BRIEFING · INNOVATION SERIES

Innovation scorecard and daily management

Ten numbers on two clocks. One weekly cadence that changes the date.

The numbers leadership reviews weekly to change the date, the numbers it reviews quarterly to judge the strategy, and the daily cadence inside every product team that produces both.

PREPARED BY

lateralworks

BASIS

Client engagement, identity withheld

DATE

August 2026 · Rev 1.0

Four levels, one set of numbers

Innovation strategy

Own customer intelligence · Own the system · Execute with excellence · Create growth

Sets what matters

Quarterly business scorecard — portfolio committee

Portfolio yield · Innovation vitality · Customer evidence coverage · Capability maturity

Is the strategy working?

Weekly operating scorecard — CEO and VP Product Development

Gap to target · Role fill · Decision velocity · Provisioning · Team health · Milestones

Will we hit the date?

Daily and weekly management — product core teams

Critical path · Pull-in actions · Decisions · Commitments · Impediments

What do we change today?

Every level answers a different question. All four resolve to the same ten numbers.

STRUCTURE

Two clocks, one system

Execution numbers and business numbers move at different speeds. On one page they produce a report. On two clocks they produce two decisions: what we change this week, and whether the strategy is working.

WEEKLY

Run the program

Six numbers. VP Product Development with the CEO. Every red arrives with the cause and the corrective action already done.

- Gap to target, in weeks
- Critical-path role fill
- Decision velocity
- Provisioning latency and interrupts
- Team health, by exception
- Milestones achieved to plan

QUARTERLY

Run the portfolio

Four numbers. The portfolio committee. These move too slowly to manage against and too consequentially to ignore.

- Portfolio yield
- Innovation vitality
- Customer evidence coverage
- Strategic capability maturity

Forecast accuracy reads as the six-week trend on gap to target: one instrument, two views. First-pass gate yield is reported at each gate as supporting detail rather than carried on the weekly page.

Six numbers, reviewed every week

Metric	First reading	Target	Cadence	Owner	Definition
1 **Gap to target**	+9 wks	Zero	Weekly	Program Manager	Bottom-up critical path against committed date, per team
2 **Critical-path role fill**	30%	100%	Weekly	VP PD / functional leads	Core roles named and released on every committed team
3 **Decision velocity**	12 days	≤2 / ≤7 days	Weekly	Leadership Triads	Median days from decision identified to decision made
4 **Provisioning and interrupts**	34 days / 3	≤10 days / 0	Weekly	Functional leaders	Request-to-release latency; host interrupts, trailing 12 months
5 **Team health**	46%	>90%	Weekly	PMO Director	Reported per team, worst first — never as a portfolio average
6 **Milestones to plan**	71%	100%	Weekly	Project Owners	Phase gates and software releases passed YTD against plan

First readings are estimates from the program assessment. They become measured values once the integrated plan of record is reconciled, and every pack marks them as estimates until then.

Four numbers, reviewed at the portfolio committee

Metric	First reading	Target	Owner	Definition
Portfolio yield	3.8%	5%	VP PD with Finance	Annual incremental growth above run-rate divided by active portfolio NPV
Innovation vitality	22%	30%	Finance with Category Directors	Revenue from products launched inside a 30-month window, as a share of total revenue
Customer evidence coverage	38%	100%	Director, Upstream Marketing	Active programs carrying target definition, segmentation, workflow research, problem validation, jobs-to-be-done outcomes and an approved requirements document
Strategic capability maturity	45%	Roadmap milestones	VP PD with functional leaders	Assessed maturity against the approved capability roadmap: customer intelligence, systems engineering, product management, PMO, human-centered design

Customer evidence coverage at 38% is the number behind the program's rework. The lead program entered development without a jobs-to-be-done front end and is closing that gap now, under time pressure. The metric exists so it does not happen twice.

THE CONNECTIVE NUMBER

Cost of delay

Every number on the weekly scorecard converts to money through this one figure. It is what makes a late decision a priced event rather than an inconvenience.

$2.8M

2026 exposure

Full-year cost of delay carried by the current portfolio

$431K

per week, 2027

What a one-week slip to Release 1 costs next year

$792K

per week, 2028

What the same week costs once Release 2 is in market

HOW WE USE IT

- Every pull-in action carries the value of the days it recovers. Acceleration becomes an investment case, not a favor.
- Every decision older than its target carries a price. Twelve days on a Release 1 decision is roughly $740K of 2027 exposure.
- Release 1 carries about 55% of the exposure, Release 2 about 35%, Release 3 about 10%. Each team gets its own daily figure.
- Where a day can be bought (a contractor, a second test rig, a parallel tooling path) we compare its cost against the day's value and decide in the room.

Source: the client's R&D strategy. Per-team allocation by forecast revenue share; confirmed with Finance before publication.

WEEKLY METRIC 1

Gap to target, priced

The gap in weeks is the distance between what the bottom-up critical path says and what we committed to. Multiplied by each team's cost of delay, it stops being a schedule number and becomes a sum of money we are currently choosing to spend.

Product team	Gap to target, weeks	Cost of delay / day	Exposure in the gap
Project A	32	$8.7K	**$1.95M**
Project B	20	$8.7K	**$1.22M**
Project C	14	$10.1K	**$0.99M**
Project D	8	$11.7K	**$0.66M**
Project E	6	$10.6K	**$0.45M**
Project F (software platform)	6	$6.7K	**$0.28M**
Project G	4	$13.7K	**$0.38M**
Project H	2	$16.9K	**$0.24M**

$6.2M

carried by the current gap, at today's forecast dates

Project A carries the largest gap but the lowest daily rate. Project C burns $10.1K a day against Project A's $8.7K, and Project G at four weeks costs more than Project F at six. The order we attack is not the order of the bars.

Illustrative. Gaps estimated from the program assessment; per-team cost of delay allocated from the R&D strategy by forecast revenue share, per calendar day, confirmed with Finance.

WEEKLY METRIC 2

Critical-path role fill

Role fill is the gating condition for every other number on this page. A team with an unstaffed critical path cannot hold a date, however healthy it looks on the other criteria, so it is reported on its own.

17 of 56

core roles filled across eight committed teams

Portfolio reading: 30%

THE SEVEN ROLES

- Product Category Director
- Project Manager
- Product Manager
- Technical Lead
- Industrial Design
- Quality Engineering
- Test Engineering

Industrial design, quality and test are unfilled at program level across all three releases.

Filled means named by the functional manager and released to the team. A name on an org chart with no released time counts as zero.

WEEKLY METRIC 4

Provisioning and interrupts

Fast programs are a function of two things: how the team behaves, and the environment it works in. Five of these six numbers measure the teams. This one measures us.

34 days

Provisioning latency

Median days from a team's resource request to that resource actually released by the functional manager. Named is not released.

Target ≤10 days

3

Host interrupts

Late-hour reversals, re-prioritizations, and resources pulled off a critical path in the trailing twelve months.

Target Zero

7

Decision round-trips

Decisions escalated above the Triad that the bounding box says the Triad owns. Each one is a week of waiting.

Target ≤2 per quarter

WHY THIS BELONGS ON THE CEO'S PAGE

Two products were reversed late after clearing their gates: a display decision and an industrial-design decision. Both cost months, and neither appeared in any number leadership reviewed. The data comes free — it is the impediment row on every team's daily management board, aged in days.

Team health, reported by exception

Averaging eight equally weighted criteria across eight teams produces a portfolio number that can look healthy while the team on the critical path is failing. We report every team, worst first, and leave alone anything inside tolerance.

	Triad	Team	Plan	Crit. path	Pull-in	Rights	Risks	Escal.	Health
Project A	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	13% Critical
Project B	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	13% Critical
Project C	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	38% At risk
Project F (software)	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	38% At risk
Project D	●	○	●	○	○	○	●	●	50% At risk
Project E	●	●	●	○	○	○	●	●	63% Improving
Project G	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	75% Improving
Project H	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	75% Improving

Portfolio average would read 46% against a >90% target. The average is not the management information; the two teams at 13% are. · Filled dot = criterion met: Triad assigned, core team staffed, integrated plan, critical path visible, pull-in cadence active, decision rights defined, top risks owned, escalation path clear.

The weekly pull-in and decision cycle

1

Update the plan

Task and workstream owners

- Confirm actual progress
- Re-estimate remaining duration
- Name new dependencies
- Surface risk honestly — no artificial green

2

Analyze the paths

Project Owner and core team

- Refresh the integrated schedule
- Identify the longest path and the ten behind it
- Understand what changed, and why

3

Run the pull-in

Project Owner and core team

- Examine the top paths together
- Simplify, overlap, re-sequence, reuse, eliminate
- Enter agreed changes live

4

Commit and execute

Named action owners

- One owner per action
- State the expected schedule effect
- Close before the next refresh

5

Align across program

Program leadership Triad

- Resolve cross-team conflicts
- Confirm priorities and escalations
- Hold the releases to one plan

Updating tells us where the program is going. Pull-in actions and timely decisions change where it is going. Sixty minutes per team per week. Longer than that and it has become a status meeting, and we have lost the point of it.

The board every team runs

Item	Team question	Owner	Cadence
Customer outcome	What value are we delivering?	Product Owner	Daily
Target vs forecast	Are we on track, and by how many weeks?	Project Owner	Daily
Critical path	What determines the date today?	Project Owner	Daily
Pull-in actions	What can we accelerate or protect?	Core team	Daily
Product decisions	What product choices are needed?	Product Owner	Daily
Technical risks	What threatens system integrity?	Technical Owner	Daily
Execution risks	What constraint blocks progress?	Project Owner	Daily
Commitments	Who will do what, by when?	Task Owners	Daily
Impediments on the host	What are we waiting on from the organization?	Project Owner	Daily, aged

The impediment row is how a team tells us we are the constraint. It also generates the provisioning and interrupt data on the weekly scorecard, at no extra cost.

Who reviews what, and when

MONTHLY

Portfolio committee review

Business outcomes, portfolio health, capability development, phase-gate go / no-go

- Quarterly scorecard, one quarter in four
- Portfolio priorities and resourcing
- Starts, pauses and kills
- Exception drill-down on any red carried three weeks

WEEKLY

Program review

Cross-team dependencies, forecast movement, shared risks, escalations

- The six weekly numbers
- Gap movement and pull-in results
- Cross-team resource and architecture conflicts
- Decisions older than target

DAILY

Team management

Critical path, pull-in actions, decisions, commitments, impediments

- The nine-row board
- Sixty-minute weekly refresh
- 80% of product decisions made here
- Impediments raised same day

Nothing is reported at two levels in the same form. The weekly numbers roll into the quarterly review as trend, not as a second reading.

Sequenced so the numbers are real

Launching ten metrics at once across eight teams produces estimated numbers, and estimated numbers on a CEO scorecard teach the organization to produce comfortable ones. We start with what the plan of record can actually support.

WEEKS 1–4

Build the instrument

- Reconcile the timeline sources into one integrated plan of record
- Stand up the weekly refresh on all eight teams
- Open the decision log: identified date and resolved date, owned by the Program Manager
- Add the impediment row to every daily board

WEEKS 5–8

First measured pack

- Gap to target, role fill and milestones go live as measured values
- Decision velocity and provisioning latency produce their first real readings
- Team health published per project, worst first
- Weekly pack to the CEO begins

QUARTER TWO

Full system

- Quarterly scorecard reviewed at the portfolio committee with Finance-confirmed figures
- Per-team cost of delay agreed and published
- Targets reset off measured baselines rather than estimates
- Extend beyond the lead program to the wider portfolio

Until a number is measured, the pack marks it as an estimate. No exceptions.

DECISION

What we need from the room

1 Confirm the ten numbers and the two clocks

Six weekly, four quarterly. Everything else moves to supporting detail.

2 Approve provisioning latency and interrupt count

This measures leadership, not the teams. It needs explicit sponsorship to survive its first red.

3 Sign the cost-of-delay figures with Finance

Per-team allocation off the R&D strategy numbers, published to the core teams, not held at portfolio level.

4 Set the forecast tolerance

Gap trend needs an agreed variance band. We propose ±2 weeks once a baseline exists.

5 Take the Project A decision this quarter

Thirty-two weeks behind with no team is not a schedule problem. Build it or pause it.

6 Accept estimates on the first two packs

The numbers become real in week five. Punishing the first honest reading is how we get comfortable ones after that.

The scorecard measures whether the strategy is working. The cadence is what makes it work.

APPENDIX A

Weekly metric definitions

Metric	Definition	Source	Owner
Gap to target	Bottom-up critical path finish date minus the committed date, in weeks, per team. The six-week trend carries forecast accuracy.	Integrated plan of record, refreshed weekly	Program Manager
Critical-path role fill	Core roles named by the functional manager and released to the team, divided by seven roles per committed project.	Resource plan, confirmed by functional leads	VP PD with functional leaders
Decision velocity	Median calendar days from decision identified to decision made. Tracked separately for product, technical and program decisions.	Decision log, opened week 1	Leadership Triads
Provisioning and interrupts	Median days from resource request to release; count of late reversals, re-prioritizations and critical-path resource pulls, trailing twelve months.	Impediment row on the daily board	Functional leaders
Team health	Eight operating-standard criteria met, per project, published worst first. No portfolio average is reported.	Team self-assessment, audited monthly	PMO Director
Milestones to plan	Phase gates and software releases passed year to date against planned, per release.	Phase-gate record	Project Owners

APPENDIX B

Quarterly metric definitions, and what is excluded

Metric	Definition	Source	Owner
Portfolio yield	Annual incremental growth above run-rate divided by active portfolio NPV. NPVs refreshed by Product Owners with Finance.	Portfolio NPV model	VP PD with Finance
Innovation vitality	Revenue from products launched inside a 30-month window as a share of total company revenue.	Revenue by SKU, launch dated	Finance with Category Directors
Customer evidence coverage	Active programs carrying all six evidence elements and an approved requirements document, divided by active programs. Assessed before development commit.	Requirements register	Director, Upstream Marketing
Strategic capability maturity	Assessed maturity against the approved capability roadmap, averaged across capabilities.	Annual maturity assessment	VP PD with functional leaders

DELIBERATELY EXCLUDED

- Forecast accuracy as a standalone metric: it is the six-week trend on gap to target, read from the same instrument.
- First-pass gate yield: reported at each gate as supporting detail, not carried on the weekly page.
- Launch confidence as a percentage: a share of launches on forecast hides the size of the miss; the gap in weeks does not.
- Any portfolio average that masks a critical-path team.