

CLEAR Examples Handbook

Eight cross-industry illustrations showing how an activity or output can be reframed as a reviewable outcome.

Created by Anshul Lalit and Ania Mendoz | Free to use | CC BY-SA 4.0

Working release 0.1. Use for structured practice and review. This resource does not replace domain obligations or establish that CLEAR has completed cross-industry validation.

HOW TO READ THE EXAMPLES

Copy the reasoning pattern, never the target.

Every number below is illustrative. It is not a benchmark, recommendation, or claim of observed performance unless independently established in your setting. A defensible local record needs a real baseline, operational definitions, stakeholder review, domain obligations, and decision authority.

Starting statement	Often an activity, output, preferred intervention, compliance target, or weak proxy.
CLEAR outcome	A bounded change experienced by an actor or system.
Evidence	A mix proportionate to the decision, including counter-evidence and limitations.
Guardrail	A condition that must not be sacrificed to achieve the headline result.
Review	A real decision point, not a reporting ritual.

EXAMPLE 01 / PRODUCT

Starting statement	Launch a new onboarding wizard.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Within six months, increase new tenant administrators completing a first verified production workflow within 24 hours from 35% to 60%.
Evidence plan	Product events, cohort analysis, support data, and user interviews.
Guardrail	Support demand, accessibility, security, and configuration quality do not worsen.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Customer mix and event quality may affect the result.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 02 / IT RESILIENCE

Starting statement	Move every critical service to multi-zone architecture.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	By Q4, restore user-facing transactions within 15 minutes in at least 95% of controlled single-zone-loss exercises, from 55% at baseline.
Evidence plan	Exercise telemetry, transaction monitoring, recovery logs, and independent observation.
Guardrail	No data loss beyond the approved recovery point and no bypass of change controls.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Exercises may not represent correlated regional or supplier failures.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 03 / OT RELIABILITY

Starting statement	Install condition-monitoring sensors on all critical motors.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Reduce packaging-line production loss from 9.2 to below 5.0 hours per 1,000 runtime hours over two rolling quarters.
Evidence plan	Historian data, downtime classification, maintenance records, and operator observations.
Guardrail	Safety trips, bypasses, defects, environmental events, and unapproved changes do not increase.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Product mix, ambient conditions, and operating mode affect comparability.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 04 / PUBLIC SERVICE

Starting statement	Launch a self-service permit portal.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Within nine months, increase complete standard applications receiving a correct decision within 10 working days from 46% to 75%, without subgroup deterioration.
Evidence plan	Case timestamps, quality samples, appeals, applicant research, and assisted-channel records.
Guardrail	Accessibility, privacy, appeal rights, and equitable access do not worsen.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Policy, complexity, demand mix, and missing demographic data affect interpretation.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 05 / HEALTH

Starting statement	Deploy a medication-reconciliation alert to every ward.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Within 12 months, reduce clinically significant unresolved medication discrepancies within 72 hours of discharge from 11.4 to below 5.0 per 100 eligible discharges.
Evidence plan	Record review, pharmacist samples, and patient and primary-care follow-up.
Guardrail	Discharge delay, alert burden, and high-risk group performance do not worsen.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Documentation and care outside the service affect detection and attribution.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 06 / CYBERSECURITY

Starting statement	Patch 100% of critical vulnerabilities in seven days.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Over two quarters, reduce median time that confirmed exploitable vulnerabilities remain reachable on internet-facing production assets from 12 days to fewer than 4.
Evidence plan	Validated inventory, reachability and exploitability confirmation, and closure sampling.
Guardrail	Remediation respects service limits; closure requires evidence that exploitability is removed.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Threat conditions, discovery rate, and inventory improvement change the measured population.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 07 / SUPPLY CHAIN

Starting statement	Implement a new supply-planning platform.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Within three quarters, increase production orders starting with all critical materials available from 72% to 90%.
Evidence plan	Order readiness, supplier and transit variability, inventory age, and incoming quality.
Guardrail	Obsolescence, quality acceptance, and hidden expedite risk remain within limits.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Demand volatility, specification changes, and major external events constrain comparison.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

EXAMPLE 08 / CAPABILITY

Starting statement	Train all frontline employees in root-cause analysis.
Why it is insufficient	It describes work or a preferred solution without establishing the meaningful changed condition.
CLEAR outcome	Within nine months, frontline teams independently resolve at least 70% of eligible recurring defects using evidence-based problem solving, from 25% at baseline.
Evidence plan	Eligibility rules, independent analysis-quality samples, recurrence, and escalation data.
Guardrail	High-risk defects follow mandatory escalation; unsafe local workarounds do not rise.
Candidate interventions	Preserve at least two plausible routes; test them as contribution hypotheses rather than embedding one in the outcome.
Review	Set a cadence proportionate to feedback delay and risk; pre-agree continue, adapt, revise, escalate, pause, stop, and retire options.
Limitation	Classification requires judgment; authority and management behaviour affect the result.

Localise before use: replace every illustrative baseline, threshold, scope, source, owner, assumption, and guardrail with evidence from the real setting.

CASE REVIEW QUESTIONS

- Does the statement describe a changed condition rather than the completion of work?
- Is the objective legitimate, and are beneficiaries, burdens, distribution, and trade-offs visible?
- Could the evidence report success while the intended condition worsens?
- Does the named owner have meaningful influence and an escalation path for dependencies?
- Which assumption is most fragile, and what would count as counter-evidence?
- What may be gamed, displaced, excluded, delayed, or harmed?
- Can the review change an intervention, evidence plan, outcome, owner, or decision to continue?

SELECTED FOUNDATIONS

- OECD, Effective Results Frameworks for Sustainable Development (2024).
- UK Government, Magenta Book (updated 2026).
- NIST SP 800-55 Vol. 1 (2024) and NIST SP 800-82 Rev. 3 for OT context.
- UK HSE HSG254 for critical-control performance indicators.
- See clearoutcomes.org/examples for 36 cases and clearoutcomes.org/research for direct links.