ORDER

# DESIGNING AN OPERATING MODEL FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH & CAPITAL READINESS

CASE STUDY #3

VERSIÓN 1.0 | 2026

# CASE STUDY #3

Designing an Operating Model for Sustainable Growth & Capital Readiness

## Document Control

| | |
|---|---|
| **Document Name** | Case Study #3 — Operating Model for Sustainable Growth & Capital Readiness |
| **Prepared by** | ORDER |
| **Authorized by** | Juan Camilo Herrera |
| **Effective Date** | 06 July 2026 |
| **Supersedes** | N/A |

### Version History

| Versión | Date | Descripción | Autor |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | 06 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 — Business Context**
Organization · Industry · Stage · Constraints · Stakeholders

**03 — Initial Situation**
Symptoms · Consequences · Strategic Risks

**04 — Root Cause**
Diagnosis · Discoveries · Connections · Hypotheses · Fundamental Cause

**05 — Intervention Strategy**
Philosophy · Principles · Alternatives

**06 — Solution Architecture**
Executive Model · Governance · Capability · Reporting · Readiness · Founder Transition

**07 — Execution**
Assessment · Design · Integration · Translation · Adoption

**08 — Outcomes**
Operational · Strategic · Commercial · Organizational · Capability

**09 — Assets Created**
Institutional Operating System · Frameworks · Models

**10 — Lessons**
Key principles · Structural insights

**11 — Reusability**
Applicability across industries and contexts

# CAPA 1 — Executive Summary

## Context

A founder-led professional services company had reached an important stage in its evolution. Revenue was growing steadily, demand continued increasing, and the business had established a strong reputation within its market. However, leadership recognized that future growth would require capabilities the organization had never been designed to support.

The company wanted to expand into larger contracts, develop strategic partnerships, and position itself for future investment opportunities. While commercial momentum existed, the underlying operating model remained heavily dependent on the founders, informal decision-making, and organically developed processes. The challenge was no longer generating growth. The challenge was becoming an organization capable of sustaining it.

## Problem

Although the business appeared successful externally, its internal architecture had not evolved at the same pace as its commercial ambitions.

- Critical knowledge remained concentrated within leadership.
- Strategic decisions relied on experience rather than structured governance.
- Operational visibility varied across functions.
- Performance reporting lacked executive consistency.
- Growth planning remained largely reactive.

From an investor's, strategic partner's, or institutional stakeholder's perspective, the organization represented significant execution risk despite healthy commercial performance. The business had become commercially attractive before becoming institutionally prepared.

## Intervention

ORDER designed a complete operating model focused on organizational maturity rather than operational efficiency alone. The intervention redefined governance, decision-making, strategic planning, operational visibility, executive reporting, capability ownership, growth governance, and organizational architecture into a single integrated operating model capable of supporting long-term expansion. Rather than preparing documents for investors, the objective became preparing the business itself.

## Result

Leadership transitioned from managing day-to-day complexity toward governing organizational capability.

- Decision-making became structured.
- Strategic planning became repeatable.
- Commercial growth aligned with operational capacity.
- Institutional credibility increased through stronger governance, executive visibility, and organizational coherence.

## Impact

The intervention fundamentally shifted how the organization operated. Instead of relying primarily on founder judgment and operational experience, the company developed an operating model capable of supporting larger opportunities, strategic partnerships, capital discussions, and future organizational scale without proportionally increasing complexity. The company became better prepared not only to grow—but to justify growth.

# CAPA 2 — Business Context

## Organization

The client operated within the professional services sector, delivering specialized solutions through a founder-led business model that had evolved organically over several years. The organization had successfully established market credibility through execution quality, customer relationships, and entrepreneurial leadership. Commercial demand continued increasing. However, internal systems reflected the company's early-stage origins rather than its future ambitions.

## Industry Environment

The market increasingly rewarded organizations capable of delivering predictable execution, governance maturity, and operational reliability.

- Larger customers expected structured operating models.
- Strategic partners required organizational transparency.
- Capital providers evaluated institutional capability alongside financial performance.

Growth increasingly depended upon organizational sophistication rather than commercial effort alone.

## Business Stage

The company occupied an important transitional phase. It had moved beyond startup uncertainty but had not yet reached institutional maturity.

- Increasing commercial complexity.
- Larger customer opportunities.
- Higher operational demands.
- Growing leadership responsibilities.
- More strategic decisions.
- Greater organizational interdependence.

The operating model originally designed for entrepreneurial agility had become increasingly insufficient for sustained expansion.

## Constraints

- The organization needed to continue operating while transformation occurred.
- Leadership capacity remained limited.
- Resources had to be allocated carefully.
- Governance improvements could not reduce execution speed.
- Any operating model introduced needed to strengthen flexibility rather than bureaucracy.

The objective was institutionalization without unnecessary complexity.

## Stakeholders

**Founders**

Seeking sustainable growth without becoming permanent operational bottlenecks.

**Leadership Team**

Requiring clearer decision authority, visibility, accountability, and strategic alignment.

**Operational Teams**

Needing structured priorities, clearer ownership, and improved coordination across functions.

**Strategic Partners**

Expecting greater organizational maturity and execution confidence.

**Future Investors and Capital Providers**

Requiring evidence that the organization possessed the governance, reporting, and operational capability necessary to responsibly manage accelerated growth.

---

# CAPA 3 — Initial Situation

The organization exhibited many characteristics commonly associated with successful founder-led businesses approaching their next stage of development.

- Growth existed.
- Execution remained strong.
- Customer relationships continued expanding.

However, beneath these positive indicators, increasing structural tension had begun emerging. The business functioned well largely because experienced leadership continuously compensated for organizational limitations. Rather than operating through institutional capability, the organization relied heavily upon founder intervention.

## Observable Symptoms

- Strategic priorities frequently shifted as leadership responded to emerging opportunities.
- Executive discussions often revisited previously resolved decisions because governance mechanisms remained informal.
- Operational reporting varied significantly across business functions.
- Business performance could not always be evaluated using consistent executive information.
- Planning horizons remained relatively short despite increasingly long-term commercial commitments.
- As complexity increased, organizational coordination required progressively more founder involvement.

### Organizational Consequences

- Decision velocity slowed as leadership accumulated additional operational responsibilities.
- Cross-functional alignment became increasingly dependent upon direct communication rather than established operating systems.
- Resource allocation became more reactive than strategic.
- Organizational learning remained largely implicit instead of becoming institutional knowledge.
- Growth increasingly required additional leadership effort rather than improved organizational capability.

### Strategic Risks

While none of these issues individually threatened immediate business continuity, together they represented substantial long-term constraints.

- Larger commercial opportunities would demand stronger governance.
- Strategic partnerships would require greater operational transparency.
- Capital discussions would require institutional confidence rather than founder credibility alone.

Most importantly, continued organizational growth without corresponding operating maturity would gradually increase complexity faster than capability. The business risked becoming progressively harder to scale despite becoming increasingly successful.

---

## CAPA 4 — Root Cause

ORDER deliberately avoided diagnosing the situation as an operational efficiency problem.

- The organization already executed effectively.
- Customers remained satisfied.
- Commercial performance remained healthy.

The underlying issue therefore had to exist elsewhere.

The intervention began by distinguishing between organizational performance and organizational maturity. Although closely related, they are fundamentally different concepts.

**Performance** describes what an organization achieves today. **Maturity** determines what it will be capable of achieving tomorrow.

The client had successfully built performance. It had not yet institutionalized maturity. This distinction became the foundation of the entire diagnostic process.

## Diagnostic Hypothesis

The initial hypothesis proposed that the organization had reached the limits of an entrepreneurial operating model. Not because the model was poorly designed—but because the organization itself had evolved beyond the conditions for which it had originally been created. The business had grown. Its architecture had not.

## What We Discovered

As the diagnosis progressed, a different picture emerged. The organization's greatest limitation was not execution quality. Nor was it operational discipline. The limitation was that the business had evolved faster than the management system responsible for governing it. Growth had been cumulative. Institutional capability had not. The company continued operating through entrepreneurial logic while attempting to pursue institutional objectives. That mismatch explained nearly every symptom observed during the assessment.

## Connections Identified

Rather than isolated problems, ORDER identified a reinforcing system.

- Commercial success generated additional complexity.
- Additional complexity increased founder dependency.
- Founder dependency slowed strategic decision-making.
- Reduced strategic capacity delayed organizational development.
- Delayed organizational development increased operational reliance on founders.

The organization had entered a self-reinforcing cycle where growth continuously produced more complexity than capability.

## Hypotheses Rejected

> **"The organization needs more managers."**
> Rejected. Leadership bandwidth was constrained because governance was informal, not because managerial capacity was insufficient.

> **"The company needs better reporting software."**
> Rejected. Technology would improve visibility but would not establish executive discipline or decision architecture.

> **"The founders simply need to delegate more."**
> Rejected. Delegation without clearly defined governance only redistributes uncertainty. Authority must follow architecture.

> **"Capital is the next logical step."**
> Rejected. External capital amplifies the strengths and weaknesses of an organization. Without institutional readiness, investment would accelerate structural problems rather than solve them.

### The Fundamental Cause

Ultimately, the intervention concluded that the organization lacked an operating model capable of translating entrepreneurial success into institutional capability. The business possessed commercial momentum. It lacked executive infrastructure. Growth readiness and capital readiness therefore depended on the same underlying challenge: designing an organization that could consistently produce high-quality decisions independently of its founders. This became the central design objective.

---

## CAPA 5 — Intervention Strategy

### Design Philosophy

> Capital does not professionalize organizations. Professional organizations attract capital.

Therefore, the intervention focused on strengthening the internal conditions that create long-term institutional confidence.

### Strategic Principles

**1. Institutional capability before institutional funding**
Financial readiness follows organizational readiness. Governance, visibility, accountability, and execution maturity precede investment.

**2. Governance should reduce dependence, not increase bureaucracy**
The objective was not additional process. The objective was better decisions with less executive friction.

**3. Executive visibility drives executive quality**
Leaders cannot govern what they cannot clearly observe. Visibility therefore became a strategic capability rather than a reporting exercise.

**4. Sustainable growth requires synchronized systems**
Commercial expansion, operational capacity, financial planning, governance, and leadership development had to evolve together.

**5. The founder becomes architect**
Leadership transitions from directing operations toward designing the conditions under which the organization continues evolving independently.

### Alternatives Considered

> **Raising capital immediately**
> Rejected. Institutional weaknesses would simply become more expensive after investment.

> **Creating additional management layers**
> Rejected. Hierarchy without governance merely slows decision-making.

> **Implementing isolated management tools**
> Rejected. Dashboards, CRMs, and project management software improve information flow but cannot substitute for organizational architecture.

The intervention therefore concentrated on redesigning the operating model rather than optimizing isolated functions.

---

## CAPA 6 — Solution Architecture

Rather than redesigning departments individually, ORDER designed a complete institutional operating model connecting governance, execution, leadership, planning, commercial growth, and organizational capability. Every component reinforced the others.

### Executive Operating Model

A new executive operating rhythm established structured cycles for strategic planning, operational review, financial oversight, commercial performance, capability development, and governance. Leadership shifted from reacting continuously toward governing deliberately.

**Strategic Planning**

↓

**Commercial Review**

↓

**Operational Review**

↓

**Financial Review**

↓

**Capability Review**

↓

**Governance Review**

↑ Return to Strategic Planning ↑

## Governance Architecture

Decision authority became explicit. Ownership, escalation paths, approval thresholds, and strategic responsibilities were formally defined. Governance reduced ambiguity without reducing agility.

| Decision Category | Decision Owner | Escalation Level | Approval Required | Strategic Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | Founder | Leadership Team | Founder | High |
| Commercial | Commercial Lead | Leadership Team | Leadership Team | Medium |
| Operational | Ops Lead | Founder | Ops Lead | Medium |
| Financial | Finance | Founder | Leadership Team | High |
| Capability | Leadership Team | Founder | Founder | High |
| Growth | Leadership Team | Founder | Leadership Team | High |

## Organizational Capability Framework

Instead of organizing improvement around departments, capability became the organizing principle. Critical organizational capabilities were identified, measured, and continuously strengthened.

- **Leadership** Strategic direction · Governance
  - **Governance** Decision rights · Accountability
    - **Commercial** Growth · Partnerships · Customers
      - **Operations** Execution · Delivery · Quality
        - **Knowledge** Institutional learning · Systems
          - **Continuous Improvement** Evolution · Adaptation

### Executive Reporting System

Leadership reporting was redesigned around executive decisions rather than operational activity. Reports became shorter, more strategic, and directly connected to organizational priorities.

### Capital Readiness Framework

Institutional readiness was translated into measurable dimensions. The framework evaluated governance maturity, operational consistency, reporting quality, strategic clarity, leadership dependency, organizational capability, and scalability.

### Founder Transition Architecture

Leadership responsibilities gradually shifted away from operational integration toward strategic oversight. The founder increasingly governed organizational evolution instead of daily execution.

Operational Leader
↓
System Builder
↓
Executive Architect
↓
Institutional Leader

---

## CAPA 7 — Execution

**Phase 1 — Institutional Assessment:** Existing governance structures, reporting systems, leadership responsibilities, planning mechanisms, commercial processes, and operational dependencies were mapped.

**Phase 2 — Operating Model Design:** The complete executive operating model was designed, including governance, reporting, decision architecture, strategic planning, capability ownership, and growth management.

**Phase 3 — System Integration:** Commercial, operational, financial, and strategic management systems were aligned into one coherent executive framework.

**Phase 4 — Operational Translation:** The architecture was translated into practical governance assets, executive routines, planning templates, reporting standards, decision protocols, and capability frameworks.

**Phase 5 — Leadership Adoption:** Leadership progressively transitioned toward operating through institutional systems instead of continuous founder coordination. Executive behavior evolved alongside organizational structure.

## CAPA 8 — Outcomes

### Operational

- Greater organizational predictability.
- Improved coordination across executive functions.
- Reduced dependency on informal communication.
- Stronger execution consistency.

### Strategic

- Institutionalized strategic planning.
- Clear governance structure.
- Improved executive decision quality.
- Better long-term resource allocation.

### Commercial

- Greater confidence during strategic partnership discussions.
- Improved credibility with enterprise clients.
- Stronger positioning for future investment opportunities.
- Better alignment between commercial growth and organizational capacity.

### Organizational

- Reduced founder dependency.
- Higher organizational maturity.
- Stronger cross-functional alignment.
- Improved leadership accountability.

### Capability

The organization's most significant improvement was not increased efficiency. It was increased institutional capacity. The company became capable of supporting larger opportunities because its internal architecture had evolved alongside its commercial ambition.

## CAPA 9 — Assets Created

The intervention produced a complete Institutional Operating System.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ◈ Executive Operating Model | ◈ Governance Framework | ◈ Decision Authority Matrix | ◈ Strategic KPI Architecture |
| ◈ Executive Reporting Standards | ◈ Organizational Capability Framework | ◈ Capital Readiness Assessment | ◈ Leadership Operating Rhythm |
| ◈ Risk Governance Matrix | ◈ Strategic Planning Framework | ◈ Founder Transition Roadmap | ◈ Institutional Maturity Model |

## CAPA 10 — Lessons

Organizations rarely become investment-ready by producing better presentations. They become investment-ready by becoming better organizations.

Institutional maturity is not created through documentation alone. It emerges when governance, decision-making, capability, and leadership reinforce one another consistently.

Perhaps the strongest lesson was that sustainable growth depends less on entrepreneurial energy than on organizational architecture.

The most valuable businesses are not those capable of growing quickly. They are those capable of continuing to grow without continually increasing executive dependency.

## CAPA 11 — Reusability

Although developed for a founder-led professional services organization, the operating model is broadly transferable.

| | |
|---|---|
| SaaS companies preparing for Series A or growth funding. | Consulting and advisory firms. |
| Marketing and creative agencies. | Technology startups. |
| Hospitality groups. | Healthcare organizations. |
| Multi-location service businesses. | Professional partnerships. |
| Family-owned businesses transitioning toward professional management. | Organizations preparing for mergers, acquisitions, or strategic alliances. |

The industry changes. The ownership structure changes. The funding source changes. The underlying institutional principles do not.

> Sustainable growth is not primarily a commercial achievement—it is the consequence of an operating model capable of converting entrepreneurial success into enduring organizational capability.