

STUCK PROGRAM DIAGNOSTIC. RECOVERY BRIEF

Salesforce Customer 360 Migration

program.director@example-corp.com.au

12 June 2026 · Confidential

36

RECOVERY SCORE / 100

Stuck

Posture. Structured intervention this quarter

Built for the program manager.

This is a peer-to-peer document. Written for a senior program manager, scored against a fixed rubric, structured so the second-most-useful page is the first one a sponsor will read.

If you have ten minutes, read the current state read, then the recommended recovery option, then the three fortnight moves. That is the spine of the brief.

The recovery options are deliberately presented as three discrete choices. The recommended one is highlighted but not the only credible move. Reading all three sharpens the choice.

Scores are calibrated against grade inflation. The model is explicitly told that a 35 told straight is more useful than a 60 dressed up, and most programs that ask for this audit land between 25 and 55.

CONTENTS

- 01* How to read this brief
- 02* Current state read and scoring
- 03* Three recovery options
- 04* The recommendation
- 05* Fortnight moves
- 06* Recovery risk register
- 07* Implementation
- 08* Appendix. Interview transcript

WEIGHTS. SCOPE 25% · GOVERNANCE 20% · DELIVERY 25% · STAKEHOLDERS 15% · RISK 15%

Where the program sits.

The program is delivering against an end-of-December date that the team does not believe and the SteerCo has stopped questioning. Three slips in five months without a re-baseline says the governance has lost its function as a brake. Two integrations dropped at SteerCo are quietly back in scope. The most important stakeholder, the call centre director, has not been in a meeting in two months. The data migration accuracy risk has been Red since April with no named owner. Each of these in isolation is recoverable; together they are the shape of a program that needs to be told the truth.

RECOVERY SCORE

36

Stuck

Genuine motion has stopped. Decisions are taking too long, scope has crept, and the team's honest read is darker than the reporting suggests. Recoverable, but not by carrying on.

Posture. Structured intervention this quarter



Dimension scores

Scope clarity	28	<i>Scope is unstable and the SteerCo accepts the instability.</i> Two integrations dropped then quietly returned. Three date slips without a re-baseline. The team has stopped believing the public commitment date.
Governance and decision rights	32	<i>Governance functions as theatre. Decisions do not stick.</i> The SteerCo accepts replans rather than triggering re-baselines. There is no functioning brake. The sponsor signs off scope changes that the program board did not see.
Delivery health	42	<i>Delivery is competent and tired. The team can name the trouble.</i> The data dry-run failure was flagged in advance and the replan was too short. The team's honest internal read is darker than the SteerCo deck.
Stakeholder reality	38	<i>The right stakeholders are absent. The wrong ones are loudest.</i> Call centre director has missed eight weeks of meetings. The COO is loudest but has the least operational stake in the cutover.
Risk posture	38	<i>The top risk has no owner. The RAID is a logging exercise, not a control.</i>



Data migration accuracy is Red for over sixty days with 'program team' as owner. This is the RAID equivalent of saying nobody.

Pick your shape of intervention.

Three deliberately distinct options. Each is a real path the evidence supports. The recommended option is highlighted; the others are credible alternatives worth weighing.

A. Recalibrate inside the existing program shape

RECOMMENDED

TWO TO FOUR WEEKS OF PROGRAM MANAGER TIME, FOUR STEERCOS, SPONSOR SIGN-OFF

Run a formal re-baseline against a March cutover. Keep the existing program structure, replace the SteerCo cadence with a sharper one, fix the data ownership.

WEEK-ONE MOVES

- Run a re-baseline workshop with the core team
- Replace the current RAID with a tighter one owned by named individuals
- Get the call centre director back in the room

EXPECTED OUTCOME

A credible March date with a public re-baseline, signed by the sponsor and the COO together. The team believes it because the date matches what they would deliver.

RISKS OF THIS OPTION

- The sponsor refuses to admit December is gone publicly.
- The COO uses the re-baseline as a political weapon.

B. Split the program: cut the call centre

THREE TO FIVE WEEKS TO DESCOPE CLEANLY, PLUS CONTRACT CHANGES WITH THE VENDOR

Carve the call centre cutover out of the program and run it as a separate phase two, starting six months after the core platform goes live. The remaining scope is the platform and the integrations.

WEEK-ONE MOVES

- Confirm with the sponsor that descope is on the table
- Bring the call centre director in to own phase two scope
- Replan the integrations against the smaller footprint

RISKS OF THIS OPTION

- The board reads it as failure.
- Phase two slips and becomes a graveyard.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

A defensible April platform go-live with the call centre as a publicly named phase two. Credibility restored because the public commitment matches the real plan.

C. Pause for sixty days, then decide

SIXTY CALENDAR DAYS, TWO SPONSOR SESSIONS, NO TEAM BURN

Stop active development for sixty days. Run a structured diagnostic with the sponsor and the COO. At the end, choose between Option A, Option B, or cancellation.

WEEK-ONE MOVES

- Negotiate the pause with the sponsor
- Stand the core team down to BAU
- Commission an external read

RISKS OF THIS OPTION

- The sponsor cannot stomach the optics of a public pause.
- Sixty days becomes the new normal and the program drifts further.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

A defensible decision in sixty days, made with quiet rather than under SteerCo pressure. The team gets sleep. The board gets clarity.

Option A. *Recalibrate inside the existing program shape*

Option A is the recommendation because the team is genuinely competent and the program is recoverable if the governance stops accepting theatre. Option B is honest but costs the sponsor face the COO will not give back. Option C is the safest read of the situation but only works if the sponsor is willing to take the visible pause, and the evidence is that they are not. A recalibration inside the existing shape, with a sharper SteerCo and a named owner on the top risk, is the path that the people in the room can actually walk down on Monday.

WHAT THIS OPTION COSTS YOU

Two to four weeks of program manager time, four SteerCos, sponsor sign-off

TRADE-OFF ACCEPTED

No recovery shape is costless. The risks listed under this option opposite are the price of choosing it. Read them before committing.

Three moves, no matter which option.

These three moves are valuable regardless of which recovery option you pick. They clarify the decision, control immediate risk, and give you a higher-resolution read by the time you commit.

01. Name an owner on the data migration accuracy risk

OWNER. PROGRAM MANAGER

WHAT TO DO

Move the risk from 'program team' to a named individual on the data engineering side. Add a weekly five-minute slot at SteerCo to read out the trend.

SUCCESS CRITERION

The risk has one human owner by Friday next week and the SteerCo agenda has the trend reading by the SteerCo after.

02. Get the call centre director back in the room

OWNER. SPONSOR

WHAT TO DO

Sponsor calls the call centre director directly. Tells them the cutover will not land without their active sign-off and asks them to commit to the next four SteerCos in writing.

SUCCESS CRITERION

Director attends the next SteerCo and signs a one-line letter committing to the next four.

03. Run a 'is December gone' candid session with the core team

OWNER. PROGRAM MANAGER

WHAT TO DO

Ninety minutes with the core team, no SteerCo, no sponsor. One question: based on what we actually know, what is the earliest credible date. Capture verbatim.

SUCCESS CRITERION

A team-signed memo with a date range. Used as the input to the re-baseline conversation with the sponsor.

Risks worth standing up.

Top risks the audit surfaced. Some are likely already on your RAID log (marked Active); some are ones the audit raised that were not (New); some are on the horizon (Watching).

RISK	SEV	LIKE	MITIGATION	OWNER	STATUS
Data migration accuracy under load	High	High	Named owner on the data engineering side, weekly trend at SteerCo, dry-run at fifty percent load before commitment.	Data lead	Active
Call centre director sustained absence	High	Medium	Sponsor escalation, written commitment to four SteerCos, named delegate for cover only.	Sponsor	New
SteerCo accepting replans rather than triggering re-baselines	Medium	High	Replace the current SteerCo charter with one that explicitly distinguishes replan from re-baseline.	Program manager	New
Sponsor reluctance to publicly own a missed date	Medium	High	Frame the re-baseline as a sponsor decision, not a program request. Pair it with a credibility-restoring move.	Sponsor	Watching
Integration team burnout	Medium	Medium	Hold the descope of two integrations from option A. Protect the team's weekends from the next replan cycle.	Tech lead	Watching

HOW TO USE THIS

Drop the New rows into your RAID log this week. Re-rate the severity and likelihood against your private read of the program. Review the Watching rows at next SteerCo.

If you want help doing this, not just diagnosing.

This brief gives you a recovery shape and the three moves to make this fortnight. If you want a hand actually doing it, DPEX runs fixed-scope program recovery engagements alongside the existing team.

The shape. Four to twelve weeks, scoped against the recovery option you chose. Embedded delivery, not advisory. SteerCo structure, replans, and the recovery risk register stood up as part of the work. The team owns the outcome after I leave.

To book a thirty-minute discussion, reply to the email this report arrived with, or write to dpexconsulting@gmail.com with the subject "Recovery". I read every message myself and reply within two business days. No funnel. No sales pressure. If we are not the right fit I will say so.

Daniel Xuereb

DPEXCONSULTING · SYDNEY

ABOUT THIS BRIEF

Generated by DPEXConsulting's Stuck Program Diagnostic engine. Scored against a fixed rubric and reviewed against behavioural anchors per question. The on-screen result and this PDF carry identical scores.

DISCLAIMER

This is a structured diagnostic, not legal or fiduciary advice. Sector-specific requirements may layer onto the recommended actions. The recovery score is a calibration tool, not a guarantee of outcome.

The interview, kept whole.

Every question asked, in order, with your answer. Kept here so you can revisit any line without having to remember the conversation.

Q1 · SCOPE CLARITY

When you say the program feels off, what is the single most concrete signal?

Three slips against the December date in five months. Each time the SteerCo accepts a new date. Nobody on the team believes it.

Q2 · SCOPE CLARITY

What is the agreed scope, in one sentence?

The Salesforce migration of forty thousand customer records, twenty-six integrations, and the call centre on the new platform by end of December.

Q3 · GOVERNANCE AND DECISION RIGHTS

Who has the standing decision-making authority on scope changes?

Formally the program board. In practice the sponsor signs off and nobody pushes back.

Q4 · GOVERNANCE AND DECISION RIGHTS

When was the last hard SteerCo decision and what was it?

Three months ago. We agreed to drop two integrations. They quietly came back in scope two weeks later.

Q5 · DELIVERY HEALTH

Walk me through the most recent failed milestone.

The data migration dry-run last month. Twelve thousand records failed validation. The team flagged it would. The replan added two weeks; it should have triggered a full re-baseline.

Q6 · STAKEHOLDER REALITY

Which stakeholder is the loudest right now, and which one is genuinely the most important?

Loudest is the COO who chairs SteerCo. Most important is the call centre director who has not been to a meeting in two months.

Q7 · RISK POSTURE

What is the top risk on your RAID log that has been Red for more than thirty days?

Data migration accuracy. Red since April. Owned by 'program team', no specific person.