

ILLUSTRATIVE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BRIEF

Executive Presentation Rescue: Illustrative Decision-Readiness Brief

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

Executive Presentation Rescue: Illustrative Decision-Readiness Brief > Illustrative sample only. Meridian GridWorks, its leaders, meeting, slide count, and figures below are fictional. This sample demonstrates DecisivIQ strategic communication and decision-support judgment. It is not verified client work or a promise of any outcome.

Executive premise

[A deck scheduled for senior review in two days is not rescued by adding content. It is rescued by making the decision unmistakable, bounded, and safe enough for an executive to own. Here, management has a credible modernization initiative, a compressed timeline, and a 23-slide deck with useful operating detail. What it lacks is an answer to the audience’s first question: what are we being asked to authorize now, and what follows if we wait?]
[The presentation should seek a staged decision: authorize a defined discovery and pilot phase, release a limited planning envelope, and return at a stated gate with evidence on capacity, operating impact, and the remaining choice. That narrower ask respects oversight without understating the work.]

Illustrative decision situation

[Meridian GridWorks is a fictional regional infrastructure operator preparing for a 45-minute executive committee meeting. Its operations team proposes a 12-month field-service scheduling modernization effort. The current deck requests approval to launch the full program, citing an illustrative annual productivity opportunity of \$ 3.8 million and fewer missed service windows. It includes technology screenshots, a 14-workstream roadmap, and charts based on internal estimates.]
[The committee has signaled concerns about frontline adoption, peak-season disruption, integration readiness, and whether the savings case assumes unapproved headcount reductions. The request appears on slide 17, presents projected benefits before explaining the baseline, and treats a vendor-preferred sequence as the only viable path.]
[For this meeting, the decision should be reframed: authorize a six-week readiness and pilot-design phase, capped by a hypothetical \$ 240,000 allocation, rather than commit to the entire program. A full-program decision can wait for supporting evidence.]

Decision-quality observations

- 01 The ask exceeds the evidence on the page.**

The deck requests full-program approval while baseline data, integration effort, peak-season constraints, and the source of the productivity gain remain untested. A staged request better matches commitment to confidence.
- 02 The story starts with solution detail rather than the operating problem.**

Screens and workstreams arrive before service failures, affected customers, and the consequence of doing nothing. Open with the decision, the operating problem, and facts that make delay consequential. Executives should not have to infer why it matters.
- 03 Several assertions need labels, owners, or relocation.**

The \$ 3.8 million opportunity, claimed 18 percent scheduling improvement, and launch date should be labeled as management estimates, tied to client-supplied source material where available, or moved to an appendix pending validation. Unsupported precision can undermine sound work. Each owner should know which claim needs follow-up.
- 04 Governance is implied, not designed.**

The deck does not distinguish the committee’s authorization from management decisions on pilot sites, configuration, or later scaling. It should show decision rights, the return point, escalation triggers, and conditions for a pause or adaptation.

DECISIVIQ / STRATEGY INTO OPERATING DISCIPLINE

Choose with clarity. Execute with control.

Options and material tradeoffs

Option A: Approve the full 12-month program now.

This creates momentum and a single public commitment. It also asks the committee to accept uncertain estimates, capacity assumptions, and dependencies in one step. It is suitable only if evidence is available and management can absorb a changed pilot.

Option B: Authorize a six-week readiness and pilot-design phase.

This maintains progress while limiting the immediate commitment. Management establishes the baseline, confirms dependencies, selects a pilot cohort, refines the benefits case, and returns with a recommendation for the next resource release. The tradeoff is a later decision and disciplined ownership between meetings. This is preferred when the organization needs evidence, not more aspiration.

Option C: Defer to the next planning cycle.

Deferral protects capacity and avoids peak-season disruption. It may also extend missed service windows, preserve manual workarounds, and let assumptions age. It is reasonable only if management can explain the cost of delay and why limited readiness work cannot occur now.

Recommended action architecture

01 Reset the opening and decision slide.

Put the decision on slide 1: authorize the bounded readiness and pilot-design phase, name the accountable sponsor, state the illustrative spending cap, and identify evidence and date for the next gate. Slide 2 should establish the operating problem and consequence of inaction. Move screenshots and detailed workstreams out of the opening.

02 Build an evidence spine before retaining projected benefits.

Add one baseline slide separating observed conditions, management estimates, and open assumptions. Assign an owner to each material claim. Combine benefit slides into one view that names the source, measure definition, and what the six-week phase tests. Move technical detail to an appendix.

03 Close with controls, accountability, and a return path.

Add a final slide showing management decisions, committee oversight, pilot stop or escalation triggers, owners, and the next decision date. The action log should cover pilot cohort confirmation, data-quality validation, operating constraints, and the gate recommendation. This turns approval into a managed commitment.

Executive questions to test

- 01** What evidence would make the committee comfortable authorizing a six-week phase now while reserving the larger commitment for the next gate?
- 02** Which claimed benefit is decision-critical, and can the sponsor distinguish its baseline, estimate, owner, and validation method in one sentence?
- 03** If the pilot disrupts peak-season service or fails to demonstrate the expected improvement, who may pause, adapt, or return for direction?

Professional boundary

This fictional brief illustrates strategic communication and decision-support materials only. It is not legal, tax, accounting, investment, regulatory, procurement, compliance, audit, certification, or government-representation advice. It does not validate data, verify facts, conduct research, build financial models, create charts, redesign a presentation, coach speakers, facilitate a meeting, or represent a client. Governance-facing planning materials require review by appropriate counsel and authorized decision makers before reliance or action. No outcome is guaranteed.

Engagement snapshot

Offer: Executive Presentation Rescue **Fixed price:** \$ 625 **Timeline:** 2 business days, beginning after receipt of one complete presentation of up to 25 slides or equivalent briefing outline, meeting context, audience, decision request, available supporting materials, and known reviewer concerns. The engagement reviews one existing presentation and provides an **Executive Deck Review Memo, Decision and Audience Matrix**, recommended slide-by-slide deck architecture, and prioritized revision plan. It is a restructuring plan, not a second deck review or a revised PowerPoint, Google Slides, Keynote, visual identity, or presentation-delivery service. One consolidated clarification round is available for scope or factual misunderstandings within 3 business days of delivery.

READY TO MOVE A CONSEQUENTIAL DECISION FORWARD?

Visit praxisiqgroup.com/decisiviq to review DecisivIQ advisory services or request a consultation.