Health Check

When the Challenge, Problem, or Environment is Complex

Applicability: Universal — Across Industries, Fields, and Subjects

- Strategies and standards
- Models, best practices, methods, and frameworks
- Processes
- Services
- Rules and regulations
- IT tools and AI
- Innovations and startups
- Communications
- Projects

Hereafter referred to as “projects”

Law of Nature Manifesto Initiative

www.LoN-Manifesto.org info@LoN-Manifesto.org

Download: Menu option Manifesto+OS / Health Check

Author: Eugen Oetringer

Copyright © 2025 by the Law of Nature Manifesto initiative. All rights reserved. This Health Check is part of the Law of Nature Manifesto. It is free to use via a Creative Commons (CC) license, even commercially. For the CC license, please see menu option About / Copyright at www.Lon-Manifesto.org.

Content

1. Introduction

This health check was created in response to these matters:

- Our long-standing solution attempts have failed us.
- Failure rates remain far too high, especially for scale-up projects.
- Large groups have learned to recognize *early on* when new projects miss the same gaps and conflicts that previous projects missed. They respond with lack of interest, lack of support, resistance, and opposition.

What's different:

- Knowledgeable individuals from within the specific environment decide what is relevant — not external consultants, models, best practices, or the like.
- This health check is based on lessons learned that were often observed but lost, possibly relevant Laws of Nature, fresh insights, and solutions that delivered needed results where our long-standing solution attempts failed.
- If the health check is done by yourself only, you decide what is relevant and what is not. If done with representatives of the groups involved and impacted, those representatives decide what is relevant. Only the relevant parts are used.
- To prevent analysis paralysis and getting lost in complexity, this health check focuses on where the highest damage is created and guides to solution possibilities positioned to achieve the highest impact at the lowest costs and risks — across industries, fields, and subjects. This reduces hundreds or even thousands of checkpoints to just a few.

The added benefit is that, when you do the check for your project and fill in the Enterprise level, or even the 'beyond Enterprise system level,' health checks from multiple projects can be combined to request an Enterprise- or system-level project that removes common obstacles undermining many — if not all — projects and daily operations.

Main source for more information

Please go to www.LoN-Manifesto.org. An overview of key knowledge elements is available via the homepage and it's submenu option "LoN Manifesto+OS."

2. Preparing for the Health Check

This Health Check is carried out by **taking responsibility for a decision or project being**:

1. Executable
2. Scalable to the promised system level and durable over time
3. Able to deliver on the value proposition at the promised system level

In the first round, you can perform the Health Check on your own. By taking responsibility, you assess it from the perspective of all groups involved and impacted.

If you conclude that these three responsibility requirements are met, the same Health Check is then carried out with:

- 1 or 2 knowledgeable representatives from each group involved and impacted.
- 3 to 5 participants with a basic knowledge of possibly relevant Manifesto content.
- One — preferably two — individuals have the Skill Set for Solving Complex Problems and a basic understanding of related Manifesto content

To keep the number of participants as low as possible, individuals with solid knowledge of multiple groups may represent more than one group. They should be able to contribute the key views, experiences, and needs of the groups they represent.

The Skill Set is available via Manifesto Tutorial 3.4.3. The basic knowledge can be obtained via the Manifesto's homepage and its submenu option 'LoN Manifesto+OS'.

3. Expressions Used

Key personnel:	Refers to individuals with advisory responsibilities, decision-making authority, lead solution designers, funders, and others with similar influence. It also includes external advisors, funders, and senior management with significant influence on the project.
Laws of Nature:	See the Manifesto's homepage for what is seen as a Law of Nature
Project:	Refers to formal projects, strategies, regulations, services, innovations, IT tools, processes, best practices, methods, frameworks, models, scale-up, and similar undertakings.

4. Doing the Health Check with Representatives

When conducting the Health Check with representatives of the groups involved and impacted, the following is recommended:

- Face-to-face in a room
- The participants are coached to listen beyond surface issues and popular ways of thinking
- All participants are equal
- No participant should experience negative consequences from their contributions
- A checkpoint is identified as 'relevant' when even a single group states that it is relevant
- One participant — ideally someone who:
  - has a stake in achieving a successful project or decision and
  - has the mindset of going beyond what has been tried before

  takes on the responsibility described above

5. Health Check Conclusions

The Project:

Project or decision name:	
Anticipated scale-up or system level:	
Value expectation at the anticipated system level:	
Responsibility for this Health Check covering the whole challenge (rather than just parts) was taken on and driven by:	
Health check organiser:	
Health check note taker:	
Participants by the group they represent:	
This is a follow-up Health Check to an earlier one dated:	

Outcome

The following conclusions are provided by:

- ☐ The person who assumed responsibility for addressing the whole challenge
- ☐ The organiser
- ☐ The consensus of the representatives of the groups involved and impacted

Conclusions

- ☐ All checkpoints are either identified as non-relevant or addressed at satisfactory levels
- ☐ A deeper investigation is required
- ☐ To prevent foreseeable failure, becoming stuck in the system, or a drastic reduction in the value expectation, a GO decision should only be made after the participants of the Health Check have concluded together that the identified issues are addressed to the level where the project becomes:
    - Executable
    - Scalable to the promised system level and durable over time
    - Can deliver on the value proposition
- ☐ This Health Check should be repeated prior to major GO/NO-GO decisions

Further conclusions:

Additional Information:

Date: _____

6. Checklist

1.1 Decision-Making

#	Checkpoints	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
1.	**Is key personnel trained or coached in possibly relevant Laws of Nature — especially when these laws cannot be expressed in exact terms?**	When the challenge, problem, or environment is complex, the Tipping Point and Capacity Bottleneck Laws are almost always relevant. More information — verbal laws, no mathematics required: • Manifesto Tutorials 1 to 3.3 • Manifesto Laws of Nature							
2.	**Is the 'one-word' policy in place and driving:** **a. Bureaucracy and complexity down to healthy levels, while ...**	This policy specifies when *exact practices* — such as numbers, mathematics, linear processes, and breaking complex matters into parts — should be used, and when *open practices* — such as patterns, natural workflows, and going straight to the system level — should be applied. For more information, please watch Tutorials 1 to 3.3							
	b. Preventing the unconscious creation of new, unnecessary bureaucracy and complexity?								
3.	**Do decision-making processes verify decisions against:** **a. Relevant Laws of Nature — especially when they cannot be expressed in exact ways, and ...**	We have lost the ability to make decisions based on critical information that cannot be expressed in exact ways. Relevant Laws, Values, and Behaviours can close much of this gap. More information: • Manifesto homepage • Tutorials 1, 2, 3.2 and 3.3 • Manifesto Laws of Nature • The Manifesto's Core Human Values and Essential Behaviours							
	b. Core Human Values and Essential Behaviours?								

#	Checkpoints	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
4.	**Are the following principles of science applied:** **I. Seek the truth**	Examples: • What do decision-makers and initiative owners REALLY NEED to make problem-solving decisions and get high-to-highest-impact solutions through the system? • Could there still be a strongly held belief that root causes of complex problems cannot be found — while each of this Health Check's questions is based on solvable root causes of the highest damage? For the root causes, see: • Manifesto homepage • Manifesto tutorials							
	II. Apply relevant Laws of Nature — especially when they cannot be expressed in exact ways	More information: • Manifesto Tutorials 1 to 3.3 • Manifesto Laws of Nature							
	III. Apply the Einstein–Newton–Darwin practices	Einstein–Newton–Darwin practices: • Go straight to the system level — instead of breaking complex matters into parts • Step out of the box • Seek simple rules at the system level • Proof without mathematics (Darwin) See also • Manifesto Laws of Nature – Darwin's Law • Confirmation reference in Tutorial 1							

#	Checkpoints	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
5.	**Complementary to the Business Case, is there a Value Case?**	Business Cases are typically based on money and other measurable parameters. Critical information that cannot be measured in exact ways is missed by default. To prevent foreseeable disappointment and failure, complementary Value Cases address this gap. More information: • Manifesto Intervention 7.C: Value Case Approach							
6.	**The Skill Set for Solving Complex Problems:** **I. Are individuals with this skill set in key advisory or decision-making positions?**	More information: • Tutorial 3.4.3							
	II. Have hiring and job advancement processes been adjusted from excluding individuals with this skill set to actively including them?								
7.	**Is learning from failure part of hiring processes, job advancement criteria, and the organisation's culture?**	In complex environments, failure is inevitable because every situation can or will be different, and the '*unexpected unexpected*' keeps appearing. A recurring pattern has emerged: learning from failure — combined with an attitude of preventing the same failure from recurring — substantially reduces failure rates.							

#	Checkpoints	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
8.	**Has one individual — ideally in an influential or decision-making position — taken responsibility for solving the complex problem in its entirety?**	This is needed to prevent complex matters from being broken down into supposedly manageable parts, while the most damaging root causes and solution possibilities — typically located outside the active parts — are missed. Whether a solution is executable, scalable to the system level, durable, and able to meet the value expectation is addressed through Checkpoint 10 below. More information: • The Manifesto's homepage • The elements at the homepage's submenu LoN Manifesto+OS							
9.	Mountains of COMMON obstacles have led to project failure rates and failure costs far beyond acceptable levels. **Has a top-level project removed the mountains of common obstacles that keep failure rates far above acceptable levels?**	A long-standing response to project failure is to blame those in charge and replace them. Yet their successors — even when following the latest trends and best practices, and working harder — fall into the same trap and do not understand why this happens. This happens because these common obstacles are hidden, lie beyond the project's sphere of influence, and nobody takes responsibility to solve them. The most damaging of these obstacles are addressed through this Health Check and the LoN Manifesto+OS.							

#	Checkpoints	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
10.	**Has the Executable Solution Framework for the desired system level been developed:** **I. With representatives of the groups involved and impacted, and**	In complex environments, knowledgeable individuals from the groups involved and impacted often hold key insights that can prevent foreseeable failure. A combination of impactful elements from two old workshop methods has led to an approach that unlocks this knowledge and identifies executable solution frameworks early on — before project design, and within a single workshop or just a few. More information: • Tutorial 3.4.2: From Solution Possibilities to Executable Solution Frameworks							
	II. Have executability, scalability, durability and the ability to deliver to the value proposition been confirmed by the participants of the associated workshop(s)?								

1.2 Communication, Restoring Trust, Governance, and Agile Decision-Making

#	Check Points	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
1.	**Do key personnel avoid expressions that may have worked well in the past but now signal 'too much of the same thinking — won't work!'?**	After more than two decades of our long-standing solution approaches failing to solve complex problems, large groups have learned to intuitively recognise when a new solution attempt uses expressions that signal too much of the same thinking that led to failure before. **The matter is further complicated because expressions that worked only a few years ago trigger now the same conclusion.** More information: • LoN Manifesto+OS / Gaps and Conflicts … / Gaps3 • How this was prevented: Tutorial 3.1 and the associated White Paper							
2.	**Are key personnel trained in Authentic Listening as a powerful communication technique in today's world?**	In a world where people are tired of one-way communication and solutions that fail to address what is REALLY NEEDED to solve growing problems, an unexpected practice has emerged as a powerful communication technique: Authentic Listening. More information: • Manifesto Intervention 7.B *Essential Behaviours / Listening Authentically* • Tutorial 3.1							

#	Check Points	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
3.	**Is the knowledge, communication, and decision-making bridge in place that enables:** • **Unlocking high- to highest-impact enterprise knowledge** • **Agile yet reliable decision-making at all levels** • **The organisation to act as a single entity**	Many organisations have tried to build this bridge. But the break-into-parts approach left too many gaps unresolved, and nobody took responsibility for the whole. The matter is complicated because, with the long-standing solution attempts, environments change faster than documentation, IT tools, and linear processes can be updated. Obstacles thought solved reappear. With the approaches identified through this Health Check and the LoN Manifesto+OS, a fresh solution possibility is now available. See: 1. The examples in Tutorial 3.4.2 2. Downloads available via the tutorial's description 3. How Simple Solutions to Highly Complex Challenges Can Be Found — Tutorial 3.4 4. The Complexity Navigator — Tutorial 3.4.1							

#	Check Points	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
4.	**Are the Integrity Law of Nature and its practice, *Adaptive Integrity*™, applied to re-establish lost trust?**	Old forms of integrity fail when environments change faster than promises can be delivered. They also fail when unforeseen obstacles keep appearing, and when fresh insights conflict with earlier promises. All of these are common situations in today's complex and quickly changing environments. What is needed is an Integrity aligned with this reality. Such an Integrity is available. Its straightforward practice shows how it can be applied. More information: • Manifesto Law of Nature 5 and its practice, Adaptive Integrity™ • Adaptive Integrity as an Essential Behaviour: Manifesto Intervention 7.B							

1.3 Designing Solutions to Complex Matters

#	Check Points	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
1.	**Do key personnel understand how effective solutions to complex problems can often be found —where our long-standing attempts have failed?**	These individuals only need to understand how this works. The actual 'doing' can be carried out by experts with the Skill Set for Solving Complex Matters. More information: • Tutorials 3.4 to 3.4.5							
2.	On Innovation: **A. Is there a truly open innovation process — complementary to the linear, in-the-box approach — for high- to highest-impact innovations?**	Today's innovation thinking focuses on technical innovations. Innovation processes demand linear steps and solutions that fit neatly into boxes. This conflicts with the very nature of what true innovation is meant to be. High- to highest-impact innovations that address complex matters rarely fit within these processes. A complementary innovation process is needed for this type of innovation. More Information: • Tutorial 3.4.4							
	B. Do both processes cover non-technical innovation?								

#	Check Points	Additional Information	My Project		Enterprise Level		System Level Beyond Enterprise		Notes, Activities Required, Etc.
			Relevant Yes/?/No	Is Issue Yes/?/No	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue? Y/?/N	Relev. Y/?/N	Issue Y/?/N	
3.	**When researching a complex matter, is the research model truly suited to addressing complex subjects?**	One pattern is that scientific research models break complex subjects into parts. In contrast, Einstein, Newton, and Darwin did the opposite: they went straight to the system level and identified the simple rules by which the systems operate. A further pattern is that, when a subject is complex, highly effective solutions are often found outside science, after scientific models have delivered insufficient or no results. More information: • Prof. Michael Fitzgerald's statement on the ability of the scientific model to solve today's big problems: *not fit for purpose* — see Tutorial 2 • Prof. Antoinette Weibel's verdict on Business Schools: *Systemic Failure* — *"BUSINESS SCHOOLS ARE DEAD – LONG LIVE BUSINESS SCHOOLS III"* (LinkedIn post, August 2025) • Prof. Harald Lesch's explanation of complicated versus complex, leading to: *Are research models — designed for complicated situations — applied to complex situations, and hence failing?* — see "*Komplex oder kompliziert, was macht den Unterschied?*" ZDF documentary, June 12, 2023 (in German) • A proposal for a Law-of-Nature-based research model for complex matters and Prof. M. Fitzgerald's view regarding the model — Manifesto Tutorial 3.4.5							