Climate Sprints

SELF-ASSESSMENT · NOT GATED · USE IT AND KEEP IT

The execution risk more capital cannot fix.

Fifteen lines about how a leadership team behaves under pressure. If you tick six or more, the constraint is not capability and not capital.

VERSION 1.0
11 SEPTEMBER 2026
REVIEW 1Q2027

CLIMATESPRINTS.COM
PRACTICE@CLIMATESPRINTS.COM

POWERED BY PURPOSE. DRIVEN BY ACTION.

How to use it

Every line is written so that **ticking it means the thing is true of you today**, not that you aspire to it. A tick is a gap, not an achievement. Count them at the end.

Answer from what you could evidence this afternoon, not from what you believe is broadly the case. “We know who our buyer is” and “I can name the person, their title, their budget line and the date they must act” are different claims, and only the second one survives contact with an allocator.

Then do it again with someone who has no position in the outcome — a co-investor, an advisor, a spouse. The point of the second person is not their expertise. It is that they are not the one who has to be right.

The reference against each line is the dimension it maps to in our assessment method, published at climatesprints.com/method. Nothing here is proprietary and nothing is held back.

> **This is not an assessment.**
>
> A checklist tells you which instrument you need. It is answered from memory, by one person, in ten minutes, and nothing in it is verified.
>
> An assessment answers a different question — should this position be taken, at what size, against what reserve — across twenty-four scored dimensions, each carrying an evidence grade recording where the evidence came from rather than how good the news was. It takes three weeks and it is commissioned by the fund, not by the company.
>
> Use this to decide what to ask for. Do not use it to decide whether a company is fundable.

The checklist

WHAT GETS AVOIDED — EC-4 · conflict metabolism

- [ ] There is a disagreement between founders that has been running longer than six months. EC-4
- [ ] There is a topic we do not raise in meetings, and everyone knows which one it is. EC-4
- [ ] Our last real disagreement ended by deferral rather than by decision. EC-4
- [ ] We have no written mechanism for who decides when we cannot agree. EC-4

WHAT GETS DEFERRED — EC-6 · decision behavior

- [ ] A strategic decision has stayed open across two or more board cycles. EC-6
- [ ] We are funding two directions at the scale of neither. EC-6
- [ ] Decisions get made in the room and quietly unmade afterward. EC-6

WHAT GETS HEARD — EC-3 · blind-spot permeability

- [ ] Nobody on the team has told me something I did not want to hear in the last quarter. EC-3
- [ ] When a stated position is challenged, my first move is to defend it rather than to test it. EC-3
- [ ] I could not name the thing my co-founder thinks I am wrong about. EC-3

WHO IS IN THE ROOM — EC-5 · cohesion and hiring integrity

- [ ] Our last three hires were selected on capability, with working-style fit assessed informally or not at all. EC-5
- [ ] Two or more people have left voluntarily in the last eighteen months. EC-5
- [ ] Roles became ambiguous after the last raise and have not been reset. EC-5

WHAT THE BOARD GETS — EC-7 · governance permeability

- [ ] The board receives bad news with the numbers rather than before them. EC-7
- [ ] I would not tell my lead investor about a slip until I had a fix to present alongside it. EC-7

What the count means

0–2	Not your constraint. A team that ticks two of these is functioning; look at the commercial checklist instead.
3–5	Worth naming out loud at the next offsite, with one person accountable for each. If the same lines are still ticked in two quarters, they are structural rather than situational.
6–10	**An Alignment Sprint is the instrument.** These patterns do not resolve with more runway, and they get more expensive as the stakes rise. Three months, individual and collective sessions sequenced, opening with an assessment of where the friction actually sits — which is rarely where the fund thinks it sits.
11–15	Do this before the next raise, not after. A round changes the org, and every line above gets harder to work on once there is new capital, new expectation and a new board seat in the room.

On confidentiality, because it is the question everyone asks

Where a fund pays for this work, individual session content is confidential and stays that way. What the fund receives is a readout on organizational readiness and a position on whether the execution risk has moved. That boundary is what makes the work possible; without it people manage the process instead of doing the work.

If you are a founder reading this and the honest count is high, that is not a disclosure problem. Every company that has ever raised has some version of this list. The ones that fail are the ones where nobody counted.