

ORTENT WHITEPAPER

The Growth-Stage TOM

A Diagnostic for Boards and PE Ops

By Andrew Wyatt, Founder, Ortent Advisory Ltd



Four operating components. One of them is amber right now. This paper is designed to tell you which.

ortent.co • Version 1.0 • July 2026

CONTENTS

Executive summary	4
Why most SaaS operating models fail at scale	5
The 20-question diagnostic	8
The four operating components	12
Applied cross-industry examples	16
Before and after	20
Where the model breaks	22
Next steps	24

Take the diagnostic in Section 3 before reading Section 4. The framework explains what the diagnostic scores. The score tells you where you are.

Executive summary

Most growth-stage SaaS businesses do not have an operating model. They have a sales machine plus a founder plus a lot of goodwill.

That works to about £10M ARR. After that, the goodwill runs out. The founder cannot personally hold every function together. The sales machine is now shipping deals faster than the delivery function can keep up. The board asks "how is the business?" and gets a slide deck instead of an answer. The CEO promises to fix it in Q3. Q3 comes and goes.

This paper is a diagnostic. Twenty questions, grouped into four operating components: Governance, Commercial, Delivery, and Operating Discipline. It takes thirty minutes to run and ninety minutes to talk through with your leadership team. Every operating area of your business either has a named owner or it does not. Every risk is either scored or it is not. The diagnostic tells you where you actually are.

It does not replace strategy. It does not replace product-market fit. It does not tell you what to build. It tells you whether the machine underneath your growth can support the growth you already have, and the growth you are about to try to add.

Written from an operating perspective. Four exits over three decades (Lotus to IBM \$3.5B, Paragon to Phone.com \$500M, Apertio to Nokia \$240M, Clearswift to Lyceum £50M) plus COO and CGO seats across enterprise software, life sciences and digital health. Every observation is drawn from operating rooms, not consultant decks.

Run the diagnostic. Read the framework if the score prompts you to. If you want a second pair of eyes on the results, the last page tells you how to book a call.

Why most SaaS operating models fail at scale



A private equity director is on a diligence call with the CTO of a growth-stage SaaS business the fund is about to close on. The call goes well. Product roadmap is clear. Engineering is strong. Architecture defensible. Then the director asks one question.

Walk me through your IT stack. Every tool. Who owns it. What data flows through it. Who has access. When it was last reviewed.

The CTO opens a spreadsheet. Forty-eight rows. Then he scrolls back to the top and admits he is not sure it is complete. Marketing has its own tools. Sales has its own tools. Customer success has its own tools. People has its own tools. Nobody decommissioned anything. Nobody mapped what data goes where.

The diligence call ends politely. The valuation drops two days later.

This is not an IT problem. It is an operating model problem. The IT stack sprawl is the visible symptom. The invisible cause is that nobody owns the operating model. Nobody is accountable for it. The business grew a sales machine, a product roadmap, and a customer base, but nobody was ever asked to grow the operating model that would need to hold all three together at scale.

The failure pattern shows up in four consistent shapes.

One. The founder-led decision bottleneck.

Every important decision goes through the CEO. The CFO checks with the CEO before authorising a hire. The CRO checks with the CEO before adjusting the pricing on a specific deal. The Head of Product checks with the CEO before saying no to a customer feature request. This is fine at fifteen people. At eighty, it is why every function is one week behind. The operating model that would delegate authority does not exist.

Two. Sales-led everything.

The product roadmap gets built from the last three big deals. The customer success play-book gets built from the last two escalations. The pricing gets built from what the newest customer paid. The business is being run by whichever customer shouted last week. This is not a partner problem or a customer success problem. It is a lack of an architected commercial strategy. Without a defined commercial architecture, every function ends up serving Sales.

Three. Function creep without architecture.

Ops becomes RevOps. HR becomes People. Marketing becomes Growth. Product becomes Platform. Every quarter a new function name gets minted, usually because the incumbent leaves and the replacement rebrands. Nobody owns the operating model of the operating model. There is no defined shape into which each function fits. When something falls between functions, it stays fallen.

Four. AI-and-software confusion.

Every function head has bought an AI tool. Marketing has a copilot. Sales has a forecasting model. Customer success has a summariser. Engineering has a coding assistant. Each was bought by the function that needed it. Nobody at the CTO level maps how these tools interact with each other, or with the underlying customer data, or with the audit trail a regulator or PE partner might one day ask for. The AI stack is growing three times faster than the operating model that would govern it.

The operating model is the substrate. It is what everything else compounds on. Growth on a thin substrate compounds risk. Growth on a thick substrate compounds capability. The businesses that scale from £10M to £50M ARR without breaking are not the ones with the best product or the best sales team. They are the ones whose operating model was built to hold what the growth would put on top of it.

The next section is the diagnostic. Twenty questions. Take it before you read the framework.

The 20-question diagnostic

How to run this

Print it or fill it in on screen. Twenty questions. Five per operating component. Each question is answered Yes or No. Score one point per Yes. Zero per No. Twenty possible. There is no "sort of." If the answer is "sort of," that is a No.

Do it alone first. Then run it with your leadership team, independently, and compare scores at the end. The interesting conversations happen in the questions where you and your leadership team disagree.

Some of the questions are designed to force a discussion rather than a clean answer. That is deliberate. If a question needs to be talked through before you can score it Yes, the honest answer for now is No. The point of the diagnostic is to surface where clarity is missing. Debate is a signal, not a workaround.

Read the framework in the next section only after you have your score.

Governance

Q1 Can your board answer, in under one minute, which single operating area is currently the highest risk to the business?

Q2 Does every operating area of your business have one named person, who is accountable to the board, not just to the CEO?

Q3 In the last twelve months, has the board changed a decision because of what an operating owner said, rather than what the CEO said?

Q4 Does your risk register drive the quarterly review, or does the quarterly review generate the risk register?

Q5 If a private equity partner asked to see your operating model on a Tuesday morning, could you show it to them by Friday afternoon?

Commercial

Q6 Can you name the four partner-programme types you run separately, or have they collapsed into “our partner strategy”?

Q7 Do you know your partner-channel ARR percentage to within five points, and does that number match what your partners believe it is?

Q8 When a deal loses, do you know within a week whether it was product, pricing, positioning, or timing? Or does it get logged as “competitive loss”?

Q9 Is your CRO’s forecast built bottom-up from named opportunities with dated close plans, rather than top-down from an ARR growth target the board asked for?

Q10 Would a new commercial hire understand your ideal customer profile in fifteen minutes from your documented ICP, or would they need three coaching sessions with the CRO to piece it together?

Delivery

Q11 If a customer signs today, can you tell them the exact date they will be live, or is the honest answer “it depends”?

Q12 Is your net revenue retention growth driven by upsell into your existing base, rather than by not-churning?

Q13 Do your implementations follow a defined playbook, or does each customer implementation reinvent the shape based on who is running it?

Q14 When something breaks in production, does the person who found it own the fix, without a three-team triage before someone takes it on?

Q15 Can your customer success team name the three customers most at risk this quarter, why they are at risk, and what is being done about it?

Operating Discipline

Q16 If a PE diligence director asked you to walk through every IT tool your business uses, who owns it, what data it touches, and when it was last reviewed, could you produce that inventory in fifteen minutes?

Q17 Do you have a live inventory of every AI tool in use across the business, with a named function owner and a defined data scope for each, that you could produce within a day?

Q18 In the last ninety days, have you held a quarterly review that included an honest conversation about the amber operating areas, not just the ones that reported green?

Q19 Do your data flows have named owners, or do they exist because they have always existed and nobody wants to touch them?

Q20 Have you identified and documented your top three single-person operating dependencies, with either succession plans or knowledge-transfer commitments against each?

Scoring

One point per Yes. Zero per No. Twenty possible. Add up the totals by component (five possible per component) and overall.

Do not average part-scores. If a question is close to Yes but not quite, it is a No. The diagnostic is designed to force clarity, not to average it.

16-20 total. Your operating model is strong. Focus should be on optimisation and second-order risks. The framework will help you compare notes with peers.

11-15 total. Functional but exposed. There are two or three operating components where you are running on goodwill. Targeted rebuild required. The framework will tell you where to start.

5-10 total. Material risk. Your operating model rebuild is the priority ahead of any growth acceleration you have planned. Read the framework for what the components look like when they work. Then decide whether you rebuild in-house or bring in help.

0-4 total. Growth is not your biggest problem. Read *Where the model breaks* first. There are situations where a low score is a symptom of something else, and the operating model is the wrong intervention. Talk to someone before you start rebuilding.

Read the component totals as well as the overall. A business that scores 4/5 on three components and 0/5 on one still has an operating model problem. Growth will expose the weakest component first. A 15/20 with a 0/5 on Operating Discipline is a very different rebuild from a 15/20 spread evenly across all four.

If your team scored differently

Run the diagnostic again with your leadership team, alone, before you compare notes. The questions where the CEO scored Yes and the head of Delivery scored No are the interesting ones. Those are the questions where the board thinks the machine works and the operator running the machine knows it does not.

The four operating components



The operating model of a growth-stage SaaS business fits into four components. Governance. Commercial. Delivery. Operating Discipline. Each component has a job. Each component fails in a recognisable way. Each component interlocks with the other three, which is why fixing one in isolation rarely holds.

The diagnostic in the previous section maps five questions per component, twenty in total. What follows is what the diagnostic is built on. Read this after you have your score.

Governance

What it is. Governance is the layer that decides what the business is going to be, and how the board sees whether the business is becoming that. It is not the same as the board itself. It is the operating model of how the board and the executive team make decisions together.

What it does. Governance names owners. Every operating area of the business has one named person accountable to the board, not to the CEO. Governance sets the risk map. Every operating area is scored, green, amber, or acute. Governance runs the quarterly review. Every owner presents their area. Governance chooses what the board asks about. If the board is asking "how is the business," Governance has failed. If the board is asking "which area is amber and what is Sarah doing about it," Governance is working.

How it interlocks. Governance sets the frame the other three components operate inside. Commercial has a named owner because Governance named them. Delivery is reviewed against a defined risk score because Governance defined the score. Operating Discipline exists as a component because Governance said audit-readiness is worth reviewing every quarter. Without Governance, the other three components run informally.

Failure signal. The CEO opens board meetings with a slide deck instead of an operating overview. Two adjacent slides say contradictory things. Board decisions get made based on which director spoke last, not on which owner presented most rigorously. Nobody knows what the risk register looks like this quarter. When something goes wrong, everyone at the executive team is surprised.

Commercial

What it is. Commercial is the architecture of how the business goes to market. It is not the sales team. It is the operating model that makes the sales team's number achievable.

What it does. Commercial defines the ideal customer profile in enough detail that a new hire can quote it. Commercial separates partner programme types. There are usually four types running inside a scale-up: strategic alliances with named tier-one partners, ISV inte-

grations that ride the platform, reseller channels that shift transactional volume, and community or advocacy programmes that seed inbound. Each has a different economic model, a different enablement need, and a different reporting cadence. Commercial makes sure they are running as four programmes, not one collapsed thing. Commercial owns the forecast discipline. The CRO's forecast is built bottom-up from named opportunities with dated close plans. The board sees the forecast at the same time the CRO does.

How it interlocks. Commercial's ICP feeds Delivery's implementation playbook. Commercial's partner architecture feeds Operating Discipline's data-flow governance. Commercial's forecast discipline feeds Governance's quarterly review. When Commercial is weak, Delivery gets flooded with mis-fit customers, Operating Discipline gets asked to govern data flows it never knew about, and Governance loses forecast credibility.

Failure signal. The CRO's forecast is a target the board asked for divided by a probability. There is no defined ICP that could be handed to a new commercial hire. Partner announcements happen because a partner asked, not because the business had a partner architecture that pulled the partner in. When a deal loses, the entry in the CRM says "competitive."

Delivery

What it is. Delivery is the operating model of turning a signed contract into a live, retained, expanding customer. It includes onboarding, implementation, customer success, and technical operations.

What it does. Delivery has a defined playbook that every implementation follows. Not the same playbook for every customer, but the same shape. The steps are named. The dependencies are mapped. The go-live date is knowable at contract signature, not discovered after week six. Delivery owns net revenue retention as a real number, not a directional target. Delivery knows which customers are at risk this quarter, why, and what is being done about it. Delivery has a triage discipline. When something breaks in production, the operating model tells everyone who owns the fix, not just who noticed.

How it interlocks. Delivery inherits the customer from Commercial. Delivery reports to Governance every quarter on the state of the base. Delivery is the primary consumer of Operating Discipline: the audit-grade IT and data flows Delivery relies on are what Operating Discipline governs. When Delivery is weak, Commercial cannot honestly sell a defined go-live date, Governance sees NRR miss without knowing why, and Operating Discipline gets asked to fix problems that were actually caused upstream.

Failure signal. Implementations reinvent the shape based on which project manager is run-

ning them. Go-live dates slip. NRR is described as “healthy” without a decomposition into upsell versus not-churning. Customer success cannot name the three most-at-risk customers this quarter. Production incidents get triaged through three teams before someone owns the fix.

Operating Discipline

What it is. Operating Discipline is the platform that Governance, Commercial and Delivery all rest on. IT stack. AI stack. Data flows. Security posture. Audit readiness. Review cadence. It is not the CTO’s job. It is the operating model of the CTO’s job, which is a distinction most scale-ups miss until a PE partner or a regulator asks the question that reveals the gap.

What it does. Operating Discipline maintains the inventory. Every IT tool has a named owner, a defined purpose, a data scope, an access list, and a last-review date. Every AI tool that a function head buys goes through a defined process before it starts pulling customer or operating data. Every data flow has a named owner. Operating Discipline runs the quarterly audit. Not a security audit, an operating audit: which areas of the business could produce the requested inventory on demand this Tuesday.

How it interlocks. Operating Discipline is the substrate. Governance’s risk map runs on Operating Discipline’s audit inventory. Commercial’s partner data flows are governed by Operating Discipline’s rules. Delivery’s uptime and incident response run on Operating Discipline’s infrastructure. When Operating Discipline is weak, the other three components can be built beautifully and still fall over on the day someone asks to see the substrate.

Failure signal. Nobody can produce the IT inventory on demand. The AI stack is growing faster than the audit trail. When a PE partner or a regulator asks the audit question, the honest answer is “give us six weeks.”

The four together

Four components. Each with a job. Each with a failure signal. Each interlocked with the other three. The diagnostic is scored across these four components, five questions each, because a business that is strong on three and weak on one still has a broken operating model. Growth exposes the weakest component first. That is why the diagnostic is scored by component, not just as a total.

Applied cross-industry examples



Three anonymised examples. Financials rounded. Sector labels only. Drawn from thirty-five years of operating experience across growth-stage SaaS in enterprise software, life sciences, digital health, and AI-adjacent platforms. No client names. No confidential detail.

Example 1: PE-backed B2B SaaS, Series C, £40M ARR

The business had raised a Series C at £40M ARR eighteen months earlier. The board was PE-heavy: two operating partners and the fund's CFO. Growth was 45% year on year. Product-market fit was clear. Every quarter the board's opening question was the same: how do we sustain this?

The CEO had built the business from scratch and had never had to run a formal operating model. Governance was strong because the PE presence forced it. Every board meeting had a named agenda, a named owner presenting each item, and a defined risk register. The board could name the top three risks in the business without checking notes.

Commercial was where the operating model broke. The business had four partner programmes but internally called them one thing: "our partner strategy." A tier-one systems integrator was running strategic alliance engagements. A dozen ISVs were riding the platform on a revenue-share model. A network of resellers was shifting transactional volume in adjacent geographies. A user-group programme was seeding inbound. Four different economics, four different enablement needs, four different reporting cadences. All reported

to the CRO under one line item. The CRO could not tell the board which of the four was actually driving revenue.

Delivery was solid. Implementation playbook was defined. NRR was 118% and decomposed cleanly between upsell and not-churning.

Operating Discipline was mixed. IT stack inventory existed but was two quarters out of date. AI adoption had started in Marketing and Sales without a defined governance process. The CTO could produce the inventory in a week, not fifteen minutes.

*Diagnostic score: 14/20. Governance 5/5. Commercial 1/5. Delivery 5/5.
Operating Discipline 3/5.*

The rebuild focused on Commercial. Partner programme separation took ninety days. Each programme got a named owner, a distinct enablement track, a defined reporting cadence, and a bottom-up forecast. Within two quarters the CRO could tell the board which programme drove the previous quarter's ARR growth and which one was the leverage point for the next.

The lesson. High Governance often masks weak Commercial. The board asks the right questions and the risk register is well-maintained, but the operating model that Commercial needs to run has never been separated out from the sales team. Fixing Commercial did not require a new CRO. It required naming the four programmes as four programmes.

Example 2: Life Sciences platform

The business was a rules-based clinical pathway orchestration platform in the digital health space. Customers included large hospital systems, national insurers, and specialist provider groups across the US and UK. Regulated environment. Audit-grade requirements built into every deployment from day one.

Governance was strong. The board included two clinical leaders and a former regulator. Every operating area had a named owner. The quarterly review discipline was rigorous because the regulatory environment demanded it. Risk map was live and accurate.

Delivery was outstanding. Implementations followed a defined playbook, adapted for clinical setting but structurally identical. Go-live dates were knowable at contract signature. NRR was strong. Customer success knew which customers were at risk and what was being done about it.

Operating Discipline was the strongest component in the business. IT and data flows had

named owners. Access controls were codified. Every clinical decision the platform surfaced was traceable to a rule and a rule-owner. When a regulator or a payer asked the audit question, the answer came out of the operating model, not out of a panic.

Commercial was the weak component. Partner architecture was under-developed. Systems integrators in the healthcare space were a natural channel and the business had one strategic alliance. But there was no separation of ISVs, no reseller strategy, no defined community programme. The CRO's forecast was strong but the business was leaving channel-driven growth on the table.

*Diagnostic score: 15/20. Governance 5/5. Commercial 1/5. Delivery 5/5.
Operating Discipline 4/5.*

The rebuild extended the audit discipline that made Delivery world-class into Commercial partner architecture. The same rigour that governed clinical rule-management was applied to partner programme separation. Within eighteen months, partner-channel ARR moved from 12% to 34% of new bookings.

The lesson. A strong Operating Discipline component is transferable. The rigour that made one component world-class can be lifted into a weak component if the naming and ownership follow it. This business did not need a new Commercial thesis. It needed to apply its existing operating discipline to a component it had never governed formally.

Example 3: AI-adjacent scale-up

The business was a lab informatics platform serving genomics, pharmaceutical R&D, and academic research. Ecosystem was built around hyperscaler partnerships, tier-one ISV integrations, and named alliance partners in the clinical research and CDMO space. Growth was strong. The AI product line, launched via a subbrand, was landing well with buyers.

Governance was strong because the founders had built for scale from Series A. Named owners. Quarterly review discipline. Risk map live and honest.

Commercial was strong. Partner architecture was cleanly separated into four programmes, each with a named owner, a defined economic model, and a reporting cadence. ISV growth was 3x on the previous year. Strategic alliances were driving lighthouse deployments at named enterprises.

Delivery was good, occasionally excellent. Implementation playbook existed. NRR was 128%. Some customer-facing friction in the AI product line because the AI adoption path

was newer.

Operating Discipline was where the business had a gap. The AI stack had grown fast, from three tools to fourteen inside eighteen months. Each was bought by the function that needed it. The IT audit inventory covered the SaaS stack but had not been extended to cover the AI tools that were pulling customer and operating data in ways the audit had not anticipated. A PE partner asked the audit question and the honest answer was "give us four weeks."

Diagnostic score: 16/20. Governance 5/5. Commercial 4/5. Delivery 4/5. Operating Discipline 3/5.

The rebuild was Operating Discipline extending its audit inventory to cover the AI stack. Ninety days of naming: every AI tool, every data pull, every access list, every review date. Six months later the answer to the PE partner's question was "fifteen minutes."

The lesson. Growth can outpace the operating model even when the operating model is largely working. The AI adoption in this business had been faster than the operating discipline that would govern it. Nothing was broken. Nothing was going wrong. But the audit trail was not yet catching up. Fixing it before the audit was requested formally was cheaper than fixing it after.

Before and after



The CEO of a Series C B2B SaaS business had just closed her second board meeting of the quarter and was frustrated. The board's opening question had been "how are we doing?" and she had opened with a slide deck. The slide deck had six charts. Two of them contradicted each other. Neither the CEO nor the CFO could explain why. The board's supplementary questions had been about the charts, not the business. The meeting ran three hours.

She ran the twenty-question diagnostic alone that Friday. Scored 8/20. Governance 2/5. Commercial 3/5. Delivery 2/5. Operating Discipline 1/5. She ran the diagnostic again on Monday with her leadership team. Her team scored 6/20 on the same questions.

The three biggest gaps were on Governance, Delivery, and Operating Discipline. On Governance, only one operating area had a named owner and even that was a soft naming. On Delivery, implementation was reinventing the shape for every customer because the head of Delivery believed no two customers were alike. On Operating Discipline, the IT stack was in a spreadsheet nobody had updated in nine months.

The rebuild took ninety days.

Governance came first. Each operating area got a named owner accountable to the board. The CEO wrote the assignment memo in an afternoon. Every owner presented at the following board meeting. The board's supplementary questions were now about operating decisions, not about the shape of charts.

Delivery came second. Not a new playbook, an old playbook applied consistently. Two of the last five implementations were reviewed against a proposed shape. The variance was smaller than the head of Delivery had expected. The playbook was published internally the following week. Go-live dates started being knowable at contract signature within a quarter.

Operating Discipline came third. The IT audit was scheduled as a working sprint, three days end-to-end. Every tool got a named owner. Every data flow got a named owner. Every access list got a review date. The audit was live inside a fortnight.

The board meeting ninety days later ran ninety minutes.

The CEO opened with: these three operating areas are green, this one is amber, here is who owns it, here is what they are doing about it. The board asked about the amber area. The named owner answered. The board made two decisions that had been sitting in “under review” for six months.

The bit that surprised the CEO. She had thought the biggest problem in the business was Commercial. The diagnostic said Governance. Once Governance was fixed, Commercial mostly fixed itself, because the named owners had the authority to make the changes they already knew were needed. The CRO had been waiting for someone to name her the owner of Commercial before she felt licensed to rebuild the partner architecture. Once she was named, the rebuild took six weeks.

The pattern is common. Boards ask for revenue answers when the actual gap is naming and authority. The diagnostic surfaces it in a Sunday afternoon.

Where the model breaks

The TOM diagnostic works when the business is a growth-stage SaaS scale-up. It stops working when the business is one of the following.

Pre-Series-A businesses

The operating model is not the priority. Product-market fit is. Building governance discipline for a business that might pivot next month is overhead the business cannot afford. Founders at this stage need to be personally in every function because being personally in every function is how they learn what the operating model will eventually need to hold. Score the diagnostic if you like, but the rebuild advice does not apply.

Sub-£3M ARR businesses

Founder-led is still the right shape. The overhead of formalising governance, separating commercial programmes, or standing up an operating discipline function costs more than it returns at this scale. Focus on customers, not on the operating model. Come back to the diagnostic at £5M ARR.

Post-IPO or post-large-exit businesses

Different problem. The public market or the acquirer imposes an operating model. Sarbanes-Oxley for public. Integration playbook for acquired. The TOM diagnostic is still useful as a self-check but it is no longer the primary lens. The primary lens is the compliance framework the outside world is applying to you.

Deep-tech businesses with long R&D cycles

Governance and Delivery components apply, but Commercial and Operating Discipline components need heavy reshaping. Commercial in a deep-tech business is often three years ahead of revenue. Operating Discipline is often shaped around research infrastructure, not customer-facing IT. Do not use the diagnostic wording literally. Extract the principles and rewrite the questions for your context.

Turnaround situations

If the business is in distress, the operating model diagnostic tells you what to fix but not in what order. Turnaround sequencing follows a different rule: cash first, then customers, then costs, then operating model. Fixing the operating model in a distressed business

consumes management attention that needs to be on cash and customers. Come back to the diagnostic once the business is out of distress.

There is one more limit worth naming. The diagnostic tells you where you are. It does not tell you what to do next. Interpretation is the operator's job. Two businesses can score identically on the diagnostic and need completely different rebuilds because their industry, their customers, their history, and their team make different rebuilds possible or impossible. The diagnostic is a map. The route is still your call.

Read the diagnostic. Score it. If the score prompts action, walk the framework. If the framework prompts specific work, sequence it. If any step of that sequence needs a second pair of eyes, the last page tells you how to book one.

Next steps

If the diagnostic surfaced something you want a second pair of eyes on, book a working session at ortent.co/contact.

Forty-five minutes. No pitch, no deck, no slides. A conversation on the questions where you scored No, and what the shape of a rebuild would look like if you decided to run one.

If you would like the diagnostic in a shareable format for your leadership team, this paper is designed to be printed. Copy the twenty questions onto a single sheet. Run the exercise together. The interesting conversations happen in the questions where the CEO scored Yes and the operator running the machine scored No.

If you want to be sent the next Ortent piece as it publishes, subscribe to **The Growth Chair** on LinkedIn. One issue a week. Same voice, same operator lens, no marketing.

That is the whole services page.

ortent.

Ortent Advisory Ltd

Registered office 14/2E Docklands Business Centre, 10-16 Tiller Road, London E14 8PX
Company number 17176275. UK trademark UK00004376535.

Every observation in this paper is drawn from over three decades of operating experience across four exits (Lotus to IBM, Paragon to Phone.com, Apertio to Nokia, Clearswift to Lyceum) and executive seats across enterprise software, life sciences, and digital health platforms. No client is named. No confidential detail is disclosed. Sector labels and rounded metrics only.

© 2026 Ortent Advisory Ltd. All rights reserved.