IC3.LLC Denton Wilson INTEGRATED TEAM DECISION-MAKING: THE WHY

LEAN A3 DECISION-MAKING TEMPLATE "Narrative" = "Why"

[Project Name] - Decision Request A3

- Date Submitted:
- A3 Owner / Facilitator:
- A3 Reference #: (for logging into project decision database) (Or Div of work)

1. Current State

What is the situation today? What challenge or opportunity are we facing? (Include background context, pain points, constraints, or status quo)

Example: "Current bathroom pod design creates plumbing congestion in shaft, delaying MEP rough-in."

2. Desired Future State

What outcome are we aiming for?

(Include proposed solution, prefabrication option, change, or new approach)

Example: "Adopt prefabricated wet wall system to reduce shaft congestion and enable parallel MEP install."

IC3.LLC Denton Wilson INTEGRATED TEAM DECISION-MAKING: THE WHY

3. Drivers for This Evaluation

- Why is this evaluation being brought forward? Check all that apply:
 - Schedule impact or delay
 - Scope gap / ownership overlap
 - Prefabrication opportunity
 - Long-term flexibility / maintainability
 - Cost efficiency
 - Owner request
 - Safety or quality concern
 - Field coordination issue
 - · Risk avoidance
 - Innovation / lifecycle improvement
 - Flexibility / Adaptability / Future proof

Brief explanation:

4. Stakeholder Review

Identify **Primary** (directly impacted) and **Secondary** (indirectly impacted) stakeholders.

Each stakeholder should contribute commentary during the review session.

Stakeholder Group	Name / Role	Primary or Secondary	Summary of Feedback / Impact
e.g., Plumbing Contractor	John S.	Primary	Prefers prefab but wants material submittal reviewed
e.g., Architect	Kim L.	Secondary	Needs coordination with ceiling heights

IC3.LLC Denton Wilson

INTEGRATED TEAM DECISION-MAKING: THE WHY

5. III Impact Matrix (Scoring from 1–5 or Color Code)

Category	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Notes
Cost	5	Est. \$20K savings in material + labor		
Schedule	5	3-week pull-forward on rough-in		
Quality	3	Higher control offsite; unknown tolerance margin		
Risk	3	Risk in first-time install coordination		
Lifecycle/Flexibility	4	Can adjust for future riser access		

6. Team's Summary & Recommendation

After review, what is the core team's recommendation? Include reasons.

Example: "Recommend proceeding with prefabricated wet wall pod strategy for Levels 2–5 only. Reduces congestion, improves install speed, minimal risk with coordination."

7. 🛞 Leadership Action Requested

What decision or resource is being requested?

- Approve and proceed
- Approve with conditions (note below)
- Defer needs further information
- Reject

Comments:

IC3.LLC Denton Wilson INTEGRATED TEAM DECISION-MAKING: THE WHY

8. Next Steps & Responsible Parties

Action Item	Owner	Due Date
Finalize prefab layout coordination	MEP Coordinator	July 5
Submit updated riser shop drawings	Plumbing Sub	July 10
Confirm schedule with GC scheduler	PM	July 8

9. <a>Quantities | Learning Notes (Optional – for Knowledge Transfer)

What did this process teach us? What will we carry forward into future decisions?

Example: "Pulling in multiple trades early helped catch ceiling height impact from prefab riser modules."