Candid Cycle

SAMPLE REPORT · FICTIONAL ORGANISATION AND DATA

Warehouse System and Network Upgrade: Team Report

Project close-out review · Lantern Bay Logistics Pty Ltd

Cycle	Cycle 2. Project close-out review
Scope	Close-out of the warehouse management system and network upgrade across the three depots, delivered on 26 June 2026, and reflection on the priorities from Cycle 1.
Input window	6–17 July 2026
Contributors	7 of 8 invited contributors submitted a reflection. A report needs at least three.
Plan	Starter plan (up to 9 contributors)
Issued	24 July 2026. Released after account holder review.

7 of 8
Contributors submitted

7
Improvement themes

7
Prioritised recommendations

6 of 7
Most widely shared theme

Confidentiality statement. This report was produced from anonymous contributor submissions. The facilitator and account holder did not see any individual response, only the themes below. No names or identifying roles appear anywhere in this report, evidence is grouped by theme and never by person, and every quotation is labelled “Anonymised submission excerpt” and edited where needed to protect identity while preserving meaning. The report was drafted with AI assistance and released after review by the account holder.

Executive Summary

Contributors value the depot super-user network and the quality of testing before go-live. Six of seven say the project ran without a clear charter, stage gates or consistent status reporting, and five say scope and supplier decisions were made informally and later reopened. Five say the same lessons had been learned on the previous depot upgrade and not reused, and five describe experienced people as stretched. On Cycle 1, only the backup power funding has moved. The continuity exercise, the shared review method and the deputy arrangements have not started because project work took priority. Several themes now appear in both cycles, which suggests the issues are structural rather than one-off.

Context

Scope. Close-out of the warehouse management system and network upgrade across the three depots, delivered on 26 June 2026, and reflection on the priorities from Cycle 1.

The nine-month upgrade went live across all three depots on 26 June 2026. Contributors report that it was about three months later than planned and about 14 per cent over budget. These figures are contributors' recollections, not finance data. This cycle also asked contributors to reflect on what had changed since the Cycle 1 priorities were issued.

Priorities from Cycle 1 (issued 5 June 2026) were shared with contributors at the start of this cycle.

Recurring strengths

Strength	Raised by	What contributors said
Depot super-users made the go-live work	6 of 7	Staff nominated at each depot trained their colleagues and resolved most early problems on the floor.
Thorough pre-go-live testing	4 of 7	The supplier's test plan and two full rehearsals found problems before they reached customers.
Visible executive presence at cutover	5 of 7	Contributors say seeing executives at the depots during cutover helped morale and speeded decisions.

Improvement Themes

Themes are grouped by topic, never by person. Counts show how many of the 7 contributors raised each theme, and a contributor can raise more than one.

1. No consistent project governance Raised by 6 of 7

The project began without an agreed charter or stage gates. Status reports used different formats and thresholds, so the real position was hard to see until late.

> *"I could not tell you at any point whether we were green or red, because everyone reported it differently."*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

2. Scope and supplier decisions were made informally Raised by 5 of 7

Scope changes were approved in conversation and two supplier decisions were later reopened and reversed. There was no register and no shared view of who could decide what.

> *"A decision would be made in a corridor and then reversed a fortnight later when someone else heard about it."*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

3. The project was not clearly tied to objectives Raised by 4 of 7

Depot teams set their own project targets, and contributors could not link the benefits to an executive objective or measure.

> *"Each depot had its own idea of what success looked like. I could not point to a single objective we were serving."*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

4. Lessons from the previous upgrade were not reused Raised by 5 of 7

A lessons list from the 2024 depot upgrade exists but nobody consulted it. Contributors describe repeating the same data-migration and training mistakes.

> *"We hit exactly the same problems as two years ago. The lessons were written down. Nobody opened the file."*
> Anonymised submission excerpt

5. Cycle 1 actions have largely stalled Raised by 6 of 7

Only the backup power funding has progressed. The continuity exercise, shared incident review method and named deputies have not started, because the same people were needed for the project.

> *"We said after the power failure what we would fix. Apart from the generator, none of it has happened."*
> Anonymised submission excerpt

6. Experienced people are stretched Raised by 5 of 7

The same small group carried the project and the daily operation. Contributors describe sustained overtime and uncertainty about how long this can continue.

> *"The people who know how everything works are exhausted. We cannot keep asking them to do two jobs."*
> Anonymised submission excerpt

7. Issues raised at close-out have no one to close them Raised by 4 of 7

Open issues from the project log do not have an agreed owner with authority to resolve them.

> *"There is a long list of open items and nobody who can actually sign them off."*
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Snapshot: yes, partially, no

Closed questions are reported as a breakdown rather than a single percentage, because a single figure would overstate what seven or eight people can show.

Question	Yes / Partially / No (n = 7)
Was there a clear charter and scope at the start of the project?	1 · Partly 2 · No 4
Did status reports give an accurate picture of progress?	Yes 2 · Partly 3 · No 2
Were scope changes agreed through an agreed route?	1 · Partly 2 · No 4
Did the project deliver the benefits you expected so far?	Yes 3 · Partly 3 · 1
Were lessons from earlier projects used?	1 · 1 · No 5

Key Learnings and Plus/Delta

- Results depend on whether an arrangement produces a record. Where there is a register, gate or template, contributors report order. Where there is not, they report improvisation.
- Themes now recur across both cycles: unfunded or unowned fixes, reliance on a few people, and lessons that are written but not used.
- A review that does not lead to owned, dated actions is read as a sign that reviews do not matter. Several contributors say this about Cycle 1.

Plus: keep doing	Delta: change

• Super-user network and local ownership at depots • Strong testing and rehearsal before go-live • Visible leadership during cutover • Candour about what has not been done since Cycle 1	• Adopt a standard charter and stage gates for network and systems projects • Record scope and supplier decisions and agree who may take them • Link depot targets to executive objectives • Use a single lessons and corrective-action register • Protect time for the Cycle 1 actions • Give issue owners clear authority to close items

Prioritised Recommendations

Owners and timing are suggestions for the account holder and team to confirm or change. Ordering reflects how widely each theme was shared and how much it exposes people or customers to harm, and is not a validated risk ranking.

#	Recommendation	Suggested owner	Suggested timing
1	Adopt stage-gate governance, a standard charter and mandatory status reporting for network and systems projects	Operations executive	By 31 August 2026
2	Introduce a decision register and refresh the delegation of authority matrix	Finance executive	By 31 August 2026
3	Cascade strategic objectives into depot-level scorecards	Chief executive	By 30 September 2026
4	Complete succession plans for critical roles and agree cover for stretched teams	People and culture lead	By 30 September 2026
5	Delegate explicit authority to close issues to named issue owners	Chief executive	By 30 September 2026
6	Run a continuity exercise and introduce one corrective-action register, as agreed in Cycle 1	Risk and compliance lead, and Operations executive	Dates to be reset
7	Consider a structured capability assessment of the seven domains, such as Calibrate, to set a baseline and prioritise these themes	Chief executive	Decision by 7 August 2026

Next cycle. Carry the seven priorities, including those from Cycle 1 that have not started, into the next cycle.

Appendix: Anonymised Evidence

Excerpts are grouped by theme, never by person. Each is labelled “Anonymised submission excerpt”.

No consistent project governance

> *“There was no charter on day one. By month four people were reporting in four different formats.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

> *“We had gates on the previous project’s plan but not on the real project.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Scope and supplier decisions were made informally

> *“Two supplier decisions were reversed after the fact. We lost weeks on both.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

The project was not clearly tied to objectives

> *“We were measured on go-live. I never saw how it linked to what the board wanted for the year.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Lessons from the previous upgrade were not reused

> *“Training came too late again. The 2024 review said so.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Cycle 1 actions have largely stalled

> *“The generator money came through. The exercise, the template and the deputies have not moved.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Experienced people are stretched

> *“I do not want to be the single point of failure any more, but there is nobody else who can do it yet.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt

Issues raised at close-out have no one to close them

> *“Everyone agrees the open items matter. Nobody has the authority to decide them.”*
>
> Anonymised submission excerpt