SAMPLE · FICTIONAL ORGANISATION AND DATA

From Debrief to Assessment

How two Candid Cycle reviews led to the Calibrate baseline assessment of Lantern Bay Logistics Pty Ltd

Candid Cycle asks people what happened and what they would change. Its themes are honest and anonymous, but they are perceptions. They show where to look, not how mature an arrangement is. Calibrate then tests the same ground against a fixed seven-domain framework and a three-step evidence ladder: whether an arrangement exists (E1), is enabled (E2) and has been executed (E3). This page traces the recurring themes from the two Candid Cycle reviews into the Calibrate sample assessment.

Sequence. Power failure 12–13 May 2026. Cycle 1 input 18–29 May (issued 5 June). Cycle 2 input 6–17 July (issued 24 July). Decision to commission an assessment 7 August. Calibrate baseline 11–22 August. Reassessment 1 on 2–13 November (issued 25 November).

Theme to domain to outcome

Candid Cycle theme	Raised in	Calibrate domain	Base	Baseline action	November 2026 position
Known risk had no funded treatment; plan not exercised	Cycle 1 (6 and 7 of 8)	D3 Risk & Resilience	**L**	A4 Exercise main-depot continuity plan (not started)	Unchanged at L. Backup power upgrade done; 11 of 14 High risks still lack a funded or dated treatment.
Experienced people stretched; no deputies	Cycles 1 and 2 (5 of 8; 5 of 7)	D5 People Leadership	**L**	A5 Succession plans for critical roles (in progress)	Regressed to P. Two critical roles vacated without a ready successor.
Emergency and scope decisions made informally	Cycles 1 and 2 (4 of 8; 5 of 7)	D2 Decision-Making Quality	**P**	A1 Decision register and authority matrix (complete)	Improved to L.
No consistent project governance	Cycle 2 (6 of 7)	D4 Execution & Control	**L**	A2 Stage-gate governance (complete)	Improved to F.
Project not tied to objectives	Cycle 2 (4 of 7)	D1 Strategy & Direction	**L**	A3 Depot-level scorecards (in progress)	Unchanged at L.
Lessons not carried forward	Cycles 1 and 2 (5 of 8; 5 of 7)	D6 Learning & Improvement	**P**	A6 Standard review and action register (not started)	Unchanged at P.
Warning had no owner; issues have no one to close them	Cycles 1 and 2 (4 of 8; 4 of 7)	D7 Governance & Accountability	**L**	A7 Delegate closure authority (in progress)	Unchanged at L. On-time closure 58 per cent against 85.

What the pairing shows, and what it does not

- All seven baseline actions trace to a theme raised in Candid Cycle. Both domains that improved by November, D2 and D4, are those where the debrief themes were turned into a record-producing mechanism (a decision register and stage gates).
- The theme that people feel most strongly, experienced people being stretched, is also the only regression. Debrief themes can act as an early signal of pressure that a documented framework does not yet show.
- A theme raised by most contributors is not proof of a gap. The assessment found some themes were already partly addressed (D2 and D4) and others were worse than the debrief implied (11 of 14 High risks without a funded or dated treatment).
- The sample does not show that the debriefs caused the improvements. Other factors, such as the incident itself, are likely to have contributed.
- Candid Cycle reports never identify contributors by name or role. The Calibrate sample reports a role mix because assessments are scoped by workspace, so the two products intentionally treat identity differently.