

# D7 — Validation Experiment Playbook

## 5 Prioritized Experiments - 30–60 Day Post-Sprint Window

NorthBridge Freight Solutions



## Playbook Purpose and Design Rules

The D7 Validation Experiment Playbook is the sprint's forward-facing deliverable. It translates the five Critical Unknowns that cannot be resolved within the 14-day sprint window into specific, sequenced experiments the client can execute without THC Consulting present. Each experiment carries a named hypothesis, a concrete method, a binary success criterion, a failure criterion, an explicit verdict revision trigger, and early-warning indicators to watch before the deadline.

The playbook is not a research agenda. Each experiment produces a go/no-go signal on a specific question. If the signal is negative, the verdict changes in a defined way. If the signal is positive, a specific forward action unlocks. Experiments that cannot be defined at that level of specificity are not in this playbook.

**Sequencing rule:** Experiments are ordered by CU importance — the experiment that resolves the highest-importance unresolved question runs first. Experiment 1 (data audit) gates board capital release for Phase 1. Experiment 3 (TMS partner positioning) gates any Phase 2 rehabilitation path. Experiments 4 and 5 gate the GO authorization meeting itself. Do not run experiments out of sequence — later experiments depend on earlier findings.

### Experiment Index — Critical Unknown Mapping

#	Experiment	CU Resolved	Phase	Deadline	Verdict Implication if Fails
1	Three-Layer Data Audit	A023 / A047 / A052 — Behavioral coverage & normalization scope	Phase 1	28 days	<b>Board capital release suspended. Phase 1 scope and cost rebuilt before any GO authorization.</b>
2	Dispatcher Knowledge Capture Sprint	A024 / A039 — Institutional knowledge loss & adoption risk	Phase 1	42 days	<b>Phase 1A scope expands. Change management plan redesigned. Build cost floor rises.</b>
3	TMS Partner Positioning Test	A050 / A056 — Data licensing path structural viability	Phase 2 Forward Path	60 days	<b>Data licensing path closed. Phase 2 NO GO is permanent. VP BD exploration window ends.</b>
4	CFO Threshold Stress Test	A022 / A051 — Payback gate flexibility and measurement framework	Phase 1	Pre-board	<b>Phase 1 CONDITIONAL GO requires CEO override of CFO threshold. Explicitly documented in board materials.</b>
5	Phase 1 Governance Commitment Audit	A018 / A019 — CEO commitment ladder and VP Operations alignment	Phase 1	14 days	<b>Phase 1 verdict moves to NO GO. Three named conditions cannot carry written commitments.</b>

# 1

PRIORITY

HYPOTHESIS

## Three-Layer Data Audit

Critical Unknown: A023 / A047 / A052 · Phase 1 — Pre-Board Gating Condition

30–60 Day Window

Executable without THC

<b>TESTED</b>	The carrier behavioral and performance attribute layer — the data the ML model actually requires for differentiated dispatch recommendations — is present at sufficient coverage (≥65% on key ML features) to support a production-grade training set. Data normalization is scoped, budgeted, and sequenced into Phase 1A without triggering a further timeline or cost revision that breaks the investment case.
<b>METHOD</b>	Commission a three-layer structured data audit with the data engineering lead as owner and a named senior data engineer as executor. The three layers must be audited sequentially and reported separately — do not allow them to be combined into a single coverage number. Layer 1: transactional completeness — count and date coverage of load records with all core fields (carrier ID, lane, on-time flag, equipment type, rate) present and parseable. Layer 2: behavioral attribute coverage — for each key ML feature (on-time rates, damage claims, seasonal reliability patterns, lane-specific refusal history, capacity commitment rates), what percentage of carrier relationships have usable records? Report by feature, not aggregate. Layer 3: recoverability assessment — for the behavioral gaps identified in Layer 2, what portion is recoverable through the legacy carrier portal, dispatcher spreadsheets, or structured knowledge interviews? What portion is permanently lost? The audit report must name the data engineer who conducted each layer and the date each was completed. Preliminary Layer 1 findings are due within 10 days. Full three-layer report is due within 28 days of board approval to commence.
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	<b>Layer 1 transactional completeness ≥85% in the post-2021 clean window. Layer 2 behavioral coverage ≥65% on the five highest-weight ML features. Layer 3 recoverability assessment documents a clear path to ≥75% overall coverage post-normalization. Data normalization is scoped as a defined Phase 1A workstream with a timeline (in weeks, not months) and a named owner.</b>
<b>FAILURE CRITERIA</b>	<b>Layer 2 behavioral coverage on any single high-weight ML feature below 40%. Or: Layer 3 recoverability assessment concludes that permanent knowledge loss leaves the behavioral layer below 55% even after normalization. Or: data normalization scope extends Phase 1A beyond 18 months, breaking the 24-month payback gate even under optimistic savings assumptions.</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Engineering Lead (accountability) · Senior Data Engineer (execution) · CEO (escalation if findings trigger scope revision)
<b>TIMELINE</b>	28 days from board authorization to commence. Layer 1 preliminary findings within 10 days. Full report at Day 28.
<b>RESOURCES REQUIRED</b>	One senior data engineer, dedicated full-time for 4 weeks. Access to McLeod TMS, legacy carrier portal, and dispatcher records. External data engineering consultant on standby if internal resource is constrained (budget: ~\$15,000–25,000 for 4-week engagement). CEO sign-off required before audit begins — this is a capital-commitment gating condition.

✓ If SUCCESS — Verdict Implication

✗ If FAILURE — Verdict Revision Trigger

<p>Phase 1 investment case confirmed on the data dimension. Board capital release authorized for Phase 1A. Data normalization is sequenced and costed into the Phase 1A workplan. The competitive moat thesis stands at a defined confidence level. D5 entries A023, A047, and A052 close RESOLVED CONFIRMED.</p>	<p>PHASE 1 VERDICT REVISION: Board capital release suspended. Phase 1 investment case cannot be authorized on current evidence. Engineering Lead and CEO must convene a scope review before any GO authorization — the data moat thesis requires rebuilding from the audit findings. If Layer 2 coverage is below 40% on multiple key features, the data moat competitive differentiator must be removed from all client-facing materials.</p>
---	--

Early-Warning Indicators — What to Watch Before the Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Day 5: Layer 1 preliminary count shows more than 30% of post-2021 records missing the on-time flag field — signals a transactional completeness problem, not just a behavioral one.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Day 10: Engineering Lead informally characterizes Layer 2 behavioral coverage as "thinner than expected" before formal report — treat as a failure-direction signal.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Day 14: Recoverability assessment reveals that the legacy carrier portal extraction requires more than 6 weeks of engineering time — normalization scope is expanding.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Day 21: Data engineer requests scope extension beyond 28 days — audit itself is taking longer than estimated, which is a proxy signal for data complexity.</li> </ul>

# 2

PRIORITY  
HYPOTHESIS

## Dispatcher Knowledge Capture Sprint

Critical Unknown: A024 / A039 · Phase 1 — Build Design Input

30–60 Day Window

Executable without THC

<b>TESTED</b>	<p>The institutional carrier relationship knowledge held by remaining senior dispatchers (10+ year tenure) can be captured in a structured format that is usable as ML training input — specifically, knowledge about carrier behavioral patterns, reliability signals, and relationship context that does not appear in any system record. This knowledge can be transferred before further attrition degrades it.</p>
<b>METHOD</b>	<p>Conduct structured knowledge-capture interviews with all dispatchers holding 10 or more years of tenure. The interviews must be designed and facilitated by someone with experience in knowledge elicitation — not a general HR conversation or informal debrief. Each interview covers three knowledge domains: (1) Carrier behavioral signals — which carriers have reliability patterns (seasonal, load-type, relationship-dependent) that do not appear in on-time records? (2) Relationship context — which carriers respond differently based on how the load is presented, who calls, or what rate band is offered? (3) Risk signals — which carriers have known risk patterns (retirement proximity, capacity limitations, shipper conflicts) that the ML model would need to encode? Each interview produces a structured output document in a defined schema that can be directly used as a training annotation layer. The Director of Transportation Operations owns day-to-day coordination. The VP Operations must formally endorse the process before it begins — her cooperation is a prerequisite, not an assumption.</p>
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	<p><b>≥80% of dispatchers with 10+ year tenure complete structured knowledge interviews. Each interview produces a schematized output document covering all three knowledge domains. Engineering Lead confirms the output format is usable as a Phase 1A training annotation layer. VP Operations formally endorses the protocol in writing before kickoff.</b></p>
<b>FAILURE CRITERIA</b>	<p><b>Fewer than 60% of senior dispatchers participate — indicating adoption resistance that predicts Phase 1C deployment resistance. Or: interview output reveals that the majority of high-value behavioral knowledge was held by the two departed dispatchers and is irrecoverable — the competitive moat thesis requires revision. Or: VP Operations does not endorse the protocol within 10 days — governance failure signal.</b></p>

<b>OWNER</b>	Director of Transportation Operations (execution) · VP Operations (endorsement and access) · Engineering Lead (schema design)
<b>TIMELINE</b>	42 days. VP Operations endorsement by Day 10. Interviews complete by Day 35. Structured output validated by Day 42.
<b>RESOURCES REQUIRED</b>	Knowledge elicitation facilitator — internal (Director of Transportation Operations with structured protocol) or external specialist (~\$8,000–15,000 for 6-week engagement). Dispatcher time: approximately 3–4 hours per dispatcher across 2–3 sessions. Schema design: 2 days of Engineering Lead time to define output format before interviews begin.

<b>✓ If SUCCESS — Verdict Implication</b>	<b>✗ If FAILURE — Verdict Revision Trigger</b>
Phase 1A training data scope is confirmed. The knowledge layer supplements data audit findings and narrows the behavioral coverage gap identified in Experiment 1. Phase 1A change management plan gains credibility — dispatchers who participated in knowledge capture are the natural candidates for Phase 1C adoption champions. D5 entries A024 and A039 close <b>RESOLVED.</b>	<b>PHASE 1A SCOPE REVISION REQUIRED:</b> If participation is below 60%, Phase 1C adoption risk escalates from monitored to critical — the same dispatchers who resisted the knowledge capture process will resist the deployment. Phase 1A change management plan must be redesigned before board approval. If irrecoverable knowledge loss is confirmed, Phase 1 competitive moat materials must be revised downward.

<b>Early-Warning Indicators — What to Watch Before the Deadline</b>
· Day 5: VP Operations does not respond to endorsement request within 5 days — early signal of cooperation friction.
· Day 14: First two dispatcher interviews produce sparse outputs — facilitator reports difficulty eliciting behavioral knowledge, suggesting the knowledge may be more tacit than structured.
· Day 21: One or more senior dispatchers declines to participate, citing concerns about "replacing our judgment" — adoption risk signal that carries directly into Phase 1C.
· Day 28: Engineering Lead reviews first batch of outputs and flags that schema does not capture the relationship context domain adequately — output format needs revision mid-sprint.

3

PRIORITY  
HYPOTHESIS

### TMS Partner Positioning Test

Critical Unknown: A050 / A056 · Phase 2 Forward Path — 90-Day Scoping Discipline

30–60 Day Window

Executable without THC

TESTED	A data licensing arrangement with a TMS platform partner resolves the structural competitive channel conflict (CU-01) by repositioning NorthBridge’s carrier performance data as a neutral infrastructure layer — sold through the TMS vendor, not directly to broker competitors. At least one TMS platform is willing to explore a formal pilot discussion within 60 days, and the commercial structure (recurring vs. one-time, integration burden, data governance requirements) is defined well enough to assess viability before senior time commits beyond the window.
METHOD	The VP Business Development leads this exploration under a 90-day scoping discipline established at the Day 14 verdict session. Three structural questions must be answered before any further senior time commits: (1) Is the problem two-sided — does broker-side carrier data fragmentation replicate the normalization burden NorthBridge has already solved internally, creating a genuine wedge for the licensing value proposition? (2) Is the commercial structure recurring rather than one-time — is there a subscription or usage-based model that produces LTV economics rather than a single integration fee? (3) Is the integration burden architectural or operational — does embedding the data layer require TMS platform re-architecture, or is it an API integration the TMS can execute in a standard implementation cycle? Conduct initial conversations with two to three TMS vendors operating in the PNW regional freight market. The first conversation must be framed as a market intelligence discussion, not a pitch — establish whether the problem exists on their side before introducing a commercial proposition. Do not present a product demo or pricing before the structural questions are answered.
SUCCESS CRITERIA	<b>At least one TMS vendor expresses genuine interest in a formal pilot discussion and agrees to a follow-up meeting that includes both a technical and a commercial counterpart. All three structural questions (two-sided problem, recurring commercial structure, integration burden classification) are answered with enough specificity to assess viability. The VP Business Development can articulate a specific commercial proposition that a TMS vendor would consider — not a concept, a proposition.</b>
FAILURE CRITERIA	<b>No TMS vendor expresses interest in a follow-up meeting after the initial conversation. Or: follow-up meetings are staffed by technical team only, with no commercial counterpart — technical-only re-engagement is the specific early warning indicator for licensing path failure. Or: the structural questions reveal that broker-side data is not fragmented in the same way (the two-sided problem does not exist), removing the primary wedge for the licensing value proposition.</b>
OWNER	VP Business Development (lead) · THC Consulting (advisory, available for conversation framing review)
TIMELINE	60 days. Initial TMS conversations complete by Day 30. Structural question answers documented by Day 45. Go/no-go on licensing path by Day 60.
RESOURCES REQUIRED	VP Business Development time: approximately 20–30 hours over 60 days for outreach, conversations, and documentation. No external spend required in the 60-day window — this is a scoping exercise, not a pilot. If structural questions produce positive answers, a second VAD sprint is recommended before any capital commitment to the licensing path.

✓ If SUCCESS — Verdict Implication

✗ If FAILURE — Verdict Revision Trigger

<p>Phase 2 licensing path opens a conditional rehabilitation — but requires a new structured sprint before capital commits. The current NO GO verdict on the original broker SaaS thesis is unchanged. The licensing path is a structurally different proposition that requires its own hypothesis lock, market sizing, and unit economics before a verdict can be issued. THC remains available in an advisory capacity.</p>	<p>PHASE 2 NO GO IS PERMANENT. The data licensing exploration has been tested and found no viable path. The VP Business Development's forward energy should redirect to Phase 1 internal deployment as the primary value creation vehicle. All Phase 2 commercial activity ceases. The 90-day scoping window closes.</p>
---	--

**Early-Warning Indicators — What to Watch Before the Deadline**

- Day 15: VP Business Development reports that TMS vendors are asking "what's in it for us?" without expressing the underlying data fragmentation problem — structural question (1) may be negative.
- Day 30: First follow-up meetings scheduled — check whether commercial counterpart is included. Technical-only staffing at this stage is the specific failure-direction indicator.
- Day 45: VP Business Development characterizes the licensing proposition as "still being defined" — the proposition is not concrete enough to assess, which itself is a signal.
- Day 50: Any TMS vendor references that they are already building similar internal capability — the neutral aggregator competitive risk has materialized.

# 4

PRIORITY  
HYPOTHESIS

## CFO Threshold Stress Test

Critical Unknown: A022 / A051 · Phase 1 — GO Authorization Prerequisite

30–60 Day Window

Executable without THC

<b>TESTED</b>	<p>The CFO's stated 24-month payback threshold has defined flexibility when presented with a phased measurement framework — specifically, a Month 12 operational checkpoint with defined metrics that would allow a partial payback assessment before the 24-month gate fires. The CFO will agree to a documented measurement framework that preserves her financial discipline posture while acknowledging that a 30–36 month build timeline makes the 24-month gate structurally unachievable as currently defined.</p>
<b>METHOD</b>	<p>The CEO meets privately with the CFO before the board authorization meeting. The conversation is not a negotiation — it is a structured disclosure of a confirmed finding and a request for a documented response. The CEO presents: (1) the confirmed finding that the 24-month payback gate is structurally unachievable given the 30–36 month build timeline; (2) the bias-adjusted Year 1 savings estimate (\$562K–\$745K vs. \$1.0–1.25M required); and (3) a proposed phased measurement framework — a formal Month 12 and Month 24 operational checkpoint with defined metrics (dispatcher adoption rate, override rate reduction, load margin improvement on instrumented lanes). The CFO's response — whether she adjusts the threshold, agrees to a phased framework, or holds the 24-month gate without modification — is documented in writing before the board meeting. The CEO does not proceed to board authorization without a documented CFO position. This is not a one-direction conversation — if the CFO holds the gate, the CEO must decide whether to override explicitly and own that decision.</p>
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	<p><b>CFO agrees in writing to a phased measurement framework with defined Month 12 and Month 24 checkpoint metrics. The framework is specific enough to constitute a performance gate — not a general monitoring commitment. Or: CEO formally overrides the CFO threshold with an explicit written acknowledgment that the Phase 1 investment case is being authorized on strategic sufficiency grounds rather than payback math, and that this decision is owned by the CEO.</b></p>

<b>FAILURE CRITERIA</b>	<b>CFO holds the 24-month gate without modification and CEO does not formally override. Board authorization meeting cannot proceed without a documented CFO position. Phase 1 verdict moves to NO GO until threshold is resolved.</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	CEO (conversation owner) · CFO (response) · THC Consulting (framing support available if requested)
<b>TIMELINE</b>	Before board authorization meeting. Conversation should occur no later than 5 business days before the board session to allow time for documentation.
<b>RESOURCES REQUIRED</b>	CEO time: 60–90 minute private conversation with CFO. THC available to prepare the CEO's briefing document and the proposed measurement framework language (~4 hours of advisory time). No external spend required.

✓ If SUCCESS — Verdict Implication	✗ If FAILURE — Verdict Revision Trigger
Phase 1 CONDITIONAL GO authorization proceeds to board. The measurement framework is attached to the board materials as a governance instrument — not buried in an appendix. The CFO's agreement is the financial discipline anchor that makes the GO defensible. Month 12 checkpoint becomes a standing agenda item for the CEO-CFO operating rhythm.	PHASE 1 BLOCKED. Board authorization meeting is delayed until CFO threshold is resolved or CEO formally overrides in writing. If CEO override is required, the Sprint Master Report framing must be updated to reflect that the Phase 1 GO is a CEO strategic judgment call, not a CFO-endorsed financial case. This distinction matters for the board's risk assessment.

Early-Warning Indicators — What to Watch Before the Deadline
· CFO does not respond to CEO's meeting request within 3 business days — avoidance signal.
· CFO requests to review the D4 full model again before the conversation — she is re-anchoring on the numbers, which may signal she is preparing to hold the gate.
· CFO proposes including the VP Business Development in the threshold conversation — triangulation signal that she does not want to own the decision bilaterally with the CEO.
· CEO characterizes the conversation as "I'll handle Linda" without scheduling a specific meeting — governance discipline is not being applied.

**5**

**PRIORITY**  
**HYPOTHESIS**

## Phase 1 Governance Commitment Audit

Critical Unknown: A018 / A019 · Phase 1 — Conditions to Written Commitments

30–60 Day Window

Executable without THC

<b>TESTED</b>	The three Phase 1 governance conditions identified in the Sprint Master Report can each carry a named owner and a written commitment before board capital release — converting conditional language from a hedge into an enforceable governance instrument. The CEO can make an explicit resource allocation decision on the carrier portal sequencing question. The VP Operations can be formally brought into the pre-deployment governance structure with a named role and defined escalation trigger. The Engineering Lead can commit to a data audit completion date and a defined preliminary findings communication protocol.
<b>METHOD</b>	Within 14 days of the Day 14 verdict session, the CEO converts each of the three Phase 1 conditions into a written governance document. This is not a memo or a slide — it is a signed planning artifact with the condition, the named owner, the deadline, and the escalation mechanism. The three required documents: (1) Carrier portal sequencing decision — a written statement from the CEO naming one of three options: defer, kill, or fund as parallel program. The document must include the VP Operations as a co-signer. Three options are valid; silence is not. (2) Pre-deployment governance structure — a written CEO-VP Operations joint document naming the priority adjudication mechanism for any Phase 1A resource conflict with core operations. Must name a specific individual as arbiter and define the trigger condition for escalation. (3) Data audit commitment — the Engineering Lead signs a commitment to complete the three-layer data audit within 28 days of board approval and to communicate preliminary findings below 40% behavioral coverage to the CEO before they appear in any formal report. THC Consulting will review the three documents and confirm they meet the condition standard before marking the CONDITIONAL GO as GO-authorized.
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	<b>All three governance documents are signed by the named owner and delivered to THC Consulting within 14 days of the Day 14 verdict session. Each document names a specific owner, a specific deadline, and a specific escalation mechanism. THC Consulting confirms in writing that each document meets the condition standard. The CONDITIONAL GO is converted to GO-authorized.</b>
<b>FAILURE CRITERIA</b>	<b>Any one of the three documents is not delivered within 14 days. Or: any document is delivered but does not name a specific owner, deadline, or escalation mechanism — a general commitment to "address the issue" does not meet the condition standard. Or: the VP Operations does not co-sign the portal sequencing decision.</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	CEO (conditions 1 and 2) · Engineering Lead (condition 3) · VP Operations (co-signer, condition 1) · THC Consulting (condition standard review)
<b>TIMELINE</b>	14 days from Day 14 verdict session. All three documents due simultaneously — partial delivery does not satisfy the condition.
<b>RESOURCES REQUIRED</b>	CEO and VP Operations: 2–3 hours total to draft and sign governance documents. THC Consulting: 2 hours to review and confirm condition standard. No external spend required. If any document requires legal review (e.g., the carrier portal sequencing decision has contractual implications), allow additional 3–5 days for counsel review.

✓ If **SUCCESS** — Verdict Implication

✗ If **FAILURE** — Verdict Revision Trigger

<p>CONDITIONAL GO converts to GO-authorized. Board capital release proceeds. The three governance documents are attached to the board authorization package as standing commitments, not supporting materials. The pre-mortem failure scenario (Immune System Death) is now governed by the escalation mechanisms named in the documents — the early-warning indicators become standing monitoring items for the CEO's monthly operating review.</p>	<p>PHASE 1 VERDICT MOVES TO NO GO. A CONDITIONAL GO without named owners and written commitments is not a verdict — it is a deferred decision. If the CEO cannot convert the conditions to written governance within 14 days of the verdict session, the structural commitment required to sustain Phase 1A through 30–36 months does not exist. The sprint verdict is revised to NO GO. THC Consulting documents the reason and the specific condition that could not be met.</p>
--	--

**Early-Warning Indicators — What to Watch Before the Deadline**

- Day 3: CEO has not initiated the carrier portal conversation with VP Operations — the sequencing decision requires her to be in the room and this conversation has a defined lead time.
- Day 7: Engineering Lead requests to see the "template" for the data audit commitment — suggests he is treating this as a form to fill rather than a governance instrument to design.
- Day 10: CEO characterizes the governance documents as "something legal needs to review" without having scheduled the legal review — process is stalling.
- Day 14 (deadline): Any document delivered without the required co-signature defaults to failure criteria — partial signatures do not satisfy the condition standard.

**Playbook Governance and Outcome Tracking**

The five experiments in this playbook are not independent. They form a dependency chain that determines whether the Phase 1 CONDITIONAL GO becomes a GO-authorized board decision, and whether a Phase 2 forward path exists beyond the current NO GO verdict. The dependency chain runs: Experiment 5 (governance commitments) must close before board authorization. Experiment 1 (data audit) gates capital release. Experiment 2 (knowledge capture) runs in parallel with Experiment 1 and feeds Phase 1A design. Experiments 4 (CFO threshold) and 5 (governance) must both close before the board meeting. Experiment 3 (TMS positioning) runs independently on a parallel 60-day track.

Experiment	Depends On	Gates	If Stalled
1 — Data Audit	Board authorization to commence	Capital release for Phase 1A	All downstream Phase 1A planning is on hold. Escalate to CEO immediately.
2 — Knowledge Capture	VP Operations endorsement (Day 10)	Phase 1A training data design	Notify CEO. Escalation trigger is a governance condition (Experiment 5).
3 — TMS Positioning	VP BD 90-day scoping mandate	Phase 2 licensing path go/no-go	If stalled at Day 30, VP BD must document and close. No extension beyond 90 days.
4 — CFO Threshold	CEO-CFO private conversation scheduled	Board authorization meeting	Board meeting cannot proceed. CEO owns this dependency — THC cannot substitute.
5 — Governance Commitments	Day 14 verdict session completed	CONDITIONAL GO → GO-authorized	Phase 1 verdict reverts to NO GO on Day 15. No extensions.

**Outcome Tracking — 90/180/365-Day Calls**

Call	Timing	Primary Questions	Pattern Library Action
90-Day	Day 90 post-verdict	Experiments 1 and 5 complete? Data audit findings — what did behavioral coverage come in at? Governance commitments holding? Phase 1A started on schedule? Experiment 3 — TMS positioning result documented?	Update Pattern Library case entry with data audit findings and governance compliance rate.
180-Day	Day 180 post-verdict	Phase 1A data engineering — on schedule? Early adoption signals from Experiment 2 knowledge capture? TMS licensing path — open or closed? CFO monitoring framework — Month 12 gate on track?	Flag any verdict revision triggers that have been hit. Update case entry with Phase 1A progress.
365-Day	Day 365 post-verdict	Was the verdict correct? Phase 1 on track to produce documented internal savings? Did the TMS licensing path produce a viable proposition? Did any pre-mortem scenario play out as described?	Final Pattern Library update with confirmed outcome. Was this a correct CONDITIONAL GO?

**STANDING RULE — NO EXPERIMENT EXTENSIONS: Each experiment has a hard deadline. Extensions are not permitted without a documented reason and a named CEO acknowledgment. An experiment that cannot complete on schedule is itself a signal — it indicates the organizational commitment required to execute Phase 1A over 30–36 months does not exist. A missed experiment deadline should be treated as a failure-direction signal, not an administrative matter.**

Thomas Calvert · Managing Director, THC Consulting · thomas@sprintverdict.com  
 NorthBridge Freight Solutions · D7 Validation Experiment Playbook · Day 13 of 14 · Confidential

SAMPLE — This report has been anonymized. All client and stakeholder details are fictionalized. The methodology, framework, and analytical structure are representative of a live engagement.