

Have you actually *crossed*?

You do not cross the chasm on a launch date. You notice, in retrospect, that you crossed. Work through both lists for one domain — the beachhead you are trying to win, not the organization as a whole. Any **no** on the first list, or **yes** on the second, marks your next move.

LIST ONE • SIX SIGNALS OF A COMPLETED CROSSING

Tick only what is true today, in the beachhead domain, without argument.

- ☐ **Removal would cause protest.**
The pragmatists in the beachhead domain would push back if you switched the agent off. This is the single cleanest signal.
- ☐ **Usage survives sponsor turnover.**
The agent no longer depends on the champion who launched it. Visionary-dependent adoption is pre-chasm by definition.
- ☐ **The references are unprompted.**
People outside the beachhead are asking when they get theirs — because a colleague told them to.
- ☐ **Escalations are routine, not incidents.**
The agent's handoffs to humans are part of the workflow's rhythm, not events that trigger meetings.
- ☐ **Trust is on a dashboard.**
Someone owns the trust scorecard, audits against the heuristics on a cadence, and can tell you whether trust rose or fell this month.
- ☐ **The next domain asked to go second.**
Expansion is being pulled by demand, not pushed by mandate.

LIST TWO • WHERE HOPE IS LOAD-BEARING

The mirrored diagnostic. Any tick here is a gap carrying weight it cannot hold.

- ☐ **Leadership cannot write the same one-sentence definition of "agentic" independently.**
Ask four executives separately, in writing. Compare.
 - ☐ **No named person is accountable for whether the agents actually get adopted.**
Not for building them — for whether they are used.
 - ☐ **You've mapped the documented workflow but not the real one.**
The documented process and the observed process are different artifacts.
 - ☐ **Your stack was chosen before your process was designed.**
Procurement ran ahead of design; the architecture now constrains the workflow.
 - ☐ **You guess at trust instead of measuring it.**
No scorecard, no cadence, no number anyone would defend.
-

How to read your result. A missing signal on list one tells you the crossing is incomplete. A tick on list two tells you which layer is carrying the weight — and each maps to a specific layer of the five-step playbook. Fix the layer, not the symptom.

WHERE EACH GAP MAPS		
LAYER	THE GAP IT EXPLAINS	WHAT YOU PRODUCE
01 Vision	No shared one-sentence definition of "agentic"	A shared definition, and how you would know it worked
02 Ownership	No named person accountable for adoption	Ownership map, RACI, governance
03 Processes	The documented workflow, not the real one	Current → agent-augmented maps, verified
04 Technology	Stack chosen before process designed	Target architecture that serves the process
05 AUX	Trust guessed at rather than measured	Continuous trust scorecards, patterns, cadence