ILLUSTRATIVE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BRIEF

DecisivIQ Executive Report Review and Development

FICTIONAL DECISION-SUPPORT EXCERPT · NOT CLIENT WORK · EXECUTIVE STRATEGY

DecisivIQ Executive Report Review and Development **Illustrative sample only.** This fictional brief demonstrates DecisivIQ decision-readiness work on one supplied executive report. Northstar Service Network, its people, operating data, dates, and figures are invented, not verified findings or a promise of results.

Executive premise

[Northstar's management paper asks leadership to approve rapid expansion of its regional service-hub model. It asks for commitment before establishing the decision, proof required, or cost of being wrong. The question is not whether expansion is attractive. It is whether Northstar can add two hubs in twelve months without weakening service reliability, exhausting its field-leadership bench, or turning an operating hypothesis into an irreversible commitment.]

[The report should recommend a staged decision, not a broad endorsement. Leadership has enough evidence to authorize a disciplined validation phase and enough uncertainty to avoid a full rollout. That distinction preserves momentum without mistaking motion for progress.]

Illustrative decision situation

[Northstar is a fictional provider of on-site maintenance services. Demand grew 18 percent last year while average response time in three priority markets rose from 1.6 to 2.4 business days. The paper proposes hubs in Harbor City and Red Mesa, citing anticipated demand, estimated lease costs, and a sub-1.5-day response-time target.]

[It does not establish whether demand is durable by market, whether qualified supervisors can move without harming existing hubs, or whether the response-time gain warrants added fixed cost. The stated audience is the CEO, COO, CFO, and operating committee. Their actual near-term decision is narrower: approve a 90-day market-validation and launch-readiness phase, with pre-agreed gates before any site commitment.]

Decision-quality observations

01 The recommendation precedes the governing question.
The paper treats expansion as the answer. Start with the decision required, alternatives, and the threshold for proceeding. Readers should not have to infer whether they are approving analysis, a pilot, leases, hiring, or all four.

02 Observed performance and forecasts are blended too casually.
Demand and slower response times are meaningful signals, not proof that two permanent hubs are the best remedy. Separate supplied facts from assumptions, name an owner, and state what would change the recommendation.

03 The people constraint is material, not incidental.
The plan assumes four experienced supervisors can move or be promoted while the network remains stable. If that fails, service can decline in old and new markets. The paper needs a staffing contingency and clear authority to halt launch activity.

04 The action path has no explicit decision rights or stop conditions.
Site selection, lease execution, staffing, customer conversion, and go-live readiness should not flow automatically from one approval. Each needs an accountable executive, timing assumption, and reason to defer.

DECISIVIQ / STRATEGY INTO OPERATING DISCIPLINE

Choose with clarity. Execute with control.

Options and material tradeoffs

Option A: Approve both hubs immediately.
This maximizes speed and signals confidence to customers. It also commits fixed cost before demand concentration, staffing readiness, and launch capacity are demonstrated. The tradeoff is faster potential coverage against a greater risk of underutilization and leadership distraction.

Option B: Authorize a gated 90-day validation phase, then launch one hub first.
This keeps momentum while testing contracted or highly qualified demand, supervisor availability, launch economics, and service-level impact. It may defer the second market and leave some near-term demand uncaptured. In return, leadership can sequence deliberately and stop before major commitments.

Option C: Defer expansion and optimize the existing network.
This protects cash and management bandwidth and may reveal lower-cost response-time improvements. It also risks ceding share if demand is real and competitors move first. Deferral is credible only if the existing network can absorb demand within a defined improvement window.

Strategic option
The illustrative recommendation is **Option B**. It is not a compromise for its own sake. It puts a reversible decision before an irreversible one and concentrates management attention on the assumptions that determine whether expansion creates value or merely moves the bottleneck.

Recommended action architecture

01 Authorize the validation phase within five business days.
The CEO names the COO accountable executive and assigns a cross-functional launch lead. The phase produces a market-demand view, supervisor-readiness assessment, operating-capacity baseline, and gate memo. It does not authorize leases, external announcements, or hiring commitments.

02 Set four launch gates before work begins.
The COO, finance, and commercial leaders confirm thresholds for demand, supervisor coverage, response-time capacity, and management-approved launch funding. The gate memo distinguishes management-supplied data from unresolved assumptions. A threshold miss triggers redesign, delay, or stop, not an informal exception.

03 Return with one sequenced recommendation on day 90.
The launch lead recommends one first market, a second-market disposition, a phased staffing plan, and a 30/60/90-day operating review cadence. The operating committee explicitly decides what is approved, what remains conditional, and who owns customer, workforce, and performance follow-through.

Executive questions to test

01 What evidence would show that improving the existing network is superior to opening a first new hub?
02 Which current commitments will we deliberately slow, stop, or reassign if experienced supervisors are needed for launch?
03 If the first hub meets demand targets but misses service-quality targets, who can pause expansion and what information must that person have?

Professional boundary

This is strategic planning, editorial, operational, and decision-support work only. It does not provide legal, tax, accounting, investment, regulatory, procurement, compliance, audit, certification, or other licensed professional advice. It does not draft binding instruments, submit filings, represent a client before a government body, independently validate claims, or guarantee funding, contract awards, board adoption, certifications, compliance outcomes, or results. Governance and 501(c)(3) materials are planning aids requiring review by appropriate counsel and authorized decision makers. In government-contracting contexts, support is limited to requirements interpretation, capability narrative, proposal architecture, and review planning.

Engagement snapshot

Offer: Executive Report Review and Development **Fixed price:** $ 395 **Timeline:** 4 business days after receipt of all required inputs **Focus:** Executive logic, audience fit, material tradeoffs, and action architecture.

The engagement reviews one existing executive report, management paper, operating plan, or stakeholder document of up to 20 pages or 8,000 words, excluding appendices and data tables. Deliverables are an annotated review copy, decision-readiness memo, revised executive summary and document architecture, and action architecture. It excludes full-document ghostwriting, net-new report development, independent research or source verification, financial modeling, presentation design, live facilitation, and board presentation delivery. One consolidated revision to the executive summary and action architecture is included within five calendar days of delivery and the original document, audience, and decision brief.

READY TO MOVE A CONSEQUENTIAL DECISION FORWARD?
Visit praxisiqgroup.com/decisiviq to review DecisivIQ advisory services or request a consultation.