READER GUIDE	AUDIENCE: EXECUTIVE / PRACTITIONER
PRIMARY READER:	Senior programme executives, CROs, and consent order programme sponsors
ALSO RELEVANT FOR:	PMO practitioners evaluating framework adoption and governance redesign
	The practical companion to the research series. Introduces the five governance protocols and what implementation looks like in practice.

WP-A · ALLAZO MANAGEMENT RESEARCH SERIES

The Allazo Programme Intelligence Framework: Five Protocols Derived from Three Years of Data

Five evidence-derived governance protocols — the practitioner companion to the series

5	27.8%	36.4%	3.32×	11
GOVERNANCE PROTOCOLS	PHANTOM GREEN RATE	FALSE RECOVERY RATE	TIPPING POINT MULTIPLIER	MEDIAN PERIODS A→R WINDOW

SECTION 01 What This Framework Is

Most governance frameworks are designed by committees. They synthesise practitioner experience, existing standards, and regulatory guidance into a set of recommended practices. Their authority comes from consensus — the accumulated wisdom of people who have managed programmes for a long time.

The Allazo Programme Intelligence Framework is designed differently. Each of its five protocols addresses a specific, statistically verified failure pattern observed in three years of RAG status data from a Tier 1 capital markets division. The protocols exist because the data showed something was broken — not because an advisory committee decided something should be better.

This distinction matters for two reasons. First, it makes the framework falsifiable. If a protocol does not address the failure pattern it claims to

defensible. When an OCC examiner or a law firm partner asks why a specific governance protocol was chosen, the answer is not "because best practice says so." It is "because 36.4% of recovery declarations in this type of portfolio are false within two reporting periods, and this protocol was designed to catch them."

SECTION 02 Protocol 1: Evidence-Backed Green

The finding it addresses: 27.8% of Green entries are immediately contradicted by the next reporting period (WP-D). Nearly one in four Green declarations does not reflect the programme's actual health at the time of reporting.

What the protocol does: A Green declaration requires the programme manager to name at least one specific, verifiable milestone completed in the reporting period. "On track" is not evidence. "Vendor testing completed, signoff received 14 April" is evidence. The distinction is between an assessment and a fact.

PROTOCOL 1 · EVIDENCE-BACKED GREEN

Green declarations require named, verifiable evidence For each Green RAG entry, the programme manager must record: (1) a specific deliverable completed in the reporting period, (2) the date of completion, and (3) the name of the person who verified it. Entries without all three elements are classified as "Green — Assessment Only" in governance reporting and flagged for follow-up at the next review. The distinction between evidence-backed and assessment-only Green is maintained in all governance packs and board reporting.

The mathematical effect of this protocol is to increase the genuine recovery rate — programmes that declare Green with evidence are less likely to reverse that declaration in the following period. The Continuous-Time Markov Chain model (WP-T) estimates that full implementation of evidence-backed recovery standards moves the portfolio's steady-state Green proportion from

SECTION 03 Protocol 2: False Recovery Hold

The finding it addresses: 36.4% of Amber-to-Green transitions reverse to Amber or Red within two reporting periods (WP-O). A recovery declaration is more likely to hold than not — but by a smaller margin than governance frameworks assume, and the rate rises to 52.7% in the most recent operating period.

What the protocol does: When a project transitions from Amber to Green, the Green status is not confirmed in governance reporting until it has held for two consecutive reporting periods. During the confirmation period, the project appears in governance packs as "Green — Under Confirmation."

PROTOCOL 2 · FALSE RECOVERY HOLD

Two-period confirmation before recovery is recorded Following any Amber-to-Green transition, the project enters a two-period hold during which it is reported as "Green — Under Confirmation." If the status reverts to Amber or Red during the hold period, the recovery declaration is voided and the governance response restarts from Amber. If the Green holds for both periods, the recovery is confirmed and the project returns to standard Green reporting. The hold applies regardless of whether the Green entry is evidence-backed — the two protocols are complementary, not alternatives.

SECTION 04 Protocol 3: Tipping Point Escalation

The finding it addresses: Projects with Amber streaks of three or more consecutive reporting periods are 3.32 times more likely to eventually reach Red than projects without such streaks (WP-E). Bootstrap 95% CI: [1.46×,

indicator of eventual Red.

What the protocol does: Any project that has been in Amber for three consecutive reporting periods triggers a mandatory escalation review — regardless of whether the programme manager believes the Amber is temporary or self-resolving. The streak counter resets only when the project achieves confirmed Green under Protocol 2.

PROTOCOL 3 · TIPPING POINT ESCALATION

Amber streak of 3 triggers mandatory escalation The streak counter for each project is maintained in governance tracking and is visible in all governance packs. When a project reaches streak-3, the following actions are mandatory: (1) a dedicated escalation item at the next governance meeting, (2) a named accountable owner for the resolution plan, and (3) a specific date by which the resolution will be evidenced. The streak counter resets only when the project achieves confirmed Green under Protocol 2 — "Under Confirmation" Green does not reset the counter.

SECTION 05 Protocol 4: Delivery Clock

The finding it addresses: The median time between a project's first Amber entry and its first Red event is 11 reporting periods (WP-B). 25.5% of Red events occur with no prior Amber warning. For the 68.8% of Red events that do show warning, the governance window is real but shorter than most frameworks assume — the 25th percentile is just 5 periods.

What the protocol does: Every project in Amber status is assigned a Delivery Clock — a running count of the number of periods it has been in non-Green status. The Delivery Clock is visible in all governance packs alongside the streak counter. It creates explicit time pressure on resolution without requiring a separate escalation trigger.

Visible time-in-status counter for every non- Green project The Delivery Clock for each project appears in governance reporting as a simple period count alongside the RAG status: "Amber — Period 4 of non-Green." At period 5, the clock changes to an amber warning in governance packs. At period 10, it escalates to a red warning. These thresholds are derived from the dataset's lower quartile (5 periods) and median (11 periods). The clock does not automatically trigger any action beyond visibility — but it makes the time dimension of Amber status explicit in every governance conversation.

SECTION 06 Protocol 5: Seasonal Uplift

The finding it addresses: The Red rate in September is 13.2% — the highest month in the dataset. The Red rate in March is 7.0% — the lowest. Q2 (April–June) shows a deterioration rate 42% higher than Q4. The seasonal pattern is consistent across all three years and across programme categories (WP-I).

What the protocol does: Governance intensity is uplifted during the two highest-risk calendar periods: Q2 (April–June) and Q3 (July–September, with particular attention to September). During uplift periods, governance meeting frequency increases, Delivery Clock thresholds are tightened, and the Evidence-Backed Green standard applies to all existing Green projects, not only to new Green declarations.

PROTOCOL 5 · SEASONAL UPLIFT

Enhanced governance during Q2 and Q3 During Q2 (April–June) and Q3 (July–September): governance review frequency increases to weekly for any project at streak-2 or above; the Evidence-Backed Green standard applies to all existing Green declarations, not only new ones; and the Delivery Clock threshold for escalation decreases from 10 to 7 periods. The seasonal uplift is pre-scheduled annually — it is not triggered by programme events. It reflects the

individual programme's condition.

SECTION 07 Implementing the Framework

The five protocols are designed to be layered, not selected. Each addresses a different failure mode, and they interact: Evidence-Backed Green reduces Phantom Green; the False Recovery Hold catches what slips past; Tipping Point Escalation catches persistent deterioration that neither of the first two protocols addresses; the Delivery Clock makes the time pressure visible; Seasonal Uplift adjusts intensity for the calendar risk pattern.

Implementation does not require new technology. All five protocols can be implemented in a standard programme governance pack — a spreadsheet or a slide deck — with three additions: a streak counter column, a Delivery Clock column, and an evidence field in the RAG status entry. The protocols create structure around what most governance frameworks treat as discretionary.

For consent order programmes: The five protocols create a documented governance trail that demonstrates to an OCC examiner or consent order monitor that programme health reporting is subject to structural validation, not just managerial assessment. The Evidence-Backed Green and False Recovery Hold protocols specifically address the examiner's core concern: that reported recovery is genuine rather than declared. A governance pack that distinguishes "Green — Evidence-Backed, Confirmed" from "Green — Assessment Only, Under Confirmation" is a materially different document from one that shows a binary Green status.

The individual finding papers provide the full statistical basis for each protocol. WP-D covers Phantom Green and Protocol 1. WP-O covers False Recovery and Protocol 2. WP-E covers the Tipping Point and Protocol 3. WP-B covers the Delivery Clock and Protocol 4. WP-I covers the seasonal pattern and Protocol

5. Each paper includes the honest limits of its finding — what the protocol addresses and what it does not.

research series: 34 confirmed; zero discrepancies. Dataset compiled under institutional confidentiality obligations; not available for third-party distribution.