



WHITE PAPER · OCTOBER 2026

When Execution Becomes a Financial Risk



Protecting investment, capacity, and operating performance in an economy increasingly intolerant of weak execution

Execution failure rarely announces itself. More often, capable people absorb it.

A milestone slips, and a leader jumps in to get it back on track. A vendor misses the mark, and the internal team quietly takes on work it never expected to own. A new system goes live but never fully lands, so employees create spreadsheets, side processes, and workarounds just to keep the operation moving. One unresolved decision becomes three more meetings. Escalations become routine. Before long, senior leaders are spending their time connecting dots, clearing roadblocks, and holding together work the operating model itself should be carrying.

For a while, that effort can look like resilience.

It can also hide the fact that the operating model is no longer converting effort into value.

The investment remains active. People remain busy. The initiative may still appear green on a dashboard. Yet the expected return moves farther away while cash, time, and leadership attention continue to be consumed.

That is when execution becomes a financial risk.

The current economic environment makes the distinction more important. The U.S. economy is still expanding: real GDP increased at a 2.2% annual rate in the second quarter of 2026. At the same time, September payroll growth slowed to 29,000, unemployment held at 4.2%, and August PCE inflation remained elevated at 3.4% year over year, with core PCE at 3.0%. In September, the Federal Reserve raised the federal funds target range to 3.75%–4.00% while continuing to describe economic activity and capital investment as solid.

This is not an argument for recession. It is an argument for selectivity. And in a more selective environment, **the burden of proof rises.**

That pressure is visible in how capital is being judged. McKinsey's 2026 investor survey found that 63% of respondents viewed return-on-invested-capital discipline as a hallmark of a quality capital allocator, while 54% looked for a clear capital-allocation framework. In healthcare, Deloitte found that nearly 60% of surveyed finance leaders were targeting operating-margin improvement of at least two percentage points over the next two years, yet

only 47% believed their organizations were well prepared to manage the pressures affecting margin.

The message is not that organizations should stop investing. They are still funding technology, AI, expansion, M&A integration, infrastructure, and transformation. The standard has changed: strategic importance alone is no longer enough. Continued investment increasingly requires a credible path to value.

SECTION 01

When the Cost Is Hiding in Plain Sight

Most organizations can identify the price of a new system, consultant, facility, vendor contract, or employee. They are less effective at identifying the cost of work that simply takes too long.

Execution drag rarely appears as a clean financial line item. It accumulates through vendor extensions, rework, implementation delays, duplicate effort, temporary staffing, executive escalation time, underused systems, deferred benefit, missed implementation windows, or assets that exist but cannot move efficiently through the operating model.

Each expense can look reasonable in isolation. The aggregate effect is not.

Execution drag compounds across four scarce assets:

Cash

Capacity

Time

Opportunity

That is what makes execution drag so difficult to see: capable people are remarkably good at compensating for it.

They step in. They bridge gaps. They smooth over friction, protect relationships, solve around broken processes, and make one more exception to keep an important commitment from failing.

In the moment, that looks like leadership. And often, it is.

The risk comes when extraordinary effort becomes the mechanism by which ordinary work gets done. When the organization depends on people continually compensating for structural weakness, heroics are no longer the exception.

They have become the operating model.

The financial question is not whether people are working hard enough. It is whether the system is converting that effort into value.

SECTION 02

Five Forms of Value Leakage

OPTIFY identifies five recurring ways execution drag becomes economic leakage.

01 Stalled Investment

Capital or operating spend continues while the expected benefit remains delayed, uncertain, or inaccessible.

Complex work takes time. The warning appears when elapsed time increases without proportional progress, or when no one can explain what specifically must happen for the investment to produce its intended value.

Delay alone is not failure. The risk begins when elapsed time increases without proportional progress.

02 Capacity Drain

Senior leaders and high-value employees compensate for deficiencies in structure, ownership, coordination, or decision-making.

This cost is easy to underestimate because leadership time is already budgeted.

This matters particularly in healthcare, where finance leaders are pursuing ambitious margin improvement while reporting uneven preparedness to manage the pressures affecting margin. When clinical, operational, technology, or finance leaders repeatedly perform translation, escalation, and follow-up that should occur elsewhere in the system, the organization is using scarce capacity to subsidize execution weakness.

Executive and specialist capacity is not free simply because it does not generate a new invoice.

03 Accountability Failure

A vendor, function, project owner, or sponsor remains involved without being accountable for a measurable outcome.

Status begins to replace accountability. Meetings occur. Updates are produced. Everyone may be working hard. Yet the relationship between activity, ownership, and outcome becomes increasingly difficult to establish.

Participation is not the same as accountability.

04 Decision Friction

Decisions move too slowly, sit at the wrong organizational level, or are repeatedly revisited.

Teams hedge. Vendors wait. Work continues against assumptions. Resources remain committed. Rework becomes more likely.

The cost of a delayed decision is often greater than the delay itself because uncertainty travels downstream.

05 Implementation Failure

An initiative reaches technical or contractual completion but fails to produce adoption, operating integration, behavioral change, or expected value.

Implementation science makes a similar distinction: implementation outcomes are distinct from service and client outcomes, including patient-level clinical outcomes. A solution can be deployed and still fail to become embedded in the environment it was meant to improve.

Technology installed is not the same as value realized. Strategy approved is not the same as execution sustained.

SECTION 03

Why Capable Teams Still Get Stuck

These forms of leakage often persist even inside capable organizations because the people closest to the problem are also operating inside the conditions that created it.

Internal leaders may be carrying recovery work on top of full-time responsibilities. They may lack authority across functions. They may have inherited decisions they did not make, or be asked to objectively reassess a vendor, system, or program they helped select.

Over time, accumulated history can blur the difference between what happened, what people believe happened, what an agreement actually requires, and what the organization is doing now.

The following cases are illustrative of that pattern, not a representative sample.

CASE 01 · LARGE HEALTHCARE ORGANIZATION

~2.5 yrs issue unresolved before recovery	~5 wks to resolution	0 replacement technology procurements
---	------------------------------------	---

At a large healthcare organization, a technology and vendor issue had remained unresolved for approximately 2.5 years. More than a dozen internal stakeholders across multiple functions and external vendor resources had been involved.

The recovery did not require replacement technology. It required returning to the existing agreement, separating assumptions from contractual obligations, clarifying ownership, and holding the incumbent vendor accountable for delivery. The issue was resolved in approximately five weeks, and the project closed without executing a replacement technology procurement.

The lesson is not that organizations should never replace technology or vendors. It is that they should not buy their way out of an accountability problem before establishing what problem they actually have.

CASE 02 · GROWTH-STAGE HEALTHCARE TECHNOLOGY

~40% reduction in monthly operating burn	8 mos to achieve the reduction	27 → 12 team size, stabilized
---	--	---

A different form of leakage appeared at a growth-stage healthcare technology company. Monthly operating burn was reduced by approximately 40% over eight months through disciplined changes to staffing, vendor spend, tools and data costs, global contracting, and executive structure. The team had grown from approximately four people to 27 before stabilizing around 12.

The reduction did not come from one dramatic cut. It came from repeatedly asking what the company actually needed to deliver the work, and what it was funding that no longer supported that objective.

Once the right operating and technical team was established, the MVP was delivered on the second committed delivery date.

Financial discipline and execution discipline were not competing priorities. They reinforced each other.

CASE 03 · SPECIALTY EQUIPMENT BUSINESS

~6 wks to recovery after ~2.5 years stalled	610 products brought under control	15% → 85% owner time on revenue-producing work (owner estimate)
--	--	--

A third example involved a specialty equipment business with more than \$1.1 million in inventory distributed across four warehouses. A commerce and operating initiative had remained stalled for approximately 2.5 years.

Recovery took approximately six weeks. The work established a governed population from 622 source records, created control across 610 products, recovered 394 images, and produced 513 activation candidates. A digital commerce channel that had not previously existed was brought live.

The operating redesign also changed how the owner spent time. The owner estimated that direct revenue-producing activity increased from roughly 15% before the intervention to approximately 85% afterward as automation, dashboarding, and operating handoff reduced day-to-day administrative involvement.

That does not mean \$1.1 million of inventory became realized revenue. It means existing economic value that had been trapped inside an unreliable operating system was brought into a governed, sellable environment while owner capacity shifted toward higher-value activity.

Across all three examples, recovery began with the same move:

Not adding more. Establishing what was true.

SECTION 04

From Diagnosis to Decision: The OPTIFY STAR Framework

Once value leakage is visible, leadership has to decide what happens next. Continuing to manage symptoms is itself a choice.

The **OPTIFY STAR Framework** provides four executive actions.

S	Stop End work that no longer justifies its cost, risk, effort, or strategic relevance. Continuing because the organization has already invested heavily is not discipline. It is sunk-cost behavior. Research on escalation of commitment has long documented the tendency to continue investing in a course of action after negative results, particularly when decision-makers feel responsible for the original choice.
T	Turn Around Recover value from an investment that remains relevant but has become stalled, structurally weak, or poorly governed.
A	Accelerate Add targeted capacity, authority, governance, or decision support when the underlying initiative is sound and faster execution can create disproportionate value.
R	Raise Elevate an unresolved issue to the level of authority capable of resolving it. Depending on the environment, that may mean executive leadership, finance, legal, the board, vendor leadership, compliance, clinical governance, or medical staff leadership.

The sequence matters: identify where value is leaking, then decide whether the work should be Stopped, Turned Around, Accelerated, or Raised. Only after that decision should the organization determine what additional resources, technology, vendors, or capital are justified.

Otherwise, more investment may simply reinforce the same operating conditions that created the problem.

SECTION 05

What Disciplined Intervention Looks Like

STAR is a decision engine, not the intervention itself. Once leadership determines the right action, the work becomes operational.

A credible intervention should make an already burdened organization simpler, not more complicated. It begins by establishing operational truth: what has been promised, what has actually happened, where decisions sit, what the organization is spending, what value remains recoverable, and what is preventing movement.

From there, the work should quantify the consequence of continued underperformance, separate symptoms from root causes, clarify ownership and decision rights, and narrow attention to the issues that materially affect value.

One economically important question should come first.

Can value be recovered from what the organization already owns before it buys something else?

That may mean enforcing an existing agreement before replacing a vendor. Simplifying an operating model before increasing headcount. Governing existing data before purchasing another platform. Stabilizing workflow before automating it.

AI can accelerate parts of this work by compressing analysis, reconciling large information sets, identifying patterns, and surfacing inconsistencies. But a model can identify an execution problem. It cannot make an organization resolve it. That still requires judgment, authority, accountability, and human leadership.

The goal of intervention is restored operating control, not permanent external dependency.

A disciplined recovery should leave the organization with clear ownership, measurable outcomes, defined 30/60/90-day priorities, and an explicit determination of whether internal leadership can sustain the work after stabilization.

A recovery that works only while the external intervention remains in the room is not yet a durable recovery.

SECTION 06

The Economic Question Executives Should Ask Earlier

Not every delayed initiative is a crisis. What matters is recognizing when reasonable friction has become persistent value leakage.

The question is not:

Are we still working on it?

It is:

Is this investment still producing a credible path to value, and if not, what are we prepared to do about it?

That is the point where execution becomes financial stewardship.

Because in a more selective operating environment, the expensive question is no longer whether an organization can afford to invest.

It is whether it can afford to keep funding work that is not moving.



About OPTIFY

OPTIFY provides principal-led operating intervention for organizations where critical execution has stalled, accountability has weakened, or leadership capacity is insufficient to regain control.

The **Operational Reset** is a contained intervention designed to establish operational truth, identify value leakage, clarify ownership, and create a 30/60/90-day recovery path. The objective is to help leadership make a sound economic decision, recover value where it can still be recovered, and return ownership to the people who must carry the work forward.

Start a conversation: optifyedge.com

SOURCES

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, *GDP, Third Estimate, Second Quarter 2026*, September 30, 2026.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *The Employment Situation, September 2026*, October 2, 2026.

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, *Personal Income and Outlays, August 2026*, September 30, 2026.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, *FOMC Statement*, September 16, 2026.

McKinsey & Company, *What Matters Most to Investors in 2026 and What It Means for Companies*, June 25, 2026.

Deloitte Center for Health Solutions, *2026 Healthcare CFO Research Series*, August 12, 2026.

Staw, B. M., *Knee-Deep in the Big Muddy: A Study of Escalating Commitment to a Chosen Course of Action*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1976.

Proctor, E. et al., *Outcomes for Implementation Research: Conceptual Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda*, *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 2011.

OPTIFY case evidence. Client identities withheld. Quantitative outcomes are presented only where supported by operating records or explicitly identified as owner estimates.