PERSPECTIVE

Technology Innovation and the Operating Model Gap

Investor Brief

Bart de Graaff · BdG Advisory · May 2026

For investors evaluating AI-driven transformation, the critical variable is not technology capability but structural readiness. This brief presents a framework for assessing whether an organization's operating model, governance structure, and capital allocation approach are aligned with AI-era requirements.

Technology innovation does not just improve systems—it reshapes how value is created and how organizations operate. The Internet redefined distribution, Cloud centralized control and standardized operations, and AI is now beginning to influence how decisions are produced and executed within systems.

These shifts do not occur in isolation. Their impact emerges through convergence—when compute, intelligence, connectivity, and device capability reinforce each other. Control redistributes across the system: decisions move closer to where data is generated, systems become more autonomous, and coordination occurs across networks rather than from a single center.

For companies, this is not a technology adoption problem. It is a positioning problem.

Each wave creates new ecosystems. Control shifts toward those who own critical layers—platforms, infrastructure, data, or decision systems. Companies that succeed align themselves with these shifts. Those that fail continue to optimize within models that are already changing.

In practice, failure is rarely technical. It is structural.

Product development becomes reactive under commercial pressure. Governance expands and slows decisions. Capital is deployed ahead of delivery capability. New technologies are introduced, but incentives, accountability, and decision structures remain unchanged.

Technology capability increases. Execution reliability decreases.

This is the operating model gap.

Organizations adopt new capabilities without adapting how they operate. Strategy disconnects from execution. Governance designed for control constrains delivery. Commercial pressure overrides sequencing. Complexity increases while execution becomes less predictable.

AI accelerates this dynamic. By increasing system speed and removing operational slack, it exposes weaknesses that were previously masked. Questions that could be deferred—ownership of decisions, sequencing of execution, alignment between commitments and capacity, and control over data—become immediate constraints.

In this environment, structure becomes the primary determinant of outcomes. Capital concentrates control. Control shapes data. Data drives execution. Execution produces outcomes, and those outcomes attract further capital. This reinforcing loop explains why organizations scale what they are structurally designed to do—not what they intend to do.

AI amplifies this loop. Strong structures scale faster. Weak structures fail sooner.

This dynamic is observable across contexts. In venture-backed companies, commercial pressure fragments product. Revenue grows, but delivery complexity grows faster, constraining further growth. In large enterprises, governance introduced to manage risk slows execution even as technology capability improves. In AI adoption, organizations deploy working models but fail to integrate them into decision structures, resulting in partial automation and limited impact.

The constraint is not the technology.

It is the operating model.

For investors and boards, the implication is direct. The primary risk is not whether a company has strong technology or a compelling strategy. It is whether its structure allows it to execute under changing conditions. This includes how decision rights are defined, how incentives are aligned, how capital is deployed, and how product, commercial, and delivery capabilities are sequenced.

Most investment assessments focus on market, product, and team. Far fewer examine whether the organization is structurally capable of executing its strategy at scale.

That gap explains a significant portion of execution failure. The relevant questions are structural:

- Does governance support execution or slow it?
- Are incentives aligned with delivery reality?
- Is product controlled by roadmap or by deal pressure?
- Does capital deployment match execution capability?
- Is data ownership and decision authority clearly defined?

These are not secondary considerations. They determine whether a company can scale.

This is not a technology transition.

It is a structural transition.

Companies that recognize this reposition themselves within new ecosystems and adapt their operating models accordingly. Those that do not will continue to adopt new technologies while scaling structural misalignment.