ZERO AVOIDABLE INTERRUPTION

FIVE QUESTIONS TO ASK BEFORE YOU BELIEVE A PREVENTION CLAIM

Five stages that survive scrutiny

Preventing IT interruptions creates an unusual accountability problem. A quiet month could mean the operating model worked exactly as intended. It could also mean fewer things went wrong. Only the record tells you which.

Prevention that survives scrutiny leaves an end-to-end record across five stages.

1	2	3	4	5
DETECTION	**DECISION**	**ACTION**	**VALIDATION**	**LEARNING**
What did the system see, and when?	Why was this action permitted?	What ran, and what changed?	Did the condition recover, and did it stay away?	What changed because of the outcome?
Evidence has to start before the employee notices.	Automation should operate within clear guardrails.	The response has to be traceable and reversible.	An action taken is not an interruption avoided.	Resolving an incident ends one event. Removing its cause ends a class of them.

When these five stages connect, prevention stops being a claim and becomes an accountable IT outcome.

POMEROY

THE EVIDENCE TRAIL

WHAT EVIDENCE SHOULD EXIST AT EACH STAGE?

Prevention is easy to claim. Proving it is harder.

Each stage has a different job. Together they show that an eligible interruption was caught early, handled under policy, and checked against what actually happened.

01 Detection

What did the system see, and when?

EVIDENCE TO CAPTURE

Timestamp | Signal source | Affected population | Baseline deviation | Predicted impact

Without a timestamp that predates employee impact, the claim is being made after the fact.

02 Decision

Why was this action permitted?

EVIDENCE TO CAPTURE

Authorizing policy | Confidence threshold | Risk classification | Approval requirement | Actions Allowed | Actions ruled out

A log can show that an action occurred. It does not tell you whether that action was appropriate, authorized or safe.

03 Action

What ran, and what changed?

EVIDENCE TO CAPTURE

Remediation | Target population | Before-and-after state | Exceptions | Rollback path

The response should be traceable from start to finish, especially when the action carries business risk. There should also be a clear way to reverse the change, if needed.

04 Validation

Did the condition recover, and did it stay away?

EVIDENCE TO CAPTURE

Recovery confirmed | Validation window | No recurrence | No employee impact observed | Known failure signature | Post-action telemetry

This is where action becomes prevention. A completed workflow does not automatically equal a prevented interruption. Validation should show that the condition cleared, remained stable for a defined period and did not create employee-facing impact during that window.

05 Learning

What changed because of the outcome?

EVIDENCE TO CAPTURE

Root cause | Rule refined | Threshold adjusted | Automation improved | Knowledge captured | Change governed

If nothing changes, IT may prevent one interruption without reducing the chance of the next. Each outcome should improve something: a rule, a threshold, an automation, a knowledge asset, a model or the underlying process itself.

Before you count it

An action taken is not the same as an interruption avoided. Before something is counted as prevention, there needs to be a credible reason to believe an interruption was likely to occur. That evidence may come from: a historical baseline, an established recurrence pattern, a known failure signature, a defined risk threshold, or a predicated incident probability.

Without that foundation, you may be counting detections or completed automations rather than prevented interruptions.

POMEROY