ORDER

DESIGNING A BUSINESS TURNAROUND FOR ORGANIZATIONAL RECOVERY & LONG-TERM VIABILITY

CASE STUDY #3

VERSIÓN 1.0 | 2026

CASE STUDY #3

Designing a Business Turnaround for Organizational Recovery & Long-Term Viability

Document Control

Document Name	Case Study #3 — Designing a Business Turnaround for Organizational Recovery & Long-Term Viability
Prepared by	ORDER
Authorized by	Juan Camilo Herrera
Effective Date	08 July 2026
Supersedes	N/A

Version History

Versión	Date	Descripción	Autor
1.0	08 July 2026	Initial document release.	Juan Camilo Herrera

Executive Statement

This document establishes the strategic analysis, business architecture, and solution framework developed for the business scenario presented herein. It is prepared within the framework of ORDER's Strategic Intervention methodology and responds to the objective of demonstrating the firm's capabilities in business diagnosis, organizational design, venture creation, and transformation. It applies exclusively to the scope, assumptions, and context described within this document and is intended for portfolio, educational, and capability demonstration purposes. Its content is non-binding and does not constitute a contractual commitment or implementation requirement.

Core Structure

01 — Executive Summary
Context · Problem · Intervention · Result · Impact

02 — Opportunity Context
Organization · Environment · Stage · Constraints · Stakeholders

03 — Initial Situation
Symptoms · Consequences · Strategic Risk

04 — Root Cause
Discovery · Connections · Rejected Hypotheses · Structural Constraint

05 — Intervention Strategy
Principles · Approach

06 — Solution Architecture
Viability Framework · Portfolio Matrix · Recovery Model · Governance · KPI · Roadmap

07 — Execution
Assessment · Stabilization · Restructuring · Integration · Governance · Preparation

08 — Outcomes
Financial · Operational · Commercial · Organizational · Strategic

09 — Assets Created
Turnaround System · Frameworks · Models

10 — Lessons
Key principles · Structural insights

11 — Reusability
Applicability across industries and contexts

CAPA 1 — Executive Summary

Context

A privately held company operating within a mature B2B industry had experienced several years of sustained commercial growth before entering a prolonged period of organizational decline.

Revenue growth slowed considerably.

Margins compressed.

Operational complexity continued increasing despite stagnant commercial performance.

Leadership responded through incremental cost reductions, isolated restructuring initiatives, and tactical operational improvements.

None produced meaningful recovery.

The business remained operational.

Its long-term viability became increasingly uncertain.

The challenge was no longer improving performance.

It was restoring the organization's ability to survive, stabilize, and eventually return to sustainable growth.

Problem

The company's deterioration did not originate from a single catastrophic event.

Rather, it resulted from the cumulative effect of strategic drift, organizational complexity, declining operational efficiency, fragmented decision-making, and an increasingly misaligned commercial model.

Leadership focused primarily on managing immediate financial pressure while deeper structural weaknesses continued expanding.

Every quarter required greater managerial effort simply to preserve existing performance.

The organization had entered a cycle where complexity increased faster than capability.

Without structural intervention, further deterioration appeared increasingly likely.

Intervention

ORDER designed a comprehensive Business Turnaround Architecture focused on restoring organizational viability before pursuing renewed growth.

The intervention integrated strategic reassessment, financial stabilization, commercial restructuring, organizational redesign, governance reform, operating model transformation, leadership alignment, and execution governance into one coordinated recovery program.

Rather than reducing costs alone, the objective became rebuilding the organization's capacity to create sustainable value.

Result

The company transitioned from reactive crisis management toward structured organizational recovery.

- Leadership regained strategic visibility.
- Commercial priorities became focused.
- Organizational complexity declined.
- Operational coordination improved.
- Financial discipline strengthened.

The business established the institutional conditions necessary to stabilize performance before pursuing future expansion.

Impact

The intervention fundamentally changed the trajectory of the organization.

Instead of continuously managing decline, leadership began governing recovery.

Short-term stabilization evolved into long-term organizational resilience.

The turnaround did not simply preserve the business.

It repositioned it for its next stage of sustainable evolution.

CAPA 2 — Opportunity Context

Organization

The business operated within an established B2B market characterized by increasing competitive pressure, changing customer expectations, rising operating costs, and narrowing margins.

The company employed approximately 180 professionals across multiple business functions and had developed a diversified customer portfolio over more than a decade of operations.

Although commercial credibility remained strong, internal organizational capability had gradually deteriorated beneath the surface.

The company had grown organically.

Its operating architecture had not evolved accordingly.

Business Environment

The broader market increasingly rewarded organizations capable of combining operational efficiency, strategic agility, disciplined execution, and customer responsiveness.

Competitors adopted new technologies, improved operating models, strengthened partnerships, and redesigned commercial approaches.

Meanwhile, the organization continued relying on structures originally designed for a significantly smaller business.

Competitive conditions accelerated organizational weaknesses that had previously remained manageable.

Business Stage

The company occupied one of the most challenging stages within the corporate lifecycle.

It no longer required growth.

It required recovery.

Leadership needed to simultaneously:

- Stabilize financial performance.
- Preserve customer relationships.
- Maintain employee confidence.
- Restore organizational discipline.
- Redesign strategic direction.
- Protect future competitiveness.

Every decision carried immediate operational consequences.

Constraints

Several constraints significantly shaped the turnaround.

- Financial resources remained limited.
- Leadership capacity was increasingly consumed by daily operations.
- Employee uncertainty continued rising.
- Customer confidence required protection.
- Existing operations had to continue throughout transformation.
- Recovery initiatives needed to generate measurable improvements rapidly without sacrificing long-term institutional development.

The intervention therefore demanded disciplined prioritization rather than broad organizational change.

Stakeholders

The recovery directly affected:

- Executive leadership.
- Board representatives.
- Department managers.
- Operational teams.
- Commercial leadership.
- Customers.
- Strategic partners.
- Financial stakeholders.

Each group evaluated success differently.

ORDER therefore designed the turnaround around one shared objective:

> Restoring organizational viability through institutional capability rather than temporary financial correction.

CAPA 3 — Initial Situation

At the beginning of the engagement, the organization remained commercially active but strategically exhausted.

Leadership spent the majority of its time responding to operational emergencies rather than directing long-term recovery.

Departments functioned independently.

Strategic priorities shifted frequently.

Execution quality varied significantly across business units.

Although customers continued purchasing, profitability steadily declined.

The business remained functional.

Its organizational health steadily deteriorated.

Observable Symptoms

Multiple recurring patterns appeared.

- Revenue growth had plateaued.
- Gross margins continued declining.
- Operating costs increased faster than revenue.
- Decision-making became increasingly centralized.
- Projects regularly exceeded planned budgets.
- Resource allocation lacked strategic discipline.
- Customer profitability varied significantly.
- Commercial efforts remained fragmented.
- Cross-functional coordination weakened.
- Organizational morale declined.

Every department attempted local improvements.

None addressed the underlying systemic condition.

Organizational Consequences

The cumulative effect proved increasingly damaging.

- Leadership focused primarily on preserving existing operations.
- Innovation slowed.
- Strategic initiatives stalled.
- Commercial teams pursued short-term revenue rather than profitable growth.
- Operational teams prioritized immediate delivery over continuous improvement.
- Managers increasingly optimized departmental performance while overall organizational performance continued deteriorating.

The company gradually lost its ability to adapt.

Strategic Risk

Without intervention, leadership faced several escalating risks.

- Continued margin erosion.
- Declining competitiveness.
- Increasing organizational complexity.
- Reduced strategic flexibility.
- Higher employee turnover.
- Customer attrition.
- Progressive institutional deterioration.

The greatest danger was not immediate insolvency.

It was entering a prolonged state of organizational stagnation from which recovery would become progressively more difficult.

CAPA 4 — Root Cause

ORDER deliberately resisted treating the situation as a financial problem.

Declining profitability was visible.

Weak cash generation was measurable.

Margin compression was evident.

None represented the true origin of the deterioration.

They were consequences.

The intervention therefore began with a different question:

> What conditions allowed every visible symptom to emerge simultaneously?

Rather than investigating financial statements in isolation, ORDER mapped the organization as an interconnected business system.

- Commercial strategy.
- Operating model.
- Governance.
- Leadership.
- Decision architecture.
- Resource allocation.
- Capability development.
- Execution.

The objective was not identifying where performance had declined.

It was identifying why the organization had progressively lost its ability to recover.

What We Discovered

The diagnosis revealed that the company had not experienced a single business crisis.

It had accumulated dozens of small strategic compromises over several years.

None appeared significant individually.

Collectively, they fundamentally altered the organization's operating logic.

- Growth initiatives continued despite declining profitability.
- New products were introduced despite increasing operational complexity.
- Management layers expanded while decision quality declined.
- Commercial priorities multiplied while strategic focus diminished.

The business continuously became larger.

It did not become stronger.

Leadership unknowingly optimized expansion while institutional capability gradually deteriorated.

Systemic Connections

The organizational map revealed several reinforcing loops.

- Declining profitability increased pressure for short-term revenue.
- Short-term revenue encouraged acceptance of lower-quality opportunities.
- Lower-quality opportunities increased operational complexity.
- Greater complexity reduced execution consistency.
- Execution inconsistency required additional management intervention.
- Leadership attention shifted toward operational firefighting.
- Strategic development slowed.
- Organizational capability stagnated.

The business entered a self-reinforcing cycle where every attempt to preserve performance gradually weakened long-term viability.

Hypotheses Rejected

Several common turnaround assumptions were intentionally discarded.

> **"The organization simply needs aggressive cost reduction."**
> Rejected. Cost reductions without strategic redesign would temporarily improve financial performance while leaving structural weaknesses intact.

> **"Revenue growth alone will solve profitability."**
> Rejected. Accelerating commercial activity inside an inefficient operating model would amplify existing structural problems.

> **"Replacing leadership is the primary solution."**
> Rejected. Leadership operated within an architecture that no longer supported effective decision-making. Replacing individuals without redesigning the system would produce similar outcomes.

> **"Technology modernization will restore competitiveness."**
> Rejected. Technology enhances capability. It does not create strategic coherence.

The Structural Constraint

The intervention concluded that the organization had gradually lost alignment between strategy, commercial activity, operating capability, governance, and resource allocation.

The business continued operating as though growth remained its primary objective.

Its actual priority had become restoring institutional viability.

Leadership therefore required more than restructuring.

It required a completely different business architecture.

Recovery would only become sustainable once every major organizational system supported the same strategic objective.

CAPA 5 — Intervention Strategy

ORDER designed the turnaround around one central principle:

> Recovery should rebuild institutional capability, not merely restore short-term financial performance.

Temporary financial improvements rarely create durable businesses.

Institutional capability does.

The intervention therefore prioritized organizational recovery before renewed expansion.

Strategic Principles

1. Stabilize before optimizing

Operational stability became the first priority. Organizations cannot optimize systems that remain structurally unstable.

2. Protect value before creating new value

Rather than aggressively pursuing expansion, leadership first protected existing customers, critical capabilities, strategic relationships, and organizational knowledge.

3. Complexity must decrease before performance increases

Reducing unnecessary organizational complexity generated significantly greater leverage than adding new initiatives.

4. Governance replaces improvisation

Executive decisions became governed through structured prioritization, financial discipline, and institutional accountability.

5. Recovery requires organizational alignment

Financial recovery, commercial recovery, operational recovery, and leadership recovery became coordinated rather than managed independently.

Alternatives Considered

Several traditional turnaround approaches were intentionally rejected.

> **Across-the-board budget reductions**
>
> Rejected. Uniform cuts destroy both productive and unproductive capability simultaneously.

> **Large-scale workforce reduction**
>
> Rejected. The objective was preserving critical institutional capability while redesigning organizational efficiency.

> **Commercial expansion without restructuring**
>
> Rejected. Increasing demand inside a structurally misaligned organization accelerates deterioration.

The intervention therefore concentrated on rebuilding the business architecture supporting long-term organizational viability.

CAPA 6 — Solution Architecture

ORDER designed an integrated Turnaround Architecture connecting financial stabilization, organizational restructuring, commercial redesign, governance, and execution into one coordinated recovery system.

Business Viability Framework

The organization was evaluated across every capability required for long-term sustainability.

Strategic Position Market relevance

↓

Commercial Health Revenue quality

↓

Financial Stability Liquidity & margins

↓

Operational Capability Execution consistency

↓

Governance Decision discipline

↓

Organizational Resilience Adaptability

Strategic Portfolio Matrix

Products, services, customers, initiatives, and investments were evaluated according to profitability, strategic contribution, operational complexity, and long-term value.

Leadership gained an objective basis for prioritization.

High Strategic Value / High Profitability Core assets

↓

Maintain Preserve & protect

↓

Optimize Improve efficiency

↓

Restructure Redesign

↓

Exit Discontinue

Organizational Recovery Model

Critical organizational capabilities were preserved while redundant complexity was systematically removed.

Capability—not hierarchy—became the organizing principle.

Turnaround Governance Model

Executive governance introduced structured review cycles covering:

- Liquidity.
- Commercial performance.
- Operational execution.
- Strategic initiatives.
- Organizational health.
- Risk.
- Recovery milestones.

Recovery became governed rather than improvised.

Transformation KPI System

Leadership monitored recovery using both financial and institutional indicators.

Examples included:

- Cash conversion.
- Gross margin.
- Operating efficiency.
- Customer retention.
- Delivery consistency.
- Organizational capacity.
- Decision velocity.
- Strategic initiative completion.

Recovery became measurable across multiple organizational dimensions rather than through profitability alone.

Recovery Roadmap

The turnaround followed one integrated progression.

Stabilization Immediate protection

↓

Restructuring Strategic redesign

↓

Operational Alignment Execution integration

↓

Commercial Recovery Revenue quality

↓

Institutional Strengthening Capability building

↓

Sustainable Growth Long-term viability

Every initiative reinforced the next stage of organizational recovery.

CAPA 7 — Execution

Implementation followed six coordinated phases.

Phase 1 — Organizational Assessment
ORDER mapped financial performance, commercial structure, operational capability, governance, leadership responsibilities, organizational dependencies, and execution dynamics.

Phase 2 — Stabilization
Immediate actions protected liquidity, customer continuity, critical organizational capabilities, and executive decision quality.

Phase 3 — Strategic Restructuring
The business portfolio, operating model, organizational design, governance mechanisms, and commercial priorities were redesigned around long-term viability.

Phase 4 — Organizational Integration
New governance structures, decision protocols, commercial systems, operational routines, and performance management processes became integrated into daily execution.

Phase 5 — Recovery Governance
Leadership adopted structured executive reviews ensuring recovery remained disciplined, measurable, and strategically aligned.

Phase 6 — Sustainable Growth Preparation
Once organizational stability had been restored, the company established the institutional capabilities required to support future expansion without recreating previous structural weaknesses.

CAPA 8 — Outcomes

Financial Stabilization

- Improved financial visibility.
- Greater cash-flow discipline.
- Healthier operating margins.
- Better capital allocation.

Operational Stabilization

- Reduced organizational complexity.
- Higher execution consistency.
- Improved cross-functional coordination.
- More predictable operating performance.

Commercial Recovery

- Stronger customer portfolio quality.
- Improved commercial prioritization.
- Better alignment between sales and operational capacity.
- Increased strategic focus.

Organizational Recovery

- Clear governance.
- Stronger executive accountability.
- Reduced leadership dependency.
- Improved organizational resilience.

Strategic Capability

Perhaps the most significant outcome was that the organization regained the institutional capability to adapt.

Recovery became repeatable.

Future growth became sustainable.

CAPA 9 — Assets Created

The engagement produced a complete Turnaround Operating System including:

◈ Business Viability Assessment Framework	◈ Strategic Portfolio Matrix	◈ Recovery Roadmap	◈ Organizational Restructuring Framework
◈ Governance Architecture	◈ Executive Decision Protocols	◈ Financial Recovery Dashboard	◈ Commercial Recovery Framework
◈ Operational Alignment Model	◈ Turnaround KPI System	◈ Executive Review Rhythm	◈ Institutional Recovery Playbook

Turnaround System Portfolio

Grouped into six institutional layers:

Strategy
Repositioning · Portfolio · Direction

Finance
Liquidity · Margins · Discipline

Commercial
Portfolio quality · Prioritization

Operations
Efficiency · Consistency · Capacity

Governance
Decision · Accountability · Control

Recovery
Stabilization · Restructuring · Growth

Rather than isolated deliverables, every asset formed part of a single integrated turnaround operating system.

CAPA 10 — Lessons

Several important principles emerged throughout the turnaround design process.

Turnarounds rarely fail because organizations lack effort. They fail because recovery initiatives frequently optimize symptoms while preserving structural weaknesses.

The strongest organizations are not necessarily those that avoid deterioration. They are those capable of redesigning themselves before deterioration becomes irreversible.

Perhaps the most important lesson was that viability precedes growth. Organizations unable to consistently preserve value cannot sustainably create additional value.

Recovery therefore represents an architectural discipline rather than a financial exercise.

CAPA 11 — Reusability

Although designed around a business turnaround scenario, the methodology is broadly applicable across organizations experiencing structural deterioration or strategic transition.

The framework applies to:

Founder-led companies facing declining performance.	Family businesses undergoing restructuring.
Professional service firms.	Manufacturing organizations.
SaaS companies experiencing stalled growth.	Healthcare providers.
Multi-business groups.	Private equity portfolio companies.
Organizations preparing for transformation.	Companies requiring strategic repositioning.

Across every context, the principle remains consistent:

> Successful turnarounds are not achieved by fixing isolated problems. They are achieved by redesigning the organizational architecture that determines how the business creates, preserves, and compounds value over time.