story	"We are late because we do not have enough engineers."	Hypothesis only. Allocation and utilization do not establish effective throughput capacity.
Observed system	One shared test chamber and two systems architects carry most near-term work; two items are not ready; one mandatory test is still running; one change package is decision-ready but unclosed.	Mixed diagnosis. No single-number capacity answer.
Remaining unknowns	Whether a specialty EMC shortage becomes the next governing constraint; what concurrency pattern maximizes completed value; whether outside testing moves the queue downstream.	Requires new evidence before a broad capacity commitment is treated as proven.

2. Evidence register

Every material statement is labeled as evidence, inference, hypothesis, or unknown. The last column is the operator control: what the source does not prove.

ID	Export or observed fact	Class	Quality	What it supports / what it does not prove
E-01	Roadmap baseline moved the customer pilot from 2026-04-06 to 2026-06-01, then to 2026-07-27.	Evidence	A	Supports a material slip. Does not identify cause.
E-02	Test queue shows 24 open requests; 16 require chamber C-2; median age is 14 days.	Evidence	A	Supports a shared test constraint. Does not show that every request is ready.
E-03	Two systems architects are assigned across nine active variants; planning load is 98 percent.	Evidence	B	Supports shared-resource load. Does not establish sustainable completion capacity.
E-04	Sustaining escalation log shows 21 percent of engineering hours used on field issues during the last four weeks.	Evidence	B	Supports interruption load. Does not prove the correct response is more headcount.
E-05	CR-142 completeness checklist contains all required technical and quality signatures as of 2026-06-03.	Evidence	A	Supports decision eligibility for CR-142.
E-06	Product Change Board on 2026-06-05 was canceled; no replacement forum occurred before 2026-06-15.	Evidence	A	Supports governance waiting after eligibility.
E-07	Supplier firmware tracker shows missing checksum and regression report for variants V4 and V5.	Evidence	A	Supports readiness delay for V4 and V5.
E-08	Variant V2 environmental test is on day 5 of a mandatory 10-day cycle and is not a prerequisite for CR-142.	Evidence	A	Supports active physics. It must not be relabeled as decision delay.
E-09	Hiring request asks for four generalist engineers, citing utilization and backlog, without a constraint-to-completion test.	Evidence	B	Supports an active intervention decision. Does not prove that generalist labor is governing.
E-10	Finance scenario provides low, base, and high weekly margin-timing bands for the pilot.	Evidence	B	Supports illustrative waiting economics. Does not prove recovery or enterprise value uplift.

Operator control applied

I did not treat 98 percent planned allocation as 98 percent effective throughput capacity.

I did not classify the active environmental cycle as governance waiting.

I did not use the finance band until the underlying decision passed the eligibility test.

I preserved a plausible true specialty shortage as an alternative diagnosis rather than forcing a portfolio-flow answer.

3. Five-way diagnosis matrix

The question is not whether concurrency or capacity is good or bad in general. The question is which mechanism is governing this work mix now, what evidence supports it, and what would disconfirm it.

1. True shortage

PARTIAL

Support: EMC troubleshooting is concentrated in one specialist, and three defect investigations are waiting for that skill.

Limits: Seven of the nine delayed items do not require EMC expertise. No completion-rate evidence links four generalist hires to the near-term bottleneck.

Operator finding: A local specialty shortage is plausible. A broad engineering shortage is not yet established.

Decision implication: Tie any capacity addition to a specific governing skill or resource and a measurable completion outcome.

2. Shared constraint

STRONG

Support: Sixteen of 24 open test requests require chamber C-2.

Nine variants rely on two systems architects. Queue age rises where those resources are required.

Limits: Four requests can use an outside lab, and the bottleneck may move to data review or product decision after capacity is added.

Operator finding: The chamber and architecture review are the strongest near-term throughput constraints.

Decision implication: Test whether targeted external capacity and protected architecture review reduce queue age and increase completions rather than merely moving work.

3. Simultaneous work

SUPPORTED

Support: Nine active variants repeatedly cross the same two architects and one chamber; reopen rate is 31 percent after review.

Limits: Some parallel work is useful while mandatory tests run and while supplier inputs are pending.

Operator finding: The current pattern appears above the useful concurrency range, but the optimal level is not yet measured.

Decision implication: Name which work would pause or sequence, who owns that tradeoff, and what completion measure would prove the change helped.

4. Readiness or physics

MATERIAL

Support: V4 and V5 lack supplier firmware evidence. Variant V2 is in a mandatory 10-day environmental cycle and is not a prerequisite for CR-142.

Limits: CR-142 has a complete evidence packet and no remaining mandatory input.

Operator finding: Readiness and physics explain part of the delay, but they do not explain the eligible CR-142 wait.

Decision implication: Protect mandatory work. Name missing inputs with owner and due date. Do not promise to compress the cycle.

5. Governance waiting

CONFIRMED FOR D-01

Support: CR-142 was complete on 2026-06-03. The close forum was canceled, and no yes/no was recorded for eight business days.

Limits: This classification applies only to CR-142. It does not apply to the active test cycle or missing supplier firmware.

Operator finding: One decision is eligible and waiting. A second portfolio choice has an authority gap because no one owns what stops instead.

Decision implication: Produce a decision receipt, name the closer and forum, and make the displaced work and exception path explicit.

4. Decision eligibility ledger

Eligibility is the control that prevents physics, queue waiting, and missing evidence from being mislabeled as decision latency.

Decision or gate	Evidence state	Classification	Closer / forum	Next dated close
D-01 Approve hardware revision C for entry into validation?	Required technical and quality evidence complete on 2026-06-03.	ELIGIBLE GOVERNANCE WAITING	VP Engineering Product Change Board	Record yes, no, or defined hold at 2026-06-19 forum.
D-02 Release V4 supplier firmware to system test?	Checksum and regression report missing.	READINESS DELAY	Supplier Quality Manager Readiness review	Owner to supply missing evidence by 2026-06-18.
D-03 End the V2 environmental cycle early?	Mandatory cycle is active, day 5 of 10.	PHYSICS / RUN	Test Engineering Lab protocol	Complete the mandatory cycle. No governance acceleration claim.
D-04 Continue variant V7 into the next prototype build?	Technical packet complete, but pause authority and displaced work are unnamed.	AUTHORITY GAP	GM or CFO Portfolio review	Name closer, "what stops instead," and exception owner before classifying delay.

Classification result

- Only D-01 is counted as decision latency.
- D-02 is readiness delay with missing inputs, owner, and due date.
- D-03 is active mandatory physics and remains protected.
- D-04 is an authority gap. Decision Practice does not pretend a pause occurred when no one owns the tradeoff.

Decision-latency clock for D-01

Eligibility date	2026-06-03
Observation date	2026-06-15
Eligible business days open	8
Reason still open	Close forum canceled; no replacement forum and no recorded yes/no.
Excluded from clock	Mandatory environmental cycle, supplier-firmware readiness, and general queue age for unrelated work.

5. Waiting economics for the one eligible decision

The band is an exposure estimate, not a promise of recovered value. It is applied only after eligibility is established.

DECISION D-01 | CR-142 | UNITS: \$000

Component	Low	Base	High	Assumption / control
Team carry while the decision remains open	12	18	25	4.5 FTE equivalent x loaded weekly cost x exposed share.
Prototype, chamber, and rebooking exposure	4	8	15	Direct rebooking and expedite exposure only.
Revenue and gross-margin timing exposure	30	55	90	Finance timing band for the pilot; not a permanent-loss claim.
TOTAL WEEKLY EXPOSURE	46	81	130	Sum of non-overlapping bands.
CUMULATIVE AT 1.6 WEEKS	74	130	208	8 eligible business days / 5 = 1.6 weeks.

Double-counting and confidence controls

Margin band	Excludes loaded labor already counted in team carry.
Mandatory work	Assigns no waiting cost to the active 10-day environmental cycle.
Recovery claim	Does not claim that closing D-01 recovers enterprise value or guarantees revenue.
Evidence quality	Eligibility evidence is A. Economic input is B and illustrative. Overall quantitative confidence is moderate.
Update trigger	Replace the band when finance exports provide actual contribution margin, launch timing, and rebooking cost.

Operator conclusion

The broad four-person hiring request is not supported by this band. The band belongs to the eligible decision D-01, not to every symptom in the program.

The immediate work product is a receipt that makes the decision, authority path, and timing exposure legible. The client still owns the choice and enforcement.

6. Ready-to-sign decision receipt

DECISION RECEIPT DP-ILL-001 | DRAFT READY TO SIGN | FICTIONAL

Decision question	Approve NLM-7 hardware revision C for entry into the scheduled validation slot?
Eligibility	Yes. Required technical and quality evidence complete on 2026-06-03.
Classification	Eligible governance waiting. Not physics, not readiness, and not general queue time.
Evidence basis	E-05 completeness checklist; E-06 forum record; E-08 mandatory test log.
Current exposure	\$46k / \$81k / \$130k per eligible week, low / base / high. Illustrative, moderate confidence.
Closer	VP Engineering.
Required concurrence	Director of Quality.
Close forum and date	Product Change Board 2026-06-19 at 09:00.
What stops instead	Variant V7 chamber reservation moves one week if option A is selected.
Exception path	Safety or quality exception routes to the Quality Director. No mandatory work is waived.

Decision options

Option	Exact record required	Consequence to record
A APPROVE	Approve revision C for validation and record authorized signatures.	Validation begins in the reserved slot; V7 chamber reservation moves one week.
B DEFINED HOLD	Name the new evidence required, owner, and due date.	Decision clock pauses only for the named readiness requirement.
C REJECT / REOPEN	Name the architecture issue, owner, scope, and next forum.	Program plan and waiting band are rebaselined; no silent reopen.

Final close record

Selected option	
Decision rationale	
Exceptions / conditions	
Decision owner signature	Date:
Quality concurrence	Date:

What the receipt does and does not do

It makes eligibility, evidence, economics, owner, forum, exceptions, and displaced work visible in one versioned object. It does not select the option, run the forum, chase signatures, or claim that the organization implemented the decision.

7. Authority path and operator judgment log

Authority path

Role in the close	Fictional owner	Job
Wound owner	Program Director	States the missed commitment and operational consequence without blaming a function.
Technical owner	Chief Systems Architect	Confirms technical evidence and names any legitimate missing input.
Quality concurrence	Director of Quality	Protects mandatory test and exception rules.
Closer	VP Engineering	Records the yes, no, or defined hold.
Bill / authority owner	GM and CFO	Own the capacity commitment, waiting exposure, and what stops instead.
Forum	Product Change Board	Makes the decision real on a dated cadence.
Exception route	Quality Director to GM	Handles safety or quality exceptions without bypassing mandatory work.

Operator judgment log

These are the hands-on judgment calls that a polished status deck normally hides.

ID	Operator decision	Why it mattered	What would change it
J-01	Reclassified the active environmental cycle from "delay" to physics.	Avoided claiming that mandatory RUN work could be compressed.	Evidence that the cycle was optional or already complete.
J-02	Rejected 98 percent allocation as proof of 98 percent effective throughput.	Prevented a nominal-capacity number from settling the intervention decision.	Completion, quality, queue, and work-mix evidence tied to the four roles.
J-03	Separated generalist headcount from the EMC specialist and chamber constraints.	Kept the intervention test specific to the governing resource.	Evidence that generalist work is the dominant completion constraint.
J-04	Started the D-01 clock only after the completeness checklist passed.	Protected the eligibility boundary between readiness and governance.	A newly discovered mandatory input that would change the yes/no.
J-05	Removed loaded labor from the margin-timing band.	Prevented double counting in the weekly exposure total.	A finance export showing that labor was not embedded in the margin band.
J-06	Required a named "what stops instead" for D-04.	Avoided treating pause or sequencing as free capacity or pretending authority existed.	A named closer, displaced work, and exception owner.

Auditor posture

The result is not "you have too many projects." It is a receipt of what is known, what is inferred, what remains unknown, and which decision can actually close now.

A finding that the primary issue is skill shortage, physics, quality, architecture, supply, or another cause would be a valid outcome.

8. Reusable operator workflow and blank template

Workflow

1	Name one commitment and one active intervention decision.	2	Inventory the minimum exports and assign source IDs.
3	Label each material statement: evidence, inference, hypothesis, or unknown.	4	Test true shortage, shared constraint, simultaneous work, readiness or physics, and governance waiting.
5	Establish decision eligibility before starting any latency clock.	6	Quantify only eligible waiting with low, base, and high bands plus assumptions and confidence.
7	Map closer, forum, exceptions, and what stops instead.	8	Issue the decision receipt, authority-gap statement, or missing-data path. Do not drift into implementation.

Blank one-page operator worksheet

Commitment at issue	_____
Intervention under consideration	_____
Visible symptom	_____
True shortage evidence / disconfirming evidence	_____
Shared constraint evidence / disconfirming evidence	_____
Concurrency evidence / disconfirming evidence	_____
Readiness, physics, quality, supply, or market evidence	_____
Eligible governance waiting	_____
Decision question and eligibility date	_____
Closer / forum / next dated action	_____
What stops instead / exception path	_____
Low / base / high weekly exposure	_____
Unknowns and evidence that would change the finding	_____

Working posture

Read-only posture: we work from exports and produce versioned deliverables; we do not write back into client systems.
No PMO behavior: we do not chase stakeholders or manage execution; every deliverable names a Client Owner.
Safety/reg RUN is sacred: we do not recommend skipping mandatory RUN work to hit dates.

Method basis: Decision Practice Rev35.2 Canon, PMF and GTM Operating Doctrine, and the public proof brief. This document is a public illustrative work sample, not a client deliverable.