GOCCELERATE™ · D12

Reinforcement & Sustainment Plan

[redacted]

Prepared for: OCM Lead, Executive Sponsor & People Managers | Initiative: [redacted] | *Assessment Date:* [redacted]

SECTION 1 — SUSTAINMENT FRAMING

A formal sustainment plan is required for this initiative on two independent grounds: this organization's mixed track record with prior change adoption, and an overall Moderate PRI risk band. Regression is not a possibility for an organization with this change history — it is the default outcome without active, named, owner-specific sustainment activity, and this plan is calibrated to a higher intervention intensity than a standard sustainment approach as a result. The primary sustainment risk for this initiative is cultural: three or more culture characteristics that inhibit sustained adoption are active (risk-averse, hierarchical, change-fatigued), and cultural barriers do not respond to generic reinforcement — each identified barrier requires a specific, targeted response, not a "stay visible" instruction to leaders. Post-go-live visibility is also carried substantially by people managers who are not yet fully equipped for the role; this plan therefore requires the Manager Sustainment Toolkit — built in D09 — to be distributed and its use enforced, not merely available. This plan defines the actions; the Adoption & Outcomes Dashboard (D13) tracks whether they are working.

SECTION 2 — 30/60/90-DAY POST GO-LIVE ACTION PLAN

"*Recommended*" *actions in a standard plan are required actions in this sustainment context.*

Timeframe	Action	Owner	Success Indicator	Risk If Not Done
Days 1–7	Sponsor visible on go-live day, in person or via video, actively referencing [redacted] publicly	[redacted]	Confirmed presence; at least one employee-facing appearance	Absence signals leadership has moved on
Days 1–7	OCM Lead conducts go-live day check-in with all managers (structured 5-question debrief)	OCM Lead	100% manager response rate; issues compiled by end of day	Day 1 problems go undetected and compound
Days 1–7	Critical issues from go-live day escalated and responded to within 24 hours	Escalation Owner (Project Manager/Change Lead, C&BB Transformation	Response sent within 24 hrs of identification	Unresolved Day 1 issues destroy confidence, accelerate

Timeframe	Action	Owner	Success Indicator	Risk If Not Done
		Office)		workarounds
Days 1–7	Updated FAQ distributed to all managers based on go-live day questions	OCM Lead	FAQ updated and sent before end of Day 2	Managers face Day 2 questions they can't answer
Days 1–7	Manager Sustainment Toolkit distributed and receipt confirmed by every people manager	OCM Lead	100% of managers confirm receipt; first structured check-in scheduled	Managers carry sustainment without the equipment for it — the exact condition this plan exists to prevent
Days 8–30	Sponsor-visible action at 2-week mark: written update naming what's working and what's being addressed	[redacted]	Communication sent; response monitored	Two weeks of silence signals abandonment
Days 8–30	Manager bi-weekly check-in with teams, using the Manager Sustainment Toolkit prompts	People Managers	90% of managers conduct and report on check-in	Teams with inactive managers get no support; issues escalate or colleagues disengage
Days 8–30	30-day adoption pulse conducted	OCM Lead	≥60% response rate; results reviewed within 48 hrs	No data on adoption health at the most critical regression window
Days 8–30	D13 Dashboard updated with 30-day pulse data	OCM Lead	Dashboard reflects current data	Dashboard shows stale data; team operates without current signal
Days 8–30	Recognition of 30-day milestone via sponsor acknowledgment of specific early-adopter behaviors	[redacted]	Recognition communicated before Day 31	No reinforcement of positive behavior means it fades
Days 31–60	Manager individual check-ins with any colleague showing avoidance or workaround behavior	People Managers	OCM Lead receives report of at-risk individuals and conversations held	At-risk individuals become pockets of sustained non-adoption

Timeframe	Action	Owner	Success Indicator	Risk If Not Done
				that spread
Days 31–60	Sponsor models a specific target behavior in a visible setting (e.g., referencing [redacted] output directly in a leadership forum)	[redacted]	Behavior observed and reported by OCM Lead or manager	"Stays visible" without a named behavior produces performative visibility, not real modeling
Days 31–60	Mid-point review with sponsor: OCM Lead presents D13 data, sponsor confirms/adjusts resource allocation	OCM Lead + [redacted]	Meeting held; decisions documented	Plan drifts without sponsor oversight at the midpoint
Days 31–60	Regression signals reviewed against the registry (Section 3); escalation triggered if threshold met	OCM Lead	Review documented; no open signal unaddressed beyond 5 business days	Regression signals accumulate undetected
Days 61–90	60-day pulse results reviewed and acted on	OCM Lead	Targeted support deployed to at-risk groups within 5 business days	Data collected but not acted on
Days 61–90	Policy updates confirmed in place (call-monitoring policy, performance-management guidelines)	HR + Project Lead	Policy updated and communicated	Colleagues who revert to old behaviors can defend it — no policy anchor
Days 61–90	90-day outcomes assessment against the success definition and business metrics	OCM Lead + [redacted]	Assessment completed; results documented	Initiative closes without confirming whether adoption actually occurred
Days 61–90	Sponsor 90-day acknowledgment: behaviors observed, outcomes achieved, what continues	[redacted]	Communication sent to all impacted colleagues	No close-out communication signals abandonment before completion
Days 61–90	Sustainment close-out or continuation decision	OCM Lead + [redacted]	Decision documented and communicated	Sustainment activity continues indefinitely without governance

SECTION 3 — REGRESSION SIGNAL REGISTRY

The Regression Signal Registry defines the observable indicators that signal adoption is deteriorating — and the threshold at which each signal requires a formal response.

Signal Category	Observable Indicator	Detection Method	Threshold for Response	Owner
Behavioral Regression (AI-specific)	Colleagues ignoring or overriding [redacted] outputs without documented reason	Manager observation; QA sampling	Any confirmed pattern in a hub or region	OCM Lead
Behavioral Regression (AI-specific)	Colleagues routing work around the tool entirely	Manager observation; usage metrics	Any confirmed instance	OCM Lead
Behavioral Regression (AI-specific)	Colleagues completing AI-assisted tasks manually "to be safe"	Manager observation	Pattern across more than one colleague per team	OCM Lead
Compliance Regression	Non-compliant disclosure behaviors continuing post go-live; required documentation not completed	QA/Compliance monitoring	Any confirmed instance	OCM Lead → Compliance Owner
Sentiment Regression	Pulse survey confidence scores declining from prior period	Readiness pulse; champion feedback	Decline of 10+ points from prior pulse	OCM Lead
Sentiment Regression	Champion signal quality declining — fewer questions surfacing weekly	Weekly champion debrief	Two consecutive weeks of decline	OCM Lead
Sentiment Regression	Manager check-in cadence dropping	Manager self-report; OCM Lead observation	<70% of managers completing bi-weekly check-in	OCM Lead
Leader Modeling Regression	Sponsor visible in communications but not modeling target behavior in practice	OCM Lead observation; manager feedback	Any instance of contradiction	OCM Lead → HR
Leader Modeling Regression	Managers not using required tools/processes themselves	Manager peer observation	Any confirmed manager non-adoption	Manager's manager
Fatigue Signal	Colleagues describing this as "just the latest thing" or unfavorably comparing it to the 2024/2025 rollouts	Feedback channels; champion network; manager check-ins	Any pattern appearing in more than one team	OCM Lead → Sponsor
Displacement Anxiety Signal	Colleagues complying visibly while quietly disengaging, minimizing tool use, or raising	Champion network; feedback inbox;	Any recurring job-security language after	OCM Lead →

Signal Category	Observable Indicator	Detection Method	Threshold for Response	Owner
	job-security concerns indirectly	manager one-on-ones	the sponsor's job-security communication	Sponsor

SECTION 4 — ESCALATION AND RESPONSE PROTOCOL

The named escalation owner for this initiative is the Project Manager/Change Lead role in the C&BB Transformation Office. Formal escalation is triggered when a Days 1–7 critical issue is unresolved beyond 24 hours, a regression signal above crosses its stated threshold, or two or more regression signals are active in the same reporting period. The escalation path runs: OCM Lead notifies the escalation owner within 24 hours of a threshold being met; the escalation owner notifies [redacted] within 48 hours; sponsor response is expected within five business days. The response menu includes direct sponsor communication, an additional training cohort or refresher session, a manager performance conversation, policy enforcement or clarification, champion network redesign, or additional OCM resource deployment. Escalation closure is confirmed by the OCM Lead verifying the underlying signal has actually resolved — not merely that an action was taken — and documented in the weekly signal summary. Cultural barrier escalations require a different response than operational escalations: deploying additional training or communication to a cultural resistance signal will not resolve it — cultural escalations require a direct conversation between the sponsor and the resistant population, not a message.

SECTION 5 — POLICY AND PROCESS ANCHORING CHECKLIST

Sustained adoption requires that new behaviors be anchored in updated policy and process. The following policy updates are required to support long-term behavior change for this initiative.

Policy / Process	What Changes	Owner	Target Date	Status	Risk If Not Updated
Call-Monitoring Policy	Updated to reflect [redacted]-captured interaction data and monitoring scope	Legal & Compliance	60 days pre go-live	○ Pending	Colleagues can contest undocumented monitoring practices
Remote Work Equipment/Security Policy	Updated for AI tool access on remote and hybrid workstations	IT + HR	60 days pre go-live	○ Pending	Inconsistent access controls create security

Policy / Process	What Changes	Owner	Target Date	Status	Risk If Not Updated
					and equity issues
Performance Management Guidelines	Defines whether/how AI-flagged quality metrics factor into formal performance reviews	HR Total Rewards & Employee Relations	60 days pre go-live	○ Pending	Colleagues cannot be held to an undocumented standard
Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)	Updated to reflect the [redacted]-based documentation workflow	Process Owner / IT	8 weeks post go-live	○ Pending	Colleagues have documented justification to continue the old manual process
Job Descriptions (Redeployment Cohort)	Updated to reflect the 350 redeployed colleagues' new servicing responsibilities	HR	30 days post go-live	○ Pending	Role ambiguity creates accountability gaps
Policy Document (Disclosure/Compliance)	Updated with effective date and specific disclosure requirements	HR + Legal	Before go-live	○ Pending	Non-compliant behavior has a policy defense
Compliance Training Records	Completion and certification pass rates reflected in the HR system	HR	At completion	○ Pending	Audit risk if records aren't current

Policy updates that are not completed by the named target dates should be flagged to the escalation owner. Colleagues cannot be held accountable to a standard that has not been formally documented and communicated — this is especially true of the performance-management guidelines given that the specific AI-scoring thresholds are currently a restricted communication topic precisely because this policy work is unfinished.

The GOccelerate People Risk Index (PRI) is a formative, expert-derived index of people and adoption risk across four dimensions — Leadership, Stakeholder, Capability, and Sustainment — grounded in established organizational change management practice. Dimension scores reflect equally weighted, normalized risk points assigned through expert judgment rather than statistically estimated weights. Baseline results derive from a structured intake completed by a single informant and reflect that respondent's knowledge of the organization at the time of assessment; the accompanying Data Confidence *indicator reflects the completeness of the information provided. Risk bands are provisional and subject to recalibration as GOccelerate's outcome-validation program accumulates post-implementation adoption data.*