



Champion Emails

Two send-ready notes: peer-to-leader, and the leadership-forum memo

Two registers for the same move. The peer note aims for a conversation where the program takes shape between two people; the forum memo aims to get the case in front of the whole leadership group at once. Send one, not both. Attach the champion brief either way; attach the deck only to the forum memo. Fill the brackets, and keep your edits in your own voice — a template that still sounds like a template persuades no one.

A — The peer-to-leader note

Subject: something I noticed in our content — worth 20 minutes?

[NAME] —

While working through [CONTEXT — e.g., "the onboarding materials refresh"], I started keeping a list of terms in our client-facing content that are costing us more than they're saying. Two examples make the point: we say *tribal knowledge* throughout our delivery docs — the knowledge-management field itself has moved to *institutional knowledge*, for precision as much as anything — and [RECENT EXAMPLE — e.g., "last month's post used 'Mexican standoff' where 'standoff' said it better"].

It's not about two phrases. Once you look, there's a family of them — and the interesting part isn't the optics, it's the precision: these terms are weak retrieval keys in our knowledge base, opaque to non-native readers, and dated against the style standards the industry (Microsoft, Google, the Linux Foundation's naming initiative, the ACM) has already adopted.

I think there's a small, well-shaped program here: a 30-day audit of our top twenty client-facing assets, then a two-page terminology standard we ratify and enforce where we already review content. Evidence first, decisions after. I've written up the case in two pages — attached.

Worth twenty minutes this week? I have a specific proposal for how we'd start.

[YOUR NAME]

B — The leadership-forum memo

Subject: Proposal: a 30-day terminology audit of our client-facing content

Team —

A short proposal, with a small ask and a specific deadline.

The observation. Our client-facing content carries terms that undercut it — some imprecise (*tribal knowledge*, three names for one concept in the KB), some dated against current industry style standards

(*master/slave, whitelist/blacklist, grandfathered*), one recently public and avoidable ([EXAMPLE]). No one owns our vocabulary, so nothing checks it on the way to a client.

Why it matters now. Three reasons, in order: retrieval (terms are search keys — for clients and for the AI systems now assembling answers from content like ours); procurement (enterprise reviews increasingly screen vendor content for exactly this); and credibility (we sell clarity — our language is the demo).

The ask. Approve a 30-day audit: twenty client-facing assets, two reviewers, a findings report with severity ratings at day 30, urgent items fixed inside the window. Cost is two people part-time for a month; no tooling. The attached brief has the full case and the four-phase program the audit would seed — but the only decision on the table today is the audit.

The deadline. If approved this week, findings land [DATE + 30]. I'll bring the readout.

[YOUR NAME]

Contextkeeping is a KCS-aligned operating model. KCS® is a service mark of the Consortium for Service Innovation; this material is not affiliated with or endorsed by the Consortium.