Owner-Dependency & Execution Capacity Check™

Focused Review | All 30 questions answered

Fictional example: Harbourview Supplies, an owner-led Caribbean trade and retail supplier. All 30 questions have been answered for this demonstration. These are illustrative self-reported conditions, not evidence about a real business.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS - NOT CLIENT ADVICE

Generated from the accepted product report engine. Sample edition v40.7.1 | 27 October 2026. Product report version: RC11-INTEGRATED-REPORT-2026-09-21

1. Result

52 /100

Moderate owner dependency

Higher means stronger operating independence. Findings reflect your answers; causes still need verification.

2. Priorities & actions

Priority 1

Identified issue

Decision flow: you report waits “Several times a week”, typically “1–4 hours”, with “Causes some delays”. This points to a decision-flow issue to verify, not a proven cause.

Action to take

Owner + manager: trace one delayed decision—who waited, for what, and how long. Check the reported gap: clear permission to decide; a written procedure or decision rule. If confirmed, trial one clear decision limit or information fix; retain required approvals.

Priority 2

Identified issue

Absence cover: two-week independence is rated “Sometimes” and trained backup “No”. Test continuity across essential jobs before relying on a longer absence.

Action to take

Owner + acting manager: list essential jobs, decision limits and backups. Run a supervised short absence; log interruptions and unfinished work. Fix demonstrated handover or access gaps before extending it.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS

Priority 3

Identified issue

Work instructions: usable written steps are not established by these answers. Independent use is rated “Partly”. Separate document gaps from training or access problems.

Action to take

Process owner + backup: choose one recurring job and use its current instructions in a supervised walkthrough. Record where help is needed; clarify that step, train for the task or fix access, then repeat.

3. Follow-up

• Track waiting time, escalations and errors weekly for four weeks; stop or revise if controls fail.

• Review unfinished work and owner calls after each trial; repeat before extending the absence.

• Check safe, correct completion without extra help after each walkthrough; correct failed steps and repeat.

Why this result?

All 30 questions have been answered. The review result is available; reported conditions and causes still need checking against real examples before stronger conclusions are drawn. Some findings also require evidence validation before stronger claims are made.

Operating independence indicator

52 /100

Moderate owner dependency

Higher scores indicate stronger operating independence and control.

Directional self-reported indicator: 22 of 22 scorable responses included in this calculation. No scorable responses excluded. Eight context questions guide the findings but do not receive a numeric score. The score bands are inherited from the RC10 design; they are not externally validated outcome predictions or proof of a root cause.

Section indicators

Signal 50%

7 of 7 scorable responses included

Delay & severity 46%

6 of 6 scorable responses included

Operating controls 57%

7 of 7 scorable responses included

Owner response & confidence 63%

2 of 2 scorable responses included

Decision flow, authority and reported delays

• The reported frequency, waiting time and effect on work describe a possible operational consequence; they do not measure financial loss or establish the cause.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS

• You selected unclear permission as a possible reason for a waiting decision. Check the actual approval limits before creating new ones.

• You selected the absence of a clear decision rule as a possible explanation. Check the existing rules and how they are used before recommending new ones.

Check: Confirm a dated decision and the relevant rule, record or team account. If a safety, financial or regulatory approval is involved, preserve its protective checks and do not delegate it without appropriate authorization.

Operating continuity during an extended owner absence

• Your answers indicate that an extended owner absence may need further preparation. They do not establish that the business would fail.

• A successful short absence does not prove the business can operate independently for two weeks.

Check: Confirm with an actual past absence or a supervised handover. A few hours without the owner does not validate two-week continuity.

Practical usability of work instructions and backup coverage

• Your answers do not establish that usable written steps are in place. First check the current documents and how people use them.

• Check actual use of any existing instructions before deciding whether they need changing.

• The answers do not establish whether any difficulty comes from the instructions, training, information access or the nature of the task.

Check: Check one actual job walkthrough and a handover example before concluding that procedures are missing or that extra staff are needed.

Controls may exist and be used, but exceptions need follow-through

• A control can exist and usually be followed without missed controls being reliably noticed and corrected.

• A “No” answer about missed controls does not tell us whether an exception occurred, went unnoticed or remained unresolved. Check a dated example before concluding that a specific control failed.

Check: Check one dated exception and its closure record before asserting a control failure; distinguish no exceptions from undetected exceptions.

All findings are retained here, including any beyond the three priorities above. Keep required protective approvals; recommendations depend on verified examples.

Illustrative report output only. The full questionnaire, scoring mechanics, editable assessment and restorable data remain private. No customer licence, personal data or live order is included.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS