RESONANCE TUNES

Self-Directed Execution KPI System

| *Internal Team Document* | *Bootstrap-to-Seed Stage*

This document defines the KPI framework that governs how every member of the Resonance Tunes team is expected to operate the full behavioral and feedback architecture and KPI categories designed to demonstrate commercial traction, product progress, and investor readiness. Performance is measured by self-direction, ownership, and intelligent communication.

> *"We do not manage people. We measure resonance. A team in resonance knows its work, owns its blockers, and moves without being pushed."*

This is not a surveillance system. It is a self-calibration tool — a mirror that shows each person where their autonomy is strong and where it needs tuning. It is designed to surface friction before it becomes failure, and to reward proactive behavior over reactive compliance.

SECTION 1: THE PHILOSOPHY OF SELF-DIRECTED EXECUTION

Resonance Tunes operates on the premise that the people best suited to build consciousness technology are people who are already operating from a state of internal coherence. This KPI system measures how people operate, not just what they produce. Behavior is the leading indicator. Outcomes are the result.

We do not manage people. We measure resonance. A team in resonance knows its work, owns its blockers, and moves without being pushed.

The Five Original Failure Conditions

- Tasks that required a reminder to begin
- Work that stalled silently with no communication after someone took ownership
- Blockers raised after a deadline, not before
- Clarification requests about basic task structure or location
- Engagement that consistently spiked and then dropped without explanation

Four Additional Failure Conditions Added in V2.0

- A quarterly review cycle passes without the person having defined their own scope
- Peers consistently have to compensate for or follow up with the same individual
- Team behavior signals that leadership direction is unclear or unresponsive
- The same mistake recurs in a second project because no learning was integrated

SECTION 2: THE FOUNDATIONAL KPI CATEGORIES

These five categories form the behavioral foundation that the feedback systems in Sections 5–8 build upon.

Code	Category	Core Question	KPIs
SA	Self-Activation	Does the person start work without being told?	SA-1 through SA-4
TN	Task Navigation Autonomy	Can they find and own their work independently?	TN-1 through TN-5
DO	Dependency Ownership	Do they surface blockers before they cause delays?	DO-1 through DO-5
EC	Execution Consistency	Do they sustain effort over time without oversight?	EC-1 through EC-5
SR	Signal Responsiveness	Do they engage with async updates and decisions promptly?	SR-1 through SR-4

Category 1: Self-Activation

This category measures whether a person begins their work independently. In a startup without a management layer, the cost of waiting for direction is not just time — it is signal that someone is not operating from internal coherence.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
SA-1	Prompt-Free Task Initiation Rate	% of tasks started without an external reminder or nudge	Target: 90%+	=Tasks started unprompted / Total tasks assigned
SA-2	Time to First Action	Hours between task assignment and first visible action	Target: <24 hrs	=Timestamp first action − Timestamp assigned
SA-3	Reminder-Triggered Task Rate	% of tasks where a reminder was required before work began	Target: <10%	=Tasks needing reminder / Total tasks × 100
SA-4	Weekly Work Initiation Score	Did the person begin their planned work each week without a check-in prompt?	Target: 4/5 weeks	Manual log: Yes/No per week

WARNING SIGNS — Category 1

- A team member has not logged any activity by Day 4 of a new sprint or work week
- The same person has been prompted more than once in a 4-week period
- Tasks sit in assigned status for more than 7 days with no update
- A person only activates after a team call or 1:1, not independently

Category 2: Task Navigation Autonomy

This category measures whether a person can locate, understand, and begin their work without hand-holding. In a distributed, remote team with little management layer, every clarification question is friction that costs the entire team.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
TN-1	Independent Task Access Rate	% of tasks accessed without asking where to find them	Target: 95%+	=Tasks accessed independently / Total tasks
TN-2	Basic Structure Clarification Requests	Number of questions about task location, format, or basic context	Target: 0–2/month	Count per person per month
TN-3	Onboarding-to-Autonomy Time	Days from joining to operating independently without directional support	Target: <30 days	=Date of first independent work cycle − Start date
TN-4	Self-Directed Context Retrieval	Does the person reference existing docs/tools before asking a question?	Target: Always	Observed: Yes/No per clarification request
TN-5	Task Self Allocation	Does the person take ownership of tasks without being assigned?	Target: 80%+	=Tasks self-allocated / Total tasks × 100

Early Warning Signals — Category 2

WARNING SIGNS TO WATCH:
- A person asks the same structural question more than once
- Someone asks 'where do I find X?' when X is documented in an accessible shared space
- A new team member has not independently navigated any tasks after 4 weeks
- Multiple people ask the same location/format question — this may signal a systems gap, not individual failure

Anti-KPI — What Failure Looks Like

FAILURE PATTERN:
Operational team members asking 'Will you be attending the meeting?' team members answer in affirmative and then doesn't show up to the meeting or communicate about their absence - if this happens consistently it is an Anti I- KPI.

Category 3: Dependency Ownership

Dependency ownership means that when something is blocking your work, you raise it BEFORE it becomes a delay, not after. Silent stalls are the single biggest killer of execution coherence in distributed teams.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
DO-1	Proactive Blocker Raise Rate	% of blockers raised before they caused a deadline miss	Target: 85%+	=Blockers raised early / Total blockers identified
DO-2	Time-to-Blocker Communication	Days between identifying a block and communicating it to the team	Target: <3 days	=Timestamp communicated − Timestamp block identified
DO-3	Silent Stall Rate	% of tasks delayed with no communication from the owner	Target: 0%	=Silent stalls / Total delayed tasks × 100
DO-4	Cross-Function Coordination Initiated	How often does the person proactively coordinate with other team members to unblock progress?	Target: Weekly	Count per month

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
DO-5	Dependency Resolution Ownership	When a block is raised, does the person attempt a resolution before escalating?	Target: Always	Observed: Yes/No per blocker

Early Warning Signals — Category 3

WARNING SIGNS TO WATCH:
- A task passes its expected completion date with no status update
- A team member mentions a blocker in a meeting that has clearly existed for days
- Someone says 'I was waiting for X' without having communicated that wait
- Progress on a work stream slows but no one in that stream has flagged anything

Anti-KPI — What Failure Looks Like

FAILURE PATTERN:
Henry is blocked waiting on a product decision from Sahar. The deadline passes. In the next meeting Henry says 'I couldn't move forward because I was waiting on the existing content templates.' This is a failure. The correct behavior was to send a message — the moment the block appeared — saying: 'I am paused on X until Y is decided. I need a decision by [date] to hit the deadline.'

Category 4: Execution Consistency

Consistency is the measure of whether someone sustains their effort over time — not just in the first week of excitement, but through the grind of a long build.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
EC-1	On-Time Completion Rate	% of tasks completed by their agreed deadline without intervention	Target: 80%+	=Tasks on time / Total tasks × 100
EC-2	Monthly Activity Consistency Score	Does the person show visible work output every month?	Target: 4/5 weeks active	Count active weeks / Total weeks
EC-3	Post-Engagement Drop-Off Rate	Does activity significantly decrease after an initial burst?	Target: 0 drops	Track output volume week-over-week
EC-4	Commitment-to-Delivery Ratio	Of tasks committed to in planning, how many were actually delivered?	Target: 75%+	=Delivered / Committed × 100
EC-5	Unplanned Absence Rate	How often does a person go dark for 14+ days?	Target: 0/month	Count per month

Early Warning Signals — Category 4

WARNING SIGNS TO WATCH:
- **A person who was highly active in week 1 becomes progressively quieter by week 4**
- **A team member commits to tasks in planning but consistently under-delivers that month**
- **No visible work output for more than 60 days without communication**
- **Commitments are made verbally but not reflected in any shared system**

Anti-KPI — What Failure Looks Like

FAILURE PATTERN:
A Marketing team member contributes energetically in a team call on Monday, commits to three deliverables, then produces nothing visible by Thursday. By Friday, there is a partial output and an explanation. Once is understandable. As a pattern, it signals a consistency problem that will compound over time.

Category 5: Signal Responsiveness

In an async, distributed team, responsiveness to shared signals is what keeps the organism coherent. This does not mean being always-on. It means that when something lands in your space that requires a response, you do not let it sit.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	Formula
SR-1	Async Response Time	Avg days to respond to messages/updates requiring a decision or acknowledgment	Target: <7 days	=Avg(Timestamp response − Timestamp message)
SR-2	Decision Escalation Rate	% of decisions made autonomously vs. escalated upward unnecessarily	Target: <20%	=Escalated decisions / Total decisions needed
SR-3	Tool Engagement Rate	Does the person actively use the shared project tools?	Target: Weekly	Login/activity count per tool per week
SR-4	Meeting Preparation Rate	% of team meetings where the person arrives having read the relevant context	Target: 90%+	Observed: Yes/No per meeting

Early Warning Signals — Category 5

WARNING SIGNS TO WATCH:
- A question asked in a shared channel goes unanswered for 14+ days by the relevant person
- A person consistently escalates decisions that are clearly within their scope
- Someone arrives at a team meeting unaware of a major update shared 2 weeks prior
- A primary communication channel for the team goes unused for 2 weeks while work continues in side channels (WhatsApp, email)

Summary: What the four additional systems add

Quarterly Reviews → Scope ownership + quality of judgment over time

360 Peer Feedback → Cross-functional reliability + blocker vs. accelerator patterns

Upward Feedback → Leadership accountability through observable team behavior

Retrospectives → Learning velocity + pattern correction + failure recurrence rate

SECTION 3: ROLE-SPECIFIC KPI EMPHASIS

Role-specific KPI focus and anti-patterns for all current team members. The five behavioral KPI categories apply universally; the weights and failure patterns below reflect the operational reality of each function.

COO / Operations — Primary Focus: Execution Consistency + Task Navigation Autonomy

Operations is the nervous system of the company. Every operational gap that requires the CEO to intervene is a systems failure.

- Systems run without prompting — recurring processes execute on schedule independently: Key KPI
- Bottleneck identification and resolution before escalation: Key KPI
- Documentation kept current without reminders: Key KPI

Technology & Product — Primary Focus: Self-Activation + Dependency Ownership

- Blocker-to-communication time: technical blocks raised within 1.5 weeks: Key KPI
- Sprint commitment fulfillment rate: 75%+ of committed work shipped each cycle: Key KPI
- Independent technical decision rate: solving problems before escalating: Key KPI

CFO / Finance — Primary Focus: Execution Consistency + Signal Responsiveness

- Financial reporting delivered on agreed schedule without reminders: Key KPI
- Investor-readiness information provided and updated proactively: Key KPI
- Cash/runway signals raised before they become crises: Key KPI
- Data room completeness maintained on a rolling basis: Key KPI

Marketing & Sales — Primary Focus: Self-Activation + Execution Consistency

- Content and campaign output consistency: weekly deliverables produced on schedule: Key KPI
- Outreach initiated proactively: B2B contacts and pilot partners reached without being assigned: Key KPI
- Number of paying pilot customer conversations opened: Key KPI (feeds Section 10)
- Campaign performance communicated to team proactively: Key KPI

Consciousness Research — Primary Focus: Task Navigation Autonomy + Dependency Ownership

- Research outputs delivered and shared proactively with relevant team members: Key KPI
- Product insights translated into actionable recommendations without prompting: Key KPI
- Cross-function dependencies communicated as they arise: Key KPI

SECTIONS 4–8: FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

The following four feedback systems govern the cyclical review architecture of Resonance Tunes. The full KPI tables and operating protocols for each are contained below

Section	System	KPI Codes	Cadence
Section 4	Quarterly Performance Review	QR-1 through QR-8	Quarterly
Section 5	360 Peer Feedback	PF-1 through PF-8	Bi-quarterly
Section 6	Upward Feedback	UF-1 through UF-8	Monthly
Section 7	Retrospective KPIs	RT-1 through RT-11	Per sprint / project
Section 8	Integrated Feedback Rhythm	All systems	Weekly → Quarterly

Summary: What the four feedback systems add

- Quarterly Reviews → Scope ownership + quality of judgment over time
- 360 Peer Feedback → Cross-functional reliability + blocker vs. accelerator patterns
- Upward Feedback → Leadership accountability through observable team behavior
- Retrospectives → Learning velocity + pattern correction + failure recurrence rate

SECTION 4: CYCLICAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW KPIS

Cyclical reviews at Resonance Tunes are not top-down evaluations. They are structured self-assessments against behavioral signals, reviewed by the individual and one other person (CEO or Operations). The question is not 'how did your manager rate you?' It is: 'What does the data from the last 90 days show about how you operate?'

These KPIs are milestone-based rather than continuous. They are assessed on a cyclical timeline based on operational capacity (e.g. quarterly or at the close of a major project cycle) and focus on two dimensions that weekly tracking does not fully capture: scope ownership and decision-making quality under ambiguity.

A. Scope Ownership KPIs

Scope ownership measures whether a person proactively defines, communicates, and maintains the boundaries of their work — without waiting to be told what is in or out of scope. This is the quarterly equivalent of self-activation, operating at a strategic rather than task level.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
QR-1	Scope Definition Rate	At the start of each quarter or project: did the person define their own scope of work in writing, unprompted?	100% of quarters	Binary: Yes (defined) / No (waited to be given scope). Reviewed at quarter open.	No written scope definition at quarter start. Scope only clarified reactively when conflicts arise.

QR-2	Scope Drift Communication	When scope changed — due to new info, dependencies, or pivots — did the person communicate the change proactively?	Every scope change flagged within 48 hrs	Count of scope changes communicated proactively vs. discovered by others after the fact.	Team or leadership discovers a scope shift because work stopped or changed without announcement.
QR-3	Scope vs. Delivery Alignment	Did the person deliver what they defined at the start of the quarter? If not, did they renegotiate before the deadline?	80%+ delivery on self-defined scope OR proactive renegotiation	Compare written scope (QR-1) with actual output. Count renegotiations that were proactive vs. missed.	Quarter ends with significant undelivered scope and no prior communication about the shortfall.
QR-4	Initiative Beyond Scope	Did the person identify and act on a relevant opportunity or gap that was not in their defined scope?	1+ per quarter	Count of self-initiated contributions outside formal scope that added visible value.	Person operates only within exact task boundaries, never surfaces adjacent needs or opportunities.

B. Decision Quality Under Ambiguity KPIs

Startups at the pre-revenue stage are defined by ambiguity. Requirements are incomplete, context shifts fast, and waiting for perfect information is itself a decision — usually the wrong one. These KPIs measure how a person navigates uncertainty, not whether they always chose correctly.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
QR-5	Ambiguity Navigation Rate	When faced with incomplete information, did the person make a documented decision and move forward — rather than stalling or escalating?	80%+ of ambiguous situations	Count decisions made autonomously under ambiguity vs. escalated unnecessarily. Tracked via task logs and blocker reports.	Repeated escalation of decisions that are clearly within the person's scope and expertise.
QR-6	Decision Documentation Rate	When a significant decision was made — especially under ambiguity — was it documented so others could understand the reasoning?	90%+ of significant decisions	Count documented decisions (written in shared tools) vs. undocumented ones discovered retrospectively.	Decisions are made verbally or informally, leaving no trail. Others must re-derive context from scratch.
QR-7	Decision Reversal Rate	Of the autonomous decisions made this quarter, how many had to be reversed due to poor judgment vs. changed circumstances?	<20% reversal rate	Count reversals. Flag each as: changed context (not a judgment failure) vs. avoidable error.	High reversal rate from avoidable errors — signals judgment gaps that need coaching.

QR-8	Time-to-Decision Under Ambiguity	How long does it take the person to make a decision when context is unclear?	<72 hrs for operational decisions	Track timestamp: ambiguity identified → decision made. Average across quarter.	Decisions sit pending for days while work stalls and no one is informed of the delay.

Early Warning Signals — Section 5

Watch for these before the quarter ends:

A person has no written scope definition by Week 4 of a new quarter

The same person escalates more than five decisions in a single week that are within their domain

Scope changes are only discovered in team meetings, never communicated in writing before the meeting

A person has not made any documented decision this quarter — suggests they are operating too narrowly or too dependently

Anti-KPIs — Section 5

Failure patterns specific to Quarterly Reviews:

Scope is defined only after Operations asks 'what are you working on this quarter?'

Quarter closes with person saying 'I didn't know that was in scope' — when it was clearly adjacent to their role

A decision that could have been made in 24 hours took 10 days because the person was waiting for certainty

No documentation exists for any of the major decisions made — tribal knowledge only

SECTION 5: 360 PEER FEEDBACK KPIS

360 feedback at Resonance Tunes is not a rating system. It is a pattern-detection system. The question is not 'what do your peers think of you?' It is: 'What patterns does your behavior create in the people working alongside you?' The data comes from observable events — follow-ups required, handoffs received incomplete, collaboration requests initiated — not from opinion questions.

These KPIs are assessed bi-quarterly. Each team member provides structured behavioral observations about the colleagues they work with directly. No subjective ratings. No qualitative impressions. Only countable events.

A. Cross-Functional Reliability KPIs

Reliability in cross-functional work means that when you commit to a handoff, a contribution, or a shared deliverable, it arrives in the state and at the time others are depending on. Unreliability in cross-functional contexts creates downstream damage that the original person often cannot see.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
PF-1	Peer Follow-Up Request Rate	How many times did peers have to follow up with this person to get something they were waiting for?	<2 per quarter per peer relationship	Peers log follow-up requests in shared tracker. Count per person per quarter.	A peer has to follow up 3+ times in a single quarter to get one deliverable.

PF-2	Handoff Completeness Rate	When this person handed work to another team member, was the handoff complete — context, files, decisions, status all included?	90%+ complete handoffs	Receiving person logs a binary: complete / incomplete. Count per quarter.	Receiving person has to go back and ask 2+ clarifying questions to begin using the handoff.
PF-3	Cross-Function Commitment Reliability	When this person made a commitment in a cross-functional context (to another team's timeline), did they deliver?	85%+ on-time cross-function delivery	Count cross-function commitments made vs. delivered on time vs. communicated-early vs. missed.	Another team's work stalls because this person's commitment was missed with no prior warning.
PF-4	Collaboration Initiation Rate	How often does this person proactively reach out to coordinate with other team members — without being asked?	Weekly for active cross-function work	Count outbound coordination messages or meetings initiated by the person. Peers log receipt.	Person only coordinates when explicitly pulled in. Never initiates cross-function communication.

B. Blocker vs. Accelerator Pattern KPIs

Every person in a collaborative system has a directional effect on the people around them. They either make others' work easier and faster (accelerator) or they create friction, delays, and rework (blocker). This is not about personality — it is about observable patterns over time.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
PF-5	Work Unblocked by This Person	How many times did this person proactively unblock a colleague — providing information, a decision, a resource — without being asked?	2+ per quarter	Peers log instances of being unblocked by this person. Count per quarter.	Person has zero logged instances of proactively unblocking a colleague across a full quarter.
PF-6	Rework Generated Rate	How often did work produced by this person require rework by another team member because it was incomplete, unclear, or wrong?	<10% of outputs	Receiving person logs rework instances. Count per quarter. Flag reason: unclear brief vs. execution error.	More than 1 in 5 outputs from this person requires rework by the next person in the chain.
PF-7	Decision Drag Rate	How often did others have to wait for a decision or response from this person before they could move forward?	<3 instances per quarter	Peers log instances where they were blocked waiting on this person. Count per quarter.	Multiple team members independently log being blocked by the same person in the same quarter.
PF-8	Peer Amplification Rate	How often does this person actively amplify or build on a colleague's work — adding value to output that is not their own?	1+ per quarter	Count instances where person contributed to, improved, or built on a peer's output unprompted.	Person never engages with others' work beyond their own direct scope.

How to Collect 360 Data Without Bias

Collection method (one row per event) rather than a survey. Each row includes: Date | My name | Their name | KPI ID | What happened (one sentence, observable only) | Was it a blocker or accelerator?

At bi-quarterly review: aggregate by person. Look for patterns, not single events.

A single negative event is noise. Three events of the same type in one quarter is a signal.

A single positive event is nice. A consistent pattern of acceleration is a meaningful strength.

When operational capacity is at the level collection method for the KPI will use a shared log and events will be logged as they happen, not recalled at review time.

Early Warning Signals — Section 6

Watch for these between reviews:

The same person appears in multiple peers' follow-up logs within a single month

A handoff from the same person is flagged as incomplete more than twice in one quarter

No one has logged a single instance of being accelerated or unblocked by a particular person in 60+ days

Rework from the same source appears in the logs of two or more different receiving team members

Anti-KPIs — Section 6

Failure patterns specific to 360 Peer Feedback:

A person scores well on their own weekly self-assessment but peers log 4+ follow-up requests in the same period

Handoffs are always technically complete but always require clarification — the person is meeting the letter but not the spirit

Cross-function commitments are always made with energy in the meeting and consistently under-delivered afterward

Person has been in the team for two quarters and has zero logged instances of proactively unblocking anyone

SECTION 6: UPWARD FEEDBACK KPIS — LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY

Leadership at Resonance Tunes is not exempt from the same accountability standard applied to every other team member. In fact, leadership clarity and responsiveness are the highest-leverage variables in the system — when they fail, the entire team pays the cost.

Critically, upward feedback is NOT gathered through opinion surveys or 'rate your manager' forms. It is inferred from observable team behavior. When a team is confused, it is a signal about clarity. When blockers pile up at the leadership layer, it is a signal about responsiveness. The data already exists in the system — this section makes it legible.

What Makes This Different from Standard Upward Feedback

Standard upward feedback asks: 'How do you feel about your leader?'

Resonance Tunes upward feedback asks: 'What does the team's behavior tell us about how leadership is performing?'

Repeated clarification requests about the same topic = signal of unclear direction

Multiple team members raising the same decision as blocked = signal of slow decision-making

Work proceeding in the wrong direction and needing reversal = signal of insufficient strategic communication

Team compensating by creating their own processes = signal of operational leadership gap

A. Clarity of Direction KPIs

These KPIs measure whether the people in leadership roles are providing direction that is clear enough for the team to operate without constant check-ins.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
UF-1	Direction Clarification Request Rate	How many times per week do team members ask leadership to clarify the strategic direction, priority, or goal of a work stream?	<3 per leader per week	Count clarification requests tagged to a leadership source in shared channels. Track weekly.	5+ clarification requests in one week about the same work stream or direction.
UF-2	Strategic Communication Proactivity	How often does leadership communicate changes to direction, priority, or scope before the team discovers them through work?	100% of significant changes	Track instances where team learned of a change reactively (in a meeting, when work stalled) vs. proactively (written update before it affected work).	Team discovers a strategic pivot during a meeting, having been working in the wrong direction for days.
UF-3	Goal Alignment Check Rate	How often does leadership verify — through a structured check, not an assumption — that the team's current work aligns with the actual goal?	Bi-weekly minimum	Count structured alignment checks (written or structured verbal) per two-week period.	Quarter passes with no structured check. Misalignment is only discovered at review time.

UF-4	Decision Backlog Volume	How many decisions are currently waiting on leadership input? How long has each been waiting?	0 decisions pending >48 hrs	Maintain a decision log. Track: date raised, date resolved, owner. Average pending time per leader.	Three or more decisions pending for 5+ days simultaneously, with no communication about timeline.

B. Responsiveness to Team Needs KPIs

Responsiveness does not mean being always available. It means that when a team member has an urgent need, a legitimate question, or a critical blocker, leadership acts on it within a timeframe that keeps work moving.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
UF-5	Leader Response Time to Flagged Blockers	When a team member flags a blocker requiring leadership input, how long does it take for leadership to respond or resolve?	<48 hrs for critical, <72 hrs for operational	Track blocker flags in shared system. Timestamp: flagged → leadership response → resolved.	A flagged blocker sits unacknowledged for 4 days while the team member waits.
UF-6	Team Compensation Rate	How often do team members create their own workarounds, informal processes, or shadow systems because official leadership direction or tools are absent?	<3 per quarter	Count instances logged by team members or discovered in retrospectives where a workaround replaced a missing leadership output.	Multiple team members independently build the same informal system because the official one was never provided.
UF-7	Availability Signal Clarity	Does the team know when leadership is available vs. unavailable vs. in deep work? Is this communicated proactively?	Always signaled in advance	Count instances where leadership was unexpectedly unreachable during without prior communication.	Team member needs an urgent decision and cannot locate the relevant leader. No status signal was set.
UF-8	Feedback Integration Rate	When team members raise concerns, suggestions, or friction signals to leadership, how often is a visible response or integration made?	80%+ acknowledged, 50%+ acted on	Log feedback raised by team. Track: acknowledged (Y/N), acted on (Y/N), timeline.	Team stops raising concerns because previous feedback consistently produced no visible response.

C. Role-Specific Upward Signals

COO

- Primary signal: How often do operational processes require ad-hoc intervention because a system was not documented or handed off?
- Primary signal: Team compensation rate — how often is someone building an informal workaround for a missing operational system?
- Upward failure pattern: Operational clarity exists only in Operation team members head. When they are unavailable, the team improvises.

CPO

- Primary signal: Technical direction clarification requests — how often does the engineering team ask 'what are we building?' or 'what does done look like?'
- Primary signal: Build reversal rate — how often does work get undone because technical direction was ambiguous?
- Upward failure pattern: Product and tech are misaligned for days before anyone flags it, because the CPO-founder sync rhythm is unclear.

Early Warning Signals — Section 7

Watch for these as early indicators of leadership performance gaps:

Two or more team members ask the same strategic question in the same week — suggests the answer was never communicated broadly

A decision appears in the blocker log with the note 'waiting on leadership' for more than three consecutive days

A team member creates a document, process, or tracker that should have come from leadership — signals a void being filled from below

Retrospective notes consistently cite 'unclear direction' or 'late communication' as project friction sources

Anti-KPIs — Section 7

Failure patterns specific to Upward Feedback:

Leadership identifies upward feedback as a risk to authority rather than a signal for calibration

The decision log is never reviewed — decisions accumulate without visible prioritization

Team learns of a major strategic shift in a meeting, having spent the previous week building something now deprioritized

Feedback raised by team members in retrospectives appears in the next retrospective unchanged — nothing was done

SECTION 7: RETROSPECTIVE KPIS — SYSTEM LEARNING

Retrospectives at Resonance Tunes are not venting sessions. They are diagnostic events. The question is not 'how did that feel?' It is: 'What does the pattern of events in this cycle tell us about the system — and what changes will prevent the same pattern in the next cycle?'

These KPIs measure three things: whether learning happens at all, whether learning becomes action, and whether action actually changes behavior in the next cycle. All three must be present for a retrospective to be worth the time it takes.

A. Learning Velocity KPIs

Learning velocity is the speed and depth at which a team converts experience into improved behavior. A team with high learning velocity looks noticeably different six months after a failure than it did the day the failure happened.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
RT-1	Root Cause Identification Rate	In a retrospective, does the team identify the root cause of failures — not just the symptom? (e.g., 'handoff was late' is a symptom. 'We had no shared definition of done for handoffs' is a root cause.)	100% of logged failures have a root cause identified	At each retrospective, log: issue | symptom | root cause. Count: root cause identified (Y/N).	Team logs 'it was late' and moves on. Root cause never identified. Same issue recurs next cycle.
RT-2	Root Cause Depth Score	How many levels deep did the team go in identifying the cause? (1 = surface symptom, 3 = systemic cause)	Average depth ≥ 2	Rate each root cause analysis 1–3: 1=symptom only, 2=contributing factor, 3=systemic cause. Average per retro.	All root causes are rated 1. Team never gets beneath the surface. Improvements are cosmetic.
RT-3	Time to Learning Documentation	How long after a significant event (failure, near-miss, unexpected success) does the team produce a written learning that others can access?	<72 hrs after the event	Track: event date → learning documented date. Average per quarter.	Learning from a major event is discussed in a meeting but never written down. Lost within 2 weeks.
RT-4	Individual vs. System Attribution Rate	When something goes wrong, does the team correctly attribute it to a system/process failure vs. an individual failure?	At least 60% system attribution	At each retro, log attribution for each issue: individual, system, or both. Track ratio over time.	Every failure is attributed to a person. Team never examines the process that allowed the failure.

B. Pattern Correction Rate KPIs

A retrospective that produces insights without producing change is a waste. These KPIs measure the conversion rate from insight to implemented improvement — and whether the improvement was meaningful enough to actually change the pattern.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
RT-5	Improvement Action Completion Rate	Of the actions identified in a retrospective, how many were actually implemented before the next retrospective?	70%+ of actions completed	Log each action: owner, due date, completion date, completed (Y/N). Review at next retro.	Actions are assigned in the retro but never followed up. Same list reappears next cycle.

RT-6	Improvement Action Ownership Rate	Was each action assigned or owned by a specific named person — not 'the team'?	100% of actions have one named owner	Review action log. Count: named individual owner vs. vague collective assignment.	Actions are assigned to 'everyone' or 'the team'. No one owns them. None are completed.
RT-7	Process Change Implementation Time	How long after a retrospective does a new process, tool, or practice change get adopted by the team?	<2 weeks from retro to adoption	Track: retro date → change adopted date. Average per quarter.	A process improvement agreed in Month 1 is still not adopted in Month 3. No one enforced the change.
RT-8	Insight-to-System Integration Rate	When a retrospective produces a learning, does it update a documented system (a process doc, a template, a checklist, a shared tool)? Or does it stay as verbal agreement?	80%+ of significant learnings integrated into a living document	Count learnings from retros. Check: was a document or system updated as a result? Y/N.	All improvements are verbal agreements. Nothing is written. New team members repeat the old mistakes.

C. Failure Recurrence KPIs

Failure recurrence is the most honest measure of whether learning has actually happened. If the same failure appears in two consecutive project cycles, the retrospective system is not working — regardless of how many insights were generated.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure	Failure Signal
RT-9	Failure Recurrence Rate	How often does the same category of failure appear in two or more consecutive retrospectives?	0 direct recurrences	Tag each retro issue by category. Compare categories across consecutive retros. Count matches.	The same issue category (e.g., 'handoff incomplete', 'direction unclear') appears in three consecutive retros.
RT-10	Near-Miss Capture Rate	How often does the team log near-misses — things that almost went wrong but didn't — and treat them as learning opportunities?	At least 1 near-miss per retro	Count near-miss entries in the retro log. A retro with zero near-misses may indicate under-reportin g.	Team only logs failures that actually happened. Near-misses are ignored. Same near-misses eventually become actual failures.

RT-11	Success Pattern Replication Rate	When something worked unusually well, does the team identify why and explicitly replicate it in the next cycle?	1+ explicit replication per quarter	Count documented successes with identified cause. Count how many were intentionally replicated next cycle.	Successes are celebrated but not analyzed. Team cannot reproduce them. Good outcomes remain accidental.

How to Run a Resonance Tunes Retrospective

Structure (60 minutes maximum):

10 min — Data review: What actually happened? (Use the KPI tracker, not memory.)

15 min — Pattern identification: What categories of issue recurred? What is the root cause? (Aim for depth ≥ 2)

10 min — Attribution: Is this a system failure or an individual one? (Lean toward the system first.)

15 min — Action definition: What specific change will prevent recurrence? Who owns it? By when?

10 min — Success analysis: What worked? Why? How do we do that again intentionally?

Non-negotiable rules:

Every action gets one named owner. Not 'the team'.

Every significant learning updates a living document before the end of the week.

The first 10 minutes of the NEXT retrospective reviews completion of actions from the previous one.

Early Warning Signals — Section 8

Watch for these between retrospectives:

An action item from the last retro has no update after two weeks — ask the owner directly

A near-miss occurs and no one suggests logging it — suggests the team is filtering what is 'worth' reporting

A team member says 'we talked about this before' — this is a recurrence signal, trigger a retro immediately

Retrospectives are being skipped or compressed to under 30 minutes — quality of learning degrades rapidly

Anti-KPIs — Section 8

Failure patterns specific to Retrospectives:

Retrospective produces a list of feelings and frustrations but no root causes and no action owners

Actions are assigned to 'everyone' and completed by no one

Same issue category appears in three consecutive retrospective logs without a single process change

Team skips the retrospective when a sprint went well — misses the most valuable learning opportunity

Learnings are stored in someone's personal notes. New team member onboards and makes the same mistakes two months later.

SECTION 8: THE INTEGRATED FEEDBACK RHYTHM

The four feedback systems only function if they are practiced on a consistent schedule. Below is the complete operating rhythm — from daily to quarterly — that integrates all nine KPI categories into a single coherent system.

Frequency	Event	What Happens	Who	Tool
Weekly (Friday)	Individual Self-Assessment	Each team member completes their tab in the Excel tracker. 5 KPI categories. 5–10 minutes.	All team members	Excel KPI Tracker
Bi-Weekly	Team Coherence Check	15-minute sync. Review Dashboard tab for patterns. Flag anyone below 3.0 average. No shame — only signal.	Sahar + Rebekka (+ team)	Excel Dashboard Tab
Bi-Weekly	360 Event Logging	Each person reviews their cross-function interactions from the past two weeks and logs any PF-1 through PF-8 events in the shared 360 log.	All team members	Shared 360 Log (spreadsheet or Notion)
Monthly	Pattern Review	Review 4 weeks of individual data. Identify coaching conversations needed. Identify team-wide gaps.	Sahar + Rebekka	Excel Tracker + 360 Log
Monthly	Upward Signal Review	Review UF-1 through UF-8 signals from the past month. Leadership reviews their own data honestly.	Sahar + each dept lead	Decision Log + Blocker Log
End of Each Project or Sprint	Retrospective	60-minute structured retro. Root cause analysis. Action owners. Document learnings. Review actions from last retro.	Relevant project team	Retro Log (shared doc)
Quarterly	Performance Review	Individual reviews QR-1 through QR-8 against their own data. Reviewed with Sahar or Rebekka. 45 minutes max.	All team members	QR Self-Assessment Doc

Quarterly	360 Peer Feedback Summary	Aggregate PF-1 through PF-8 event logs. Identify patterns per person. Share individually — not publicly.	Sahar + Rebekka	360 Log Aggregation

How the Systems Connect

These systems are not parallel tracks — they feed each other. The weekly tracker data is the raw material for the monthly pattern review. The monthly pattern review surfaces candidates for quarterly performance conversations. The retrospective generates inputs for the 360 log and for upward feedback signals. The upward feedback signals inform how quarterly reviews of leaders are structured.

The feedback loop in plain language:

Weekly tracker → shows you your own patterns in real time

360 log → shows you how your patterns land on others

Retro → shows the team what system-level patterns need changing

Upward feedback → shows leadership where they are creating confusion or delay

Quarterly review → synthesizes all of the above into a full picture of how a person operates

None of these systems requires a manager. They require honest self-observation, consistent logging, and the courage to look at patterns rather than explain them away.

SECTION 9: COMPLETE KPI INDEX — BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES (SA, TN, DO, EC, SR, QR, PF, UF, RT)

This index references all behavioral KPIs for quick cross-reference. commercial KPI index is in Section 14.

ID	Category	KPI Name	Target	Cadence
SA-1	Self-Activation	Prompt-Free Task Initiation Rate	90%+	Weekly
SA-2	Self-Activation	Time to First Action	<24 hrs	Weekly
SA-3	Self-Activation	Reminder-Triggered Task Rate	<10%	Weekly
SA-4	Self-Activation	Weekly Work Initiation Score	4/5 weeks	Weekly
TN-1	Task Navigation	Independent Task Access Rate	95%+	Weekly
TN-2	Task Navigation	Basic Structure Clarification Requests	0–2/month	Weekly
TN-3	Task Navigation	Onboarding-to-Autonomy Time	<30 days	Onboarding
TN-4	Task Navigation	Self-Directed Context Retrieval	Always	Weekly
TN-5	Task Navigation	Task Self Allocation	80%+	Weekly
DO-1	Dependency Ownership	Proactive Blocker Raise Rate	85%+	Weekly
DO-2	Dependency Ownership	Time-to-Blocker Communication	<3 days	Weekly
DO-3	Dependency Ownership	Silent Stall Rate	0%	Weekly
DO-4	Dependency Ownership	Cross-Function Coordination Initiated	Weekly	Weekly
DO-5	Dependency Ownership	Dependency Resolution Ownership	Always	Weekly
EC-1	Execution Consistency	On-Time Completion Rate	80%+	Weekly
EC-2	Execution Consistency	Weekly Activity Consistency Score	4/5 weeks	Weekly
EC-3	Execution Consistency	Post-Engagement Drop-Off Rate	0 drops	Weekly
EC-4	Execution Consistency	Commitment-to-Delivery Ratio	75%+	Weekly
EC-5	Execution Consistency	Unplanned Absence Rate	0/month	Weekly
SR-1	Signal Responsiveness	Async Response Time	<7 days	Weekly
SR-2	Signal Responsiveness	Decision Escalation Rate	<20%	Weekly
SR-3	Signal Responsiveness	Tool Engagement Rate	Daily	Weekly
SR-4	Signal Responsiveness	Meeting Preparation Rate	90%+	Weekly
QR-1	Quarterly Review	Scope Definition Rate	100%	Quarterly

ID	Category	KPI Name	Target	Cadence
QR-2	Quarterly Review	Scope Drift Communication	Every change <48 hrs	Quarterly
QR-3	Quarterly Review	Scope vs. Delivery Alignment	80%+ or renegotiated	Quarterly
QR-4	Quarterly Review	Initiative Beyond Scope	1+ per quarter	Quarterly
QR-5	Quarterly Review	Ambiguity Navigation Rate	80%+	Quarterly
QR-6	Quarterly Review	Decision Documentation Rate	90%+	Quarterly
QR-7	Quarterly Review	Decision Reversal Rate	<20%	Quarterly
QR-8	Quarterly Review	Time-to-Decision Under Ambiguity	<48 hrs	Quarterly
PF-1	360 Peer Feedback	Peer Follow-Up Request Rate	<2/quarter per peer	Bi-quarterly
PF-2	360 Peer Feedback	Handoff Completeness Rate	90%+	Bi-quarterly
PF-3	360 Peer Feedback	Cross-Function Commitment Reliability	85%+	Bi-quarterly
PF-4	360 Peer Feedback	Collaboration Initiation Rate	Weekly	Bi-quarterly
PF-5	360 Peer Feedback	Work Unblocked by This Person	2+ per quarter	Bi-quarterly
PF-6	360 Peer Feedback	Rework Generated Rate	<10%	Bi-quarterly
PF-7	360 Peer Feedback	Decision Drag Rate	<3/quarter	Bi-quarterly
PF-8	360 Peer Feedback	Peer Amplification Rate	1+ per quarter	Bi-quarterly
UF-1	Upward Feedback	Direction Clarification Request Rate	<3/week per leader	Monthly
UF-2	Upward Feedback	Strategic Communication Proactivity	100% of changes	Monthly
UF-3	Upward Feedback	Goal Alignment Check Rate	Bi-weekly minimum	Monthly
UF-4	Upward Feedback	Decision Backlog Volume	0 pending >48 hrs	Monthly
UF-5	Upward Feedback	Leader Response Time to Flagged Blockers	<48 hrs critical	Monthly
UF-6	Upward Feedback	Team Compensation Rate	<3/quarter	Monthly
UF-7	Upward Feedback	Availability Signal Clarity	Always signaled	Monthly
UF-8	Upward Feedback	Feedback Integration Rate	80% acknowledged	Monthly
RT-1	Retrospective	Root Cause Identification Rate	100% of failures	Per retro
RT-2	Retrospective	Root Cause Depth Score	Avg ≥ 2	Per retro
RT-3	Retrospective	Time to Learning Documentation	<72 hrs	Per retro
RT-4	Retrospective	Individual vs. System Attribution Rate	60%+ system	Per retro
RT-5	Retrospective	Improvement Action Completion Rate	70%+	Per retro
RT-6	Retrospective	Improvement Action Ownership Rate	100% named	Per retro
RT-7	Retrospective	Process Change Implementation Time	<2 weeks	Per retro
RT-8	Retrospective	Insight-to-System Integration Rate	80%+	Per retro

ID	Category	KPI Name	Target	Cadence
RT-9	Retrospective	Failure Recurrence Rate	0 direct recurrences	Per retro
RT-10	Retrospective	Near-Miss Capture Rate	1+ per retro	Per retro
RT-11	Retrospective	Success Pattern Replication Rate	1+ per quarter	Quarterly

SECTION 10: BUSINESS & COMMERCIAL KPIs

These KPIs measure whether Resonance Tunes is gaining real-world commercial traction. At bootstrap stage, even a single paying pilot customer signals product-market fit more powerfully than any prototype. This section tracks the metrics investors look at first.

Note: At bootstrap stage, the goal is not perfect numbers — it is showing direction, momentum, and a founder who tracks what matters. Even 3 months of consistent KPI reporting builds significant investor confidence.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure
BC-1	Paying Pilot Customers	Number of customers who have committed real payment (even pilot-level) for RT products or services	Target: 1+ by end of Q1; 3+ by Q2	CRM / agreement log. Count signed & paid only. No revenue recognition without payment.
BC-2	Revenue Pipeline Value	Total projected value of commercial deals in active negotiation or signed pilot phase	Target: Pipeline >$50K by end of Month 6	Maintain deal log with: contact, stage, estimated value, probability. Update weekly.
BC-3	Pilot-to-Full Conversion Rate	% of pilot customers who convert to a full or expanded commercial agreement	Target: 50%+ at 90-day review	=Full agreements / Total pilots completed × 100
BC-4	B2B Outreach Volume	Number of qualified B2B prospects contacted per month	Target: 10+ outreach contacts/month	Log each outreach: date, contact, company, method, response. Count per month.
BC-5	Revenue Recognition Timeline	Projected date of first recurring revenue	Target: Defined and updated quarterly	Maintained in investor data room. Updated by COO + Finance.

INVESTOR SIGNAL — Section 10

- BC-1 (Paying Pilot Customers) is the single highest-signal KPI for seed investors at this stage
- Even a $500 pilot payment validates willingness to pay; document every transaction
- BC-2 pipeline should be visible, timestamped, and stage-coded before investor conversations

SECTION 11: PLATFORM & PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT KPIs

These KPIs show investors the product is real and moving. Progress is measured by defined milestones and shipped features, not hours logged. A product that exists in concept only cannot close a seed round.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure
PP-1	MVP Completion Rate	Percentage of the defined MVP milestone scope completed	Target: Milestone-based, not time-based. Track % complete against the agreed MVP spec.	Define milestone criteria before tracking. % = completed items / total defined items. NOT hours.
PP-2	Features Shipped vs. Planned	Number of features shipped vs. planned in each sprint or development cycle	Target: 75%+ of planned features shipped each cycle	Sprint log: planned vs. shipped per cycle. Variance tracked and root-caused.
PP-3	Active B2B Test Users	Number of businesses actively engaging with the platform (not just signed up)	Target: 5+ active B2B test users by end of Month 4	Define 'active' (e.g., logged in 2x in last 30 days). CRM or platform analytics.
PP-4	Active B2C Test Users	Number of individual consumers actively engaging with the platform	Target: 25+ active B2C test users by Month 4	Same 'active' definition as PP-3. Platform analytics or manual log.
PP-5	User Feedback Score	Qualitative satisfaction signal from test clients and users	Target: Net Promoter Score ≥40 or equivalent 4+/5 satisfaction	Structured feedback form after each test session. 5-question max. Log by user segment.
PP-6	Algorithmic Plugins Deployed	Number of algorithmic plugins either deployed in the live platform or confirmed integration-ready	Target: 2+ deployed or integration-confirmed by Month 6	Integration readiness log: plugin name, status (deployed / confirmed / in dev), date.

NOTE ON MVP MEASUREMENT — Section 11

- PP-1 tracks completion against a predefined milestone spec, never against time estimates
- If the MVP scope changes, document the change and reset the baseline — do not adjust backwards
- PP-2 sprint variance should always be root-caused in the retro system (RT-1 through RT-4)

SECTION 12: PARTNER & ECOSYSTEM GROWTH KPIs

RT's network is a core asset. Strategic partnerships that are formally executed — not just in conversation — signal ecosystem credibility to investors and open distribution channels that no marketing budget can replicate.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure
PE-1	Strategic Partner Agreements Signed	Number of formally executed Strategic Partner Agreements (not LOIs, not handshakes)	Target: 3+ signed by Month 6	Partner agreement log: name, date signed, tier, active/pending. Maintained by COO.
PE-2	Partners in Active Negotiation	Number of partners currently in active agreement negotiation (pipeline)	Target: 5+ in pipeline at any given time	Pipeline log: name, negotiation stage, estimated close date. Weekly update.
PE-3	Revenue Share Agreement Pipeline Value	Projected total value of revenue share agreements in pipeline	Target: Defined projected value by end of Quarter 2	Deal log with estimated revenue share values. Updated by COO + Finance.
PE-4	Ecosystem Integrations (Live or Confirmed)	Number of integrations that are either live in the platform or formally confirmed in development	Target: 2+ live or confirmed by Month 5	Integration log: partner name, integration type, status (live / confirmed / in dev), date.
PE-5	Cross-Pollination Collaborations Initiated	Number of joint projects or collaborative work streams initiated between RT ecosystem partners	Target: 1+ active collaboration per quarter	Collaboration log: partners involved, project name, initiation date, status. Tracked per RT Team Agreement Suite.

ECOSYSTEM NOTE — Section 12

- PE-1 signed agreements must be formally executed — MOU or letter of intent does not count
- PE-5 Cross-Pollination tracking is currently marked Pending Implementation in the RT Team Agreement Suite — begin logging manually until a formal tracking system is deployed
- Partner pipeline (PE-2) should be reviewed in the monthly COO pattern review

SECTION 13: TEAM & CONTRIBUTOR PERFORMANCE KPIs (INVESTOR LENS)

Investors conducting due diligence on team stability need to see that the contributor base is structured, activating, and delivering. These KPIs translate the RT Team Agreement Tier system into investor-legible metrics.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure
TC-1	Active Contributors by Tier	Number of active contributors broken down by Tier (A, B, C, D)	Target: Tier breakdown clearly documented and updated quarterly	Contributor ledger maintained in RT Team Agreement Suite. Export at each quarter close.
TC-2	Tier Activation Rate	% of Conditional contributors who reach Full Activation status within their defined activation window	Target: 60%+ conditional contributors reaching activation	=Contributors activated / Total conditional contributors onboarded × 100
TC-3	Deliverable Completion Rate (Team Average)	Average % of committed deliverables completed on time across all active contributors	Target: 75%+ team average	Aggregate from individual EC-1 and EC-4 scores. Computed monthly by COO.
TC-4	Contributor Retention Rate	% of contributors who remain active across two consecutive 90-day cycles	Target: 70%+ retention across 90-day cycles	=Active contributors at end of cycle / Active contributors at start of cycle × 100
TC-5	Revenue-Share Contributor Contribution Index	For revenue-share contributors: ratio of estimated contribution value to projected revenue share obligation	Target: Positive contribution index across active revenue-share contributors	Estimated contribution value defined in contributor agreement. COO reviews quarterly.

INVESTOR DUE DILIGENCE NOTE — Section 13

- TC-1 through TC-4 should be exportable from the RT contributor ledger at any time
- TC-2 Tier Activation Rate is a leading indicator of organizational health for investors
- TC-5 applies specifically to revenue-share contributors (not deferred-salary contributors) — the two compensation structures are tracked separately to maintain ledger coherence

SECTION 14: INVESTOR READINESS INDICATORS

These KPIs are specific to the seed funding goal. They are what close a round. The metrics in Sections 10–13 build the story; the metrics here determine whether the conversation converts.

At bootstrap stage, the goal is not perfect numbers. It is showing direction, momentum, and a founder who tracks what matters.

ID	KPI Name	What It Measures	Target	How to Measure / Owner
IR-1	Investor Conversations Held	Number of warm investor meetings completed (not cold emails — actual conversations)	Target: 5+ warm meetings per quarter during active fundraise	Log: investor name, date, meeting type, outcome. Maintained by CEO.
IR-2	Letters of Intent / Pilot Agreements Signed	Number of signed LOIs or pilot agreements (the strongest investor signal at pre-seed/seed)	Target: 1+ LOI or pilot agreement signed before raise closes	Agreement log. LOIs and pilot agreements are counted separately from full commercial agreements.
IR-3	Data Room Completeness	% of data room sections that are complete, current, and investor-ready	Target: 90%+ complete before any serious investor meeting	Data room audit checklist: agreements, contributor ledger, IP documentation, financials, KPI reports, cap table. CFO/Finance KPI.
IR-4	Warm Introductions in Pipeline	Number of confirmed warm investor introductions in the pipeline (referrals from trusted connectors)	Target: 3+ warm introductions confirmed during active fundraise	Intro log: who introduced, who to, date, status (pending / meeting booked / passed). CEO manages.
IR-5	KPI Reporting Consistency	Number of consecutive months with complete, timestamped KPI reports	Target: 3+ consecutive months of full KPI reporting before investor conversations begin	This document. Monthly report generated by COO, reviewed by CEO, timestamped.

DATA ROOM CHECKLIST — Section 14 (IR-3)

- RT Team Agreement Suite — current executed version
- RT Strategic Partner Agreement — current executed version
- Contributor ledger — tier breakdown, activation status
- IP documentation — coaching frameworks, healing protocols, knowledge base ownership
- Financial statements or projections — prepared by Finance
- Cap table or equity framework — per Appendix H of Team Agreement Suite
- KPI reports — minimum 3 consecutive months (this document series)
- Signed commercial agreements and LOIs (BC-1, PE-1, IR-2)

V3.0 Commercial KPI Quick Reference Index

ID	Category	KPI Name	Target	Cadence
BC-1	Business & Commercial	Paying Pilot Customers	1+ Q1; 3+ Q2	Monthly
BC-2	Business & Commercial	Revenue Pipeline Value	>$50K by Month 6	Weekly update
BC-3	Business & Commercial	Pilot-to-Full Conversion Rate	50%+ at 90-day	Quarterly
BC-4	Business & Commercial	B2B Outreach Volume	10+/month	Monthly
BC-5	Business & Commercial	Revenue Recognition Timeline	Defined quarterly	Quarterly
PP-1	Platform & Product	MVP Completion Rate	Milestone-based	Per sprint
PP-2	Platform & Product	Features Shipped vs. Planned	75%+ per cycle	Per sprint
PP-3	Platform & Product	Active B2B Test Users	5+ by Month 4	Monthly
PP-4	Platform & Product	Active B2C Test Users	25+ by Month 4	Monthly
PP-5	Platform & Product	User Feedback Score	NPS ≥40 or 4+/5	Per session
PP-6	Platform & Product	Algorithmic Plugins Deployed	2+ by Month 6	Monthly
PE-1	Partner & Ecosystem	Strategic Partner Agreements Signed	3+ by Month 6	Monthly
PE-2	Partner & Ecosystem	Partners in Active Negotiation	5+ in pipeline	Weekly
PE-3	Partner & Ecosystem	Revenue Share Pipeline Value	Defined by Q2	Quarterly
PE-4	Partner & Ecosystem	Ecosystem Integrations	2+ live/confirmed by Month 5	Monthly
PE-5	Partner & Ecosystem	Cross-Pollination Collaborations Initiated	1+ per quarter	Quarterly
TC-1	Team & Contributor	Active Contributors by Tier	Documented quarterly	Quarterly
TC-2	Team & Contributor	Tier Activation Rate	60%+	Quarterly
TC-3	Team & Contributor	Deliverable Completion Rate	75%+ avg	Monthly
TC-4	Team & Contributor	Contributor Retention Rate	70%+ per 90-day cycle	Quarterly
TC-5	Team & Contributor	Revenue-Share Contribution Index	Positive index	Quarterly
IR-1	Investor Readiness	Investor Conversations Held	5+/quarter during raise	Monthly during raise
IR-2	Investor Readiness	LOIs / Pilot Agreements Signed	1+ before close	Ongoing
IR-3	Investor Readiness	Data Room Completeness	90%+	Before each meeting
IR-4	Investor Readiness	Warm Introductions in Pipeline	3+ during raise	Ongoing
IR-5	Investor Readiness	KPI Reporting Consistency	3+ consecutive months	Monthly

SECTION 15: OPERATIONAL TASK LOG

The Operational Task Log is the primary tool through which the RT operations team records team contributions on a rolling basis. It feeds the behavioral KPI tracking system and provides an auditable record of contribution activity for the Quarterly Review and 360 Peer Feedback processes.

Log entries should be made in real time, not retrospectively. Each entry takes under 60 seconds to complete.

15A. Individual Contribution Entry (to be logged by each contributor)

Date	Contributor Name	Task / Deliverable	Description & Outcome	KPI Category

15B. Blocker / Dependency Event Log (log as events occur)

Date	Contributor	Blocker / Dependency	Who It Affects	Action Taken	Resolution Date

15C. Cross-Pollination Collaboration Log (per PE-5 and RT Team Agreement Suite)

Date Initiated	Project / Collaboration Name	Partners Involved	Status	Outcomes / Notes

TASK LOG OPERATING RULES

- Entries are logged by the contributor, not by Operations — Operations reviews and flags patterns
- Minimum one entry per active week. No entries for 30+ days triggers an EC-5 review
- KPI Category column should reference the relevant KPI code (e.g., SA-1, EC-4, PE-5)
- Blocker log entries must be made within 72 hours of identifying the blocker (DO-2)
- Cross-Pollination log feeds both PE-5 and the RT Team Agreement Suite Appendix J

SECTION 16: SELF-ASSESSMENT LOG

The Self-Assessment Log is completed individually by each contributor on a weekly basis (5–10 minutes, Friday preferred). It is the primary input for the Bi-Weekly Team Coherence Check and the Quarterly Performance Review. This is not a reporting tool — it is a self-reflection discipline.

WEEKLY SELF-ASSESSMENT — Individual Contributor

KPI Category	Self-Score (1–5)	Target	Notes / Evidence
SA — Self-Activation: Did I begin my work without being prompted this week?		90%+	
TN — Task Navigation: Did I locate and own my tasks without asking for direction?		95%+	
DO — Dependency Ownership: Did I raise blockers before they caused delays?		85%+	
EC — Execution Consistency: Did I complete what I committed to this week?		80%+	
SR — Signal Responsiveness: Did I respond to shared signals within target time?		<7 days	

WEEKLY SELF-ASSESSMENT — Open Questions

Question	Response
What did I complete this week that I committed to?	
What did I NOT complete, and what was the reason?	
What blockers did I surface proactively this week?	
Was there anything I should have communicated earlier but did not?	
What is one thing I will do differently next week?	

QUARTERLY SELF-ASSESSMENT SUPPLEMENT (QR-1 through QR-8)

Quarterly Review Question	Response
QR-1: Did I define my scope in writing at the start of this quarter?	
QR-2: Did I communicate every scope change within 48 hours?	
QR-3: What % of my self-defined scope did I deliver? If under 80%, did I renegotiate proactively?	

Quarterly Review Question	Response
QR-4: What did I do this quarter that was outside my formal scope but added visible value?	
QR-5: How often did I make a decision under ambiguity rather than escalating?	
QR-6: What major decisions did I make this quarter, and are they documented?	
QR-7: Were any of my decisions reversed? If so, was it due to changed context or avoidable error?	
QR-8: What was my average time-to-decision when facing unclear information?	

SECTION 17: CEO ASSESSMENT LOG

The CEO Assessment Log applies the same self-direction standard to the founder. Leadership is not exempt from accountability — it carries a higher obligation. The CEO's behavioral patterns set the ceiling for the entire team. This log is reviewed monthly by the CEO with the COO. It feeds the Upward Feedback system (UF-1 through UF-8) and the Investor Readiness indicators (IR-1 through IR-5).

WEEKLY CEO SELF-ASSESSMENT

CEO KPI Dimension	Score (1–5)	Target	Notes
Strategic direction communicated proactively to team this week (UF-2)		100% of changes	
Decisions pending >48 hours from team (UF-4): how many?		0 pending >48 hrs	
Investor Readiness activity completed this week (IR-1 through IR-5)		Defined weekly action	
Commercial traction action taken: outreach, pilot, or deal progression (BC-1 through BC-4)		At least 1 action/week	
Availability and status communicated to team proactively (UF-7)		Always signaled	
Feedback from team acknowledged and integration noted (UF-8)		80%+ acknowledged	

MONTHLY CEO OPEN ASSESSMENT

Question	Response
How many warm investor conversations did I hold this month? (IR-1)	
What is the current state of the investor pipeline? (IR-2, IR-4)	
Is the data room 90%+ complete and current? What is missing? (IR-3)	
What commercial traction was generated or progressed this month? (BC-1 through BC-4)	
What did the team signal about clarity of direction? Any UF-1 or UF-2 triggers?	
What decisions did I delay that the team was waiting on? (UF-4, UF-5)	
What is one thing I communicated late that I should have communicated early?	
What did I do this month that demonstrated self-direction at the same standard I hold contributors to?	

CEO ACCOUNTABILITY NOTE

- This log is reviewed monthly with the COO — both parties initial the completed log

- Investor Readiness KPIs (IR-1 through IR-5) are the CEO's primary external accountability metric during active fundraise
- UF-4 (Decision Backlog) is reviewed weekly — any decision pending >72 hours triggers a flagged status
- The CEO's Self-Activation score is operationally defined as: strategic direction communicated before the team encounters ambiguity, not after

SECTION 18: CONTRACT OVERVIEW — EMBEDDABLE SUMMARY

The following two paragraphs may be embedded directly into contributor agreements, strategic partner agreements, and investor-facing documentation to summarize the scope and intent of this framework.

Paragraph 1 — Framework Purpose and Scope

Resonance Tunes operates according to the RT KPI Framework, a documented performance accountability system that governs how all contributors, team members, and partners are expected to operate within the RT ecosystem. The framework is built on a foundational principle of self-directed execution: all participants are expected to initiate their work without external prompting, own their dependencies and blockers before they cause downstream delays, sustain consistent output over time, and engage proactively with shared team systems. The framework comprises five core behavioral KPI categories — Self-Activation, Task Navigation Autonomy, Dependency Ownership, Execution Consistency, and Signal Responsiveness — and includes four integrated feedback systems: Quarterly Performance Reviews, 360 Peer Feedback, Upward Feedback, and Retrospectives. In Version 3.0, five additional commercial and organizational KPI categories were added: Business & Commercial, Platform & Product Development, Partner & Ecosystem Growth, Team & Contributor Performance, and Investor Readiness Indicators. In aggregate, the framework defines 63 measurable KPIs that collectively govern contribution quality, collaboration reliability, and organizational coherence at Resonance Tunes.

Paragraph 2 — Contributor and Partner Obligation

By entering into any formal agreement with Resonance Tunes — whether as a contributor, a strategic partner, or a participating organization — each party acknowledges and accepts the operational standards set out in the RT KPI Framework (current version). Contributors are expected to maintain participation in the self-assessment and feedback rhythm defined in the framework, including weekly self-assessment logging, blocker and dependency reporting, and engagement in quarterly and retrospective review cycles. Strategic partners are subject to the partner-specific KPIs set out in Section 12 (Partner & Ecosystem Growth) and any applicable provisions of the RT Strategic Partner Agreement. The framework is a living document: it is reviewed and updated on a rolling basis, and all parties will be notified of material revisions. The current version of this document supersedes all prior versions and constitutes the operative performance standard for all active RT agreements at the date of signing.