

One decision. Clear direction.

A sample of how Spanwork turns one consequential product or platform question into a recommendation, explicit tradeoffs, and a sequenced 90-day plan.

SCOPE

One decision

TIMELINE

10 working days

OUTCOME

Recommendation + plan

Prepared as a representative artifact for review and discussion.

THE DECISION

Should the team begin a full platform rewrite before committing to enterprise identity and audit controls?

RECOMMENDATION

Do not begin the full rewrite yet.

Separate identity and audit responsibilities, test the integration boundary, and measure one release cycle before approving the larger program.

WHY

A full rewrite combines several unresolved choices into one difficult-to-reverse commitment. A smaller intervention can create evidence for the larger decision while leaving a useful improvement in place.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The recommendation depends on a bounded review of the identity boundary, audit obligations, current release path, failure and rollback behavior, and the people who will own the operating obligation.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Repair	Contain the constraint inside the current platform.	Lowest disruption, but may preserve the wrong boundary.
Rebuild	Replace the platform before accepting the commitment.	Broadest change, with migration and dual-operation risk.
Resequence	Test one boundary before making the larger choice.	Creates evidence while limiting irreversible work.

WHAT SHAPES THE CHOICE

Connect the promise, the system constraint, and the owner.

Product commitment

Enterprise customers require identity controls and a reliable audit trail before launch.

- 01 Define the exact obligation.
- 02 Separate required controls from preferences.
- 03 Name the evidence that supports the claim.

Platform constraint

Identity and audit responsibilities are coupled across a boundary that has not been tested independently.

- 01 Document the current boundary.
- 02 Test failure, rollback, and data behavior.
- 03 Measure one representative release cycle.

Ownership condition

Leadership must name one decision owner and the people accountable for delivery and operation.

- 01 Assign the final decision.
- 02 Name delivery and operating owners.
- 03 Set the next evidence checkpoint.

UNKNOWNNS THAT COULD CHANGE THE RECOMMENDATION

- 1. Whether the identity boundary can be isolated without changing customer-facing behavior.
- 2. Whether audit events remain complete through failure, retry, and rollback paths.
- 3. Whether the current team can operate the new boundary without creating hidden support burden.

Evidence rule: if an unknown can reverse the recommendation, the 90-day plan must produce that evidence before the next irreversible commitment.

SEQUENCE

Make the next commitment earn its evidence.

DAYS 0-30

Define and instrument

1. Name the executive decision owner and operating owners.
2. Document identity and audit boundaries.
3. Set reliability, rollback, and evidence criteria.

Checkpoint: boundary and test plan approved.

DAYS 31-60

Test the constrained path

1. Implement the smallest complete boundary test.
2. Exercise normal, failure, retry, and rollback paths.
3. Record delivery effort and operating burden.

Checkpoint: one representative release observed.

DAYS 61-90

Decide and sequence

1. Compare observed evidence with the decision criteria.
2. Choose repair, component replacement, or broader program.
3. Fund the next scope with owners and accepted risks.

Checkpoint: leadership decision recorded.

LEADERSHIP READOUT

The readout is a working decision session. Leadership challenges the recommendation, confirms the evidence boundary, names accepted tradeoffs, and records who owns the next checkpoint.

Approve / Narrow / Defer / Stop