

The problem survived the last solution.

If the same IT-dependent problem is still here after a new leader, vendor, tool, or governance layer, the visible issue is probably not the whole problem. Plain Ops takes on the work the business cannot leave unresolved and gets it to a defined end state.

YOU MAY RECOGNIZE ONE OF THESE

- **A critical deliverable is late or not closing.**
The date matters: board, audit, regulatory, customer, transaction, or operating commitment. I establish what is actually complete, force the remaining decisions into the open, and drive the work to the agreed end state.
- **Projects or implementations keep slipping.**
I show where the work is getting stuck, then reset scope, sequencing, ownership, approvals, or handoffs so it can finish.
- **Compliance or security pressure has become recurring fire drills.**
I turn requirements and known exposure into a prioritized list of what must actually be fixed, then shore up the controls, evidence, access, patching, and configurations that need to hold up when tested.
- **Incidents and interruptions keep consuming the roadmap.**
I find why the same disruptions keep coming back, put clear ownership on the recurring causes, and change the routines that keep knocking planned work off course.
- **The business needs a defensible IT roadmap and investment plan.**
I turn scattered inventory, lifecycle, business requirements, risk, dependencies, and spend into a plan leadership can approve and budget against.
- **IT spend, vendors, or risk do not add up.**
I make the cost, ownership, assumptions, and gaps visible so leadership can decide what to fund, stop, or demand.

WHY THE OBVIOUS APPROACHES AREN'T WORKING

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| 1 VISIBLE | 2 APPROACH | 3 UNCHANGED | 4 RETURNS |
| Cost, delay, incidents, audit pressure | New tool, new leader, new vendor, more governance | How work arrives, who owns it, who decides, and what happens at each handoff. | The same operating result in another form. |

OPERATING CAPACITY | INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE

More technology does not automatically mean more output.

AI is making a familiar operating gap visible. Tools can accelerate tasks while the business still pays for delays, rework and coordination. Google DORA's research describes AI as an amplifier of existing systems. ^[4]

WHAT SURVEYS FIND IS TYPICAL

AI USE VERSUS EARNINGS

9 in 10 / 37%

McKinsey (2026): nearly nine in ten report regular AI use in at least one business function; 37% attribute some positive EBIT impact to AI, about the same share as in 2025. ^[1]

ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLEXITY

6.8 hours/week

Reported average time lost per employee to software and organizational complexity across all functions. Freshworks (2025). ^[2]

WHAT IMPROVEMENT HAS ACHIEVED

NIST MEP | LEAN PROCESS REDESIGN, MANUFACTURING (2025)

9.8%

more production

Value-stream mapping exposed excess movement in one limestone-production line. A targeted layout change increased output with the existing workforce. ^[3]

0

additional labor required

Nearly 3x

Nearly three-quarters of McKinsey's AI high performers reported fundamentally redesigning workflows because of AI use, compared with one-quarter of other respondents. ^[1]

The operating mechanism: Faster tools do not remove queue delays, divided ownership or rework. Trace work from the original request to accepted business output, separating elapsed waiting from staff effort.

CFO question: Can the business show where paid operating capacity produces accepted results before approving more spend?

SOURCES 1 McKinsey, State of AI (2026) · 2 Freshworks, Complexity (2025)
3 NIST MEP, Polycor case (2025) · 4 Google DORA, AI report (2025)

What this looks like when it works

The work changes with the problem. The standard does not: make the real situation clear, get the stalled decisions made, and leave the result in a form the team can keep running.

PRIOR OPERATING RESULTS

CAPITAL DECISION QUALITY

\$8.5M one-year infrastructure buy list became a three-year investment plan with about **\$3M** lower projected spend.

The plan moved the decision from products and price to requirements, lifecycle risk, resilience, sequencing, and total cost. It earned CFO endorsement and anchored the next two budget cycles.

COST AND OUTPUT

IT went from **65 people to 42** while major incidents fell **60%**.

Broad incident MTTR fell 79%. The organization was being right-sized to financial reality; the operating model was rebuilt so the smaller team could perform better rather than simply absorb the same work.

SIGNED WORK TO REVENUE

ARR grew from **\$3.4M to \$13.8M** within one year while stale signed-contract backlog fell from roughly **\$22M to \$8M**.

Invoicing started at go-live, so the delivery model was rebuilt around scope, capacity, lifecycle, and stabilization to move signed work to billing instead of aging in queue.

REALIZED COST REDUCTION

Software licensing costs fell about **20%** and power use about **85%** after consolidating infrastructure sprawl.

Scattered infrastructure was consolidated onto fewer standardized platforms, reducing recurring licensing spend and power use.

WHAT YOU SHOULD EXPECT

- 1 A defined result and completion condition, not open-ended activity.
- 2 Evidence, assumptions, and remaining unknowns kept separate.
- 3 Decisions, owners, and dates made explicit where the work requires them.
- 4 Working artifacts and operating structure that survive handoff.
- 5 No tool sale, maturity score, or indefinite consultant dependency.

Have an IT-dependent problem that survived the last solution?

Send me the situation: nick@plainopsconsulting.com