

Form A • IPGuru the platform keeps the record

Lab 2: from a committed concept to a consulted one

IPGURU

PART 2 · CLASSES 4 TO 6 · 90 MINUTES IN THE SESSION · YOUR OWN IDEA

0 to 8 **Name the seats your idea needs.** List the disciplines the concept itself named, plus one it has never been shown to. Say who could fill each seat: a real person you could reach, an assistant given the role, or the platform.

Keep the list short enough to run two of them today.

In IPGuru: Scenario expert profiles: read the panel the concept named; Crew consultation: pick the first two.

8 to 28 **Run two expert perspectives, one at a time.** Ask the first discipline's questions and write every concern with what would resolve it. Run the second before it has seen any of the first one's answers, then show each the other's. Check whether they answer the same question differently and record what you found, including none found. A disagreement that survives is an open question; once you can put a measure on it, write it as a requirement.

In IPGuru: Crew consultation: run each perspective on its own; send each concern to the Register with its resolution field filled, and set the source on every line so the export shows it.

28 to 40 **Structured critique, and the three improvements.** Rate eight dimensions: problem, audience, mechanism, difference, feasibility, evidence, risks, presentation. Keep the ratings as a baseline. Rank three improvements by what each would change, not by how easy they are. Write what is strongest in one line.

In IPGuru: Crew consultation: the critique view; the ratings stay in the Register as the baseline for the next pass.

40 to 52 **Model the customer voices, and write the pitch.** Four seats: the user, the buyer, the person in between, and whoever can say no without buying. Write each one's top objection in their own words and label every line anticipated. Then one sentence: what it is, who says yes, what they give up, why now.

In IPGuru: The customer voice instrument for the four seats; Sales view for the one-line pitch and who says yes.

52 to 72 **Stress test.** List what the idea rests on. For each, ask whether the idea falls or bends if it is wrong. The load-bearing ones get a failure mode and a check first, and a backed claim comes back into the queue when its evidence came from other conditions, when it crosses an interface between two people, or when safety rests on it. Cover the four science areas: working principle, physical feasibility, materials, limits. Use three of the nine methods and say why those three. Write what holds.

In IPGuru: Idea stress test: assumptions, failure modes and checks, the science coverage and what holds; the checks list goes to the Register.

72 to 85 **Debate one fork.** Pick the fork you are most sure about, which is usually the one to argue. Build both cases at full strength, including the assumptions each rests on and the result that would make it fold. Write the synthesis and

label it judgment. Keep the losing case's best point as a risk, with what would settle it.

In IPGuru: Debate: choose the fork, read both cases, save the synthesis and the kept risk to the Register.

85 to 90

Record what changed, and what did not. Write the decisions taken today, the lines that did not move and the reason each stayed. A concern you decided not to act on is recorded with what would have changed your mind.

In IPGuru: The Register: decisions, actions, parked, ruled out; export the list of concerns and the checks list.

optional, done before

Take the five questions to one real person. This step is fieldwork and is not done in the session. Pick one technical mentor (how it works) or functional mentor (how it is used, made or sold). Write five questions about what already happened, never about what somebody would do. What it adds: one line on the sheet stops being anticipated and becomes a named person's report of their own past. How to record it: who, when, what they said, and which line it moved. A conversation that confirms what you had written is a result, and so is an approach that gets no reply.

In IPGuru: The Register: export the list of concerns and the checks list to take to the conversation, and log the reply against the line it belongs to.

CONCERNS, EACH WITH WHAT WOULD RESOLVE IT the list of concerns

WHERE EACH CONCERN CAME FROM a simulated role, a named person, or evidence they supplied

DID TWO DISCIPLINES ANSWER THE SAME QUESTION DIFFERENTLY what you found, including none found

THE OPEN QUESTION, AND ANY MEASURE THAT MAKES IT A REQUIREMENT open until it has a measure

WHAT IS STRONGEST one line; never traded away

THE NEXT THREE IMPROVEMENTS, IN ORDER ranked by what each would change

CUSTOMER OBJECTIONS, WITH EVIDENCE LEVEL anticipated, or reported and by whom

THE ONE-LINE PITCH who says yes, what they give up, why now

ASSUMPTIONS, FAILURE MODES, CHECKS load bearing first; the checks list

WHAT HOLDS with the estimate or source behind it

SCIENCE AREAS COVERED, AND ANY SILENCE principle, feasibility, materials, limits

THE FORK, AND THE SYNTHESIS labelled judgment, not fact

THE LOSING CASE'S BEST POINT, KEPT AS A RISK with what would settle it

DECISIONS RECORDED, AND WHAT DID NOT CHANGE the Register, lanes 1 and 2

OPEN: CONCERNS WITH NO RESOLUTION
YET parked, not hidden

OPTIONAL, OUTSIDE THE SESSION: THE MENTOR AND FIVE QUESTIONS about the past; record who, when and which line it moved

Artefact: the list of concerns with a resolution on every live line, the three improvements in order, the customer objections with their evidence level, the one-line pitch with a named buyer, the checks list that becomes the experiment plan, what holds, and one fork decided with its synthesis labelled. Every simulated panel is labelled as simulated in the exported file itself, not only here, so a later reader can tell a role played by an assistant from a named expert's opinion and from evidence that expert supplied. The platform keeps the record; export the list of concerns and the checks list at the end and attach them to this sheet.

Lab 2: from a committed concept to a consulted one

ANY ASSISTANT

PART 2 · CLASSES 4 TO 6 · 90 MINUTES IN THE SESSION · YOUR OWN
IDEA

0 to 8 **Name the seats your idea needs.** List the disciplines the concept itself named, plus one it has never been shown to. Say who could fill each seat: a real person you could reach, an assistant given the role, or the platform. Keep the list short enough to run two of them today.

Prompt: "Here is my concept. Which disciplines does it depend on, and which one has it never been shown to? For each, give the first three questions that discipline would ask." Then choose two yourself.

8 to 28 **Run two expert perspectives, one at a time.** Ask the first discipline's questions and write every concern with what would resolve it. Run the second before it has seen any of the first one's answers, then show each the other's. Check whether they answer the same question differently and record what you found, including none found. A disagreement that survives is an open question; once you can put a measure on it, write it as a requirement.

Prompt: "You are a [discipline]. Ask me what you would ask first about this concept, one question at a time, and do not suggest solutions." Write each concern, its resolution, and its source: a simulated role, a named person, or evidence that person supplied.

28 to 40 **Structured critique, and the three improvements.** Rate eight dimensions: problem, audience, mechanism, difference, feasibility, evidence, risks, presentation. Keep the ratings as a baseline. Rank three improvements by what each would change, not by how easy they are. Write what is strongest in one line.

Prompt: "Rate my concept from 1 to 5 on each of these eight dimensions, give one sentence for each rating, then name the three changes that would raise the lowest ratings most." Do the ranking yourself.

40 to 52 **Model the customer voices, and write the pitch.** Four seats: the user, the buyer, the person in between, and whoever can say no without buying. Write each one's top objection in their own words and label every line anticipated. Then one sentence: what it is, who says yes, what they give up, why now.

Prompt: "Write the top objection each of these four people would have, in their own words, in one sentence each. Do not answer them." Write the pitch yourself and read it aloud to somebody.

52 to 72 **Stress test.** List what the idea rests on. For each, ask whether the idea falls or bends if it is wrong. The load-bearing ones get a failure mode and a check first, and a backed claim comes back into the queue when its evidence came from other conditions, when it crosses an interface between two people, or when safety rests on it. Cover the four science areas: working principle, physical feasibility, materials, limits. Use three of the nine methods and say why those three. Write what holds.

Prompt: "Here is my concept. List what it rests on. For each, say whether the idea fails or only weakens if it is wrong, and what check would settle it."

Then run a premortem yourself: a year from now this failed, and here is why.

72 to 85

Debate one fork. Pick the fork you are most sure about, which is usually the one to argue. Build both cases at full strength, including the assumptions each rests on and the result that would make it fold. Write the synthesis and label it judgment. Keep the losing case's best point as a risk, with what would settle it.

Prompt: "Argue the strongest case for this choice. Now argue the strongest case against it, as if you believed it." Write the synthesis in your own words and mark it as judgment, not fact.

85 to 90

Record what changed, and what did not. Write the decisions taken today, the lines that did not move and the reason each stayed. A concern you decided not to act on is recorded with what would have changed your mind.

Prompt: On paper: fill the decisions column, then the line for what did not change and why.

optional,

Take the five questions to one real person. This step is fieldwork and is not done in the session. Pick one technical mentor (how it works) or functional mentor (how it is used, made or sold). Write five questions about what already happened, never about what somebody would do. What it adds: one line on the sheet stops being anticipated and becomes a named person's report of their own past. How to record it: who, when, what they said, and which line it moved. A conversation that confirms what you had written is a result, and so is an approach that gets no reply.

Prompt: On paper: name the mentor, write the five questions, and write the two lines you would send to ask for twenty minutes.

CONCERNS, EACH WITH WHAT WOULD RESOLVE IT the list of concerns

WHERE EACH CONCERN CAME FROM a simulated role, a named person, or evidence they supplied

DID TWO DISCIPLINES ANSWER THE SAME QUESTION DIFFERENTLY what you found, including none found

THE OPEN QUESTION, AND ANY MEASURE THAT MAKES IT A REQUIREMENT open until it has a measure

WHAT IS STRONGEST one line; never traded away

THE NEXT THREE IMPROVEMENTS, IN ORDER ranked by what each would change

CUSTOMER OBJECTIONS, WITH EVIDENCE LEVEL anticipated, or reported and by whom

THE ONE-LINE PITCH who says yes, what they give up, why now

ASSUMPTIONS, FAILURE MODES, CHECKS load bearing first; the checks list

WHAT HOLDS with the estimate or source behind it

SCIENCE AREAS COVERED, AND ANY SILENCE principle, feasibility, materials, limits

THE FORK, AND THE SYNTHESIS labelled judgment, not fact

THE LOSING CASE'S BEST POINT, KEPT AS A RISK with what would settle it

DECISIONS RECORDED, AND WHAT DID NOT CHANGE the Register, lanes 1 and 2

OPEN: CONCERNS WITH NO RESOLUTION
YET parked, not hidden

OPTIONAL, OUTSIDE THE SESSION: THE MENTOR AND FIVE QUESTIONS about the past; record who, when and which line it moved

Artefact: the list of concerns with a resolution on every live line, the three improvements in order, the customer objections with their evidence level, the one-line pitch with a named buyer, the checks list that becomes the experiment plan, what holds, and one fork decided with its synthesis labelled. Every simulated panel is labelled as simulated in the exported file itself, not only here, so a later reader can tell a role played by an assistant from a named expert's opinion and from evidence that expert supplied. Nothing here needs the platform: this sheet and whatever assistant you already use are enough, and the record you keep is the same record.

