

BEYOND THE QUICK FIX

Technical Debt as Strategic Debt — The Post-Pandemic Reckoning

A Practitioner's Perspective on Why the Shortcuts That Saved the Business Now Threaten It

Giovanni Leonardi

March 2021



Contents

1. Executive Summary 3

2. The Anatomy of Pandemic Technical Debt 3

2.1 It was compressed, not gradual 3

2.2 It is structural, not superficial 4

2.3 It is invisible to most stakeholders 4

3. The Strategic Dimension 4

4. Why the Usual Approach Will Not Work 5

5. A Credible Approach 6

5.1 Make the debt visible 6

5.2 Treat it as a programme, not a backlog 6

5.3 Sequence ruthlessly 7

5.4 Accept that some things need to be rebuilt 7

6. The Window Is Closing 7

Technical Debt as Strategic Debt — The Post-Pandemic Reckoning

Transformation · No. 259

Originally written March 2021 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“Every shortcut taken in the spring of 2020 was a rational decision under extraordinary pressure — the irrationality lies in pretending those decisions do not have consequences.”

1. Executive Summary

In the spring of 2020, organisations across every sector made a set of technology decisions under extraordinary pressure. Systems were deployed in days that would normally have taken months. Security reviews were abbreviated. Integration was deferred. Testing was curtailed. Architecture was improvised. These were not failures of judgment — they were rational responses to an unprecedented situation, and in many cases they kept organisations functioning when the alternative was paralysis.

A year on, the bill is arriving. The technical debt accumulated during the pandemic is not the familiar, manageable kind — the gradual accumulation of shortcuts in mature systems that engineering teams budget for and steadily retire. It is something more consequential: strategic debt, embedded in the foundations of capabilities that the organisation now depends on. This paper examines how this debt accumulated, why it is more dangerous than most leadership teams recognise, and what a credible approach to addressing it looks like before it compounds further.

2. The Anatomy of Pandemic Technical Debt

Technical debt is a well-understood concept in software engineering: the accumulated cost of choosing expedient solutions over optimal ones, creating future work that must eventually be done. In normal circumstances, technical debt accrues gradually and is managed through deliberate investment — refactoring sprints, platform upgrades, architecture reviews. Teams know where it lives and roughly how much it will cost to address.

The debt accumulated during the pandemic is different in three critical ways.

2.1 It was compressed, not gradual

Most organisations made more consequential technology decisions in March and April 2020 than they had in the preceding two years. Customer-facing channels were rebuilt for digital-first operation. Collaboration platforms were deployed organisation-wide in days. Backend systems were reconfigured to support remote access patterns they were never designed for. Each of these decisions, individually rational, created technical debt. Collectively, they created a debt load that would normally have taken years to accumulate.

The compression matters because it means the debt is not distributed across the technology estate in the usual way. It is concentrated in the systems and capabilities that were built or modified most urgently — which are, by definition, the systems the organisation now relies on most heavily.

2.2 It is structural, not superficial

The usual form of technical debt is code-level: duplicated logic, outdated libraries, insufficient test coverage. The pandemic variety runs deeper. It includes architectural decisions that were made for speed rather than scalability — point-to-point integrations where an integration layer was needed, monolithic deployments where modularity would have been appropriate, shared databases where service boundaries should have been drawn.

These structural choices are orders of magnitude more expensive to unwind than code-level debt. They cannot be addressed through refactoring alone; they require re-architecture, which means re-planning, re-testing, and often re-deploying capabilities that are currently in production and serving real users.

2.3 It is invisible to most stakeholders

Perhaps most dangerously, pandemic technical debt is largely invisible to the leaders who need to decide how to address it. The systems work. Customers are being served. Revenue is flowing. From a business perspective, the technology investments made during the pandemic were successful — they delivered what was needed, when it was needed.

The debt manifests not as failure but as friction: deployments take longer than they should. Changes to one system break another in unexpected ways. New features that should take weeks take months because they must work around architectural constraints that were never intended to be permanent. Performance degrades under load in ways that are difficult to diagnose. Security vulnerabilities accumulate in components that were deployed without adequate review.

This friction is absorbed by technology teams, who work harder to compensate. It rarely surfaces in board-level reporting, which focuses on outcomes rather than the effort required to achieve them. The result is a growing gap between the organisation's perception of its technology capability and the reality — a gap that will close, eventually, either through deliberate action or through failure.

3. The Strategic Dimension

The reason this paper frames pandemic technical debt as strategic debt rather than purely technical debt is that the consequences extend well beyond the technology function. The capabilities built during the pandemic are not peripheral — they are, in many organisations, now core to the operating model. Digital channels that were emergency measures are now primary channels. Remote collaboration infrastructure is now permanent infrastructure. Data pipelines built to support crisis decision-making are now expected to support ongoing operations.

When core capabilities are built on compromised foundations, the strategic implications are significant:

- Innovation capacity is consumed by maintenance. Technology teams that should be building new capabilities are instead spending their time keeping existing systems stable. The pattern is familiar to any practitioner: the proportion of effort devoted to keeping the lights on grows steadily, crowding out the investment in change that the business expects and needs.
- Scalability is constrained. Capabilities built for crisis volumes may not scale to growth volumes. An e-commerce platform that was hastily expanded to handle the pandemic surge may cope with current demand but lack the architectural foundations to support the growth trajectory the business is planning for. This constraint is often invisible until the organisation attempts to scale — at which point it becomes urgent and expensive.
- Security exposure accumulates. Components deployed without full security review, access controls implemented as temporary workarounds, data flows established without adequate governance — these create an expanding attack surface that becomes harder to secure with each month they remain in place. The risk is not theoretical: the rapid digitisation of the pandemic period coincided with a significant increase in cyber threats, and the organisations most exposed are those that moved fastest with the least scrutiny.
- Integration becomes increasingly fragile. Point-to-point integrations — the most common architectural shortcut of the pandemic period — create a web of dependencies that becomes progressively more difficult to modify. Each new integration adds complexity. Each modification risks cascading failures. The system as a whole becomes brittle in ways that are difficult to predict and expensive to diagnose.

4. Why the Usual Approach Will Not Work

The standard enterprise response to technical debt is incremental: allocate a proportion of technology capacity to debt reduction, prioritise the most critical items, and work through them over time. This approach works for debt that has accumulated gradually across a mature estate. It does not work for the concentrated, structural debt created during the pandemic, for three reasons.

First, the volume of debt exceeds what incremental approaches can address. Allocating twenty percent of capacity to debt reduction — a generous allocation by most organisations' standards — will not materially reduce a debt load that represents the

equivalent of two years of compressed, under-governed technology decisions.

Second, the debt is interdependent. Addressing one area of structural debt often requires first addressing another. The point-to-point integrations cannot be replaced until the integration architecture is defined. The integration architecture cannot be defined until the service boundaries are established. The service boundaries cannot be drawn until the data model is rationalised. Incremental approaches that tackle individual items in isolation find themselves repeatedly blocked by dependencies they have not yet addressed.

Third, the business context has changed. During the pandemic, technology investment was understood as essential and urgent. A year on, the organisational appetite for further technology spending is diminished. Leaders who authorised emergency expenditure in 2020 are now expecting returns, not further investment. Making the case for significant spending to fix systems that appear to be working is a political challenge as much as a technical one.

The most dangerous characteristic of pandemic technical debt is that it is invisible precisely when it matters most — in the period before it causes a failure significant enough to demand attention. By the time it becomes visible to senior leaders, the cost of addressing it has multiplied.

5. A Credible Approach

Addressing pandemic technical debt requires an approach that is strategic rather than incremental, honest rather than optimistic, and led by the business rather than delegated to technology.

5.1 Make the debt visible

The first step is the most uncomfortable: creating an honest, comprehensive inventory of the debt and its implications. This means going beyond the technology function's internal backlog and producing an assessment that senior leaders can understand — one that translates architectural weaknesses into business risks, operational constraints, and capability limitations.

This assessment must be unflinching. Every organisation that moved fast during the pandemic took shortcuts, and every shortcut has consequences. The assessment is not an exercise in blame — the decisions made in 2020 were the right decisions for the moment. It is an exercise in honesty about what those decisions now require.

5.2 Treat it as a programme, not a backlog

The interdependency of pandemic technical debt means it must be addressed as a coordinated programme rather than a prioritised backlog. The programme needs its own governance, its own investment case, and its own success criteria — distinct from the technology function's normal operating budget and change portfolio.

This is a hard argument to make in most organisations. Technology programmes that are not directly tied to revenue or visible capability improvements struggle for investment. But the alternative — continuing to run core capabilities on compromised foundations — is not a neutral choice. It is a choice to accept escalating risk, diminishing agility, and growing maintenance costs.

5.3 Sequence ruthlessly

Not all pandemic debt is equally consequential. A credible programme begins with the structural debt that poses the greatest risk and constrains the most valuable capabilities, and works outward from there. This requires a severity assessment that considers not just technical risk but business impact: which compromised systems support the most critical processes? Where would a failure be most damaging? Which architectural constraints are most limiting the organisation's ability to execute its strategy?

5.4 Accept that some things need to be rebuilt

The most difficult conversation in any technical debt programme is the one where the answer is not refactoring or remediation but replacement. Some capabilities built during the pandemic were never intended to be permanent, and the cost of making them permanent exceeds the cost of rebuilding them properly. Accepting this early — rather than spending months trying to shore up something that was always temporary — saves time and money in aggregate, even if the initial investment is larger.

6. The Window Is Closing

Technical debt compounds. The longer it remains unaddressed, the more expensive it becomes to fix — not linearly but exponentially, as new capabilities are built on top of compromised foundations, as workarounds become embedded in processes, and as the people who understand the original shortcuts leave the organisation.

Every month that passes without a deliberate strategy for pandemic technical debt is a month in which the cost of that strategy increases and the organisation's ability to execute it diminishes.

The organisations that will emerge strongest from this period are those that recognise the distinction between the emergency and its aftermath. The emergency required speed, pragmatism, and a willingness to accept imperfection. The aftermath requires something different: the discipline to go back and build properly what was necessarily improvised, before the improvisation becomes the permanent architecture.

This is not an exciting investment. It does not produce new products or open new markets. It produces something more fundamental: the confidence that the digital capabilities the organisation now depends on are fit for purpose — not just for today's demands, but for the demands of a future that will require them to be more resilient, more scalable, and more secure than anything built in the urgency of a crisis.