

Subject: When "temporary" launch fixes become launch risk

Repeatedly surviving a known defect is not evidence that it is safe; it may be evidence that the organization has normalized the warning.

Subject: When "temporary" launch fixes become launch risk

Your product may be good enough to demonstrate value-and still be too fragile for its biggest launch.

The Challenger Commission found that recurring O-ring erosion and blow-by were treated as acceptable rather than resolved. The warning pattern was visible: every flight at or below 63°F showed distress, yet no trend analysis exposed the danger. Engineers also opposed launch below 53°F, but management pressure reversed the recommendation.

The practical lesson for your launch: separate tolerable imperfections from danger signals by looking for repeated workarounds, unresolved anomalies, missing trend analysis, and technical dissent that gets softened or buried during approval.

I can send a concise launch-risk review framework built around those indicators. Worth a quick look before the launch decision is finalized?