BEYOND THE GO-LIVE

Technology Is Not Transformation: Why New Systems Change Nothing on Their Own

A Practitioner's Perspective on Why Systems Replacement Is So Often Mistaken for Business Change

Giovanni Leonardi

March 2009

Technology Is Not Transformation: Why New Systems Change Nothing on Their Own

Transformation · No. 209
Originally written March 2009 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition,

> *"A transformation that the business does not own is not a transformation."*

The System Went Live, and Nothing Changed

Every practitioner who has spent a career inside large change programmes knows the particular silence that follows a successful go-live. The data migrated cleanly, the month-end reconciled, the integration held through the first peak in volume. Congratulations circulate, the programme board relaxes, and the delivery team is quietly redeployed to the next initiative. Then, across the following two or three quarters, a less comfortable observation settles in. The organisation is doing very nearly what it did before, the same processes, the same hand-offs, the same decisions taken by the same people in the same order, only now it does them on newer and considerably more expensive infrastructure.

We have been calling this transformation for the better part of a decade. The last eighteen months have made the description very hard to sustain.

What the Downturn Made Visible

When credit was cheap and revenues were climbing, the distance between installing a new system and actually changing the business was easy to overlook. A programme could be declared a success on the strength of its go-live alone, and the absence of any real change in how the organisation worked went politely unexamined. There was enough growth to absorb the disappointment, and enough optimism to reclassify it as a matter of time.

A recession is a brutal but honest auditor. When boards began, late last year, to ask where the promised returns from a decade of major systems investment had gone, the answers were thin. The platforms were in. The licences were paid. The integrators had long since demobilised. And yet unit costs had not fallen, decisions were made no faster, and the customer experienced the same organisation they always had. The technology had been replaced. The business had not been transformed. The two had been treated as the same thing, and the gap between them, invisible in good times, is now sitting in plain view on the cost line.

> *A new system is evidence that money was spent. It is not evidence that anything changed. The confusion of the two is the most expensive habit in our profession.*

Why We Kept Mistaking One for the Other

This is not a story about incompetence. The people who ran these programmes were, for the most part, capable and diligent, and the programmes themselves were often delivered with real skill. The mistake was structural, and it persisted precisely because every incentive in the way we organise change quietly encouraged it.

- The tangible is easier to govern than the intangible. A server has a delivery date; a change in behaviour does not. Faced with a choice between managing something you can put on a plan and something you can only influence, programme governance gravitates, almost without deciding to, towards the thing it can see and count. The plan fills up with the deliverable and empties of the outcome.
- The people who build the system are not paid to change the business. A software vendor is rewarded when the licence is signed; a systems integrator is rewarded when the solution is delivered to specification. Neither is contracted for the harder, slower work of altering how the organisation behaves once the system is live. We should not be surprised that we got what we paid for.
- We measured delivery, and delivery is not benefit. On time, on budget, to scope became the working definition of a successful programme. But those are the measures of a construction project, not of a transformation. They confirm that the thing was built. They say nothing whatever about whether it was worth building, or whether a single person changed how they worked as a result.
- The business treated the programme as something done to it. Ownership sat with the technology function, and the operating divisions regarded the whole endeavour as an IT matter, to be endured, resourced reluctantly, and blamed if it faltered. A transformation that the business does not own is not a transformation. It is a delivery imposed on an unchanged organisation, which absorbs the new system and carries on.

Each of these is individually reasonable. Together they produce a programme that reliably installs technology and reliably fails to change anything, while every status report on the wall declares success in green.

What Transformation Actually Requires

If the last decade taught us anything worth keeping, it is that the system is the easiest part. The genuinely difficult work sits entirely outside it: in the redesign of processes, the redistribution of decision rights, the reshaping of accountabilities and incentives, and the patient business of persuading people to work differently when the old way still feels safer and no one is being measured on the change.

Technology enables all of this. It enables none of it automatically. A new ledger does not decide who is allowed to approve what. A new customer system does not decide whether the organisation will actually organise itself around the customer, or merely record the customer more efficiently while treating them exactly as before. Those are choices about the operating model, and they have to be made deliberately, by the business, and largely before the technology is specified, because the system should be shaped to serve the intended way of working rather than the reverse.

The organisations that transformed did not buy different software. They made different decisions, and then bought software to support them.

The sequence matters more than almost anything else. When the operating model change is designed first and the system built to enable it, the technology becomes the servant of a defined intent. When the system is procured first and the organisation is left to adapt around it, the system becomes the only thing that changes, and the business quietly bends the new tool back into the shape of its old habits. The workarounds appear within weeks. The shadow spreadsheets return. The reorganised process is unofficially restored to what it was. I have watched capable organisations do exactly this and then express genuine surprise that nothing improved, as though the software had promised something it was never in a position to give.

The Honest Test

None of this is an argument against investing in technology during a downturn. It is an argument for honesty about what such investment is. There is a simple test for any programme carrying the transformation label, and it can be applied before a penny is committed. Strip the technology out of the business case and ask what change remains. If the answer is a redesigned operating model, reallocated decisions, and a defined shift in how work is done and measured, then the technology is the enabler of a real transformation, and it has earned the name. If the answer is nothing at all, if removing the system leaves an empty page, then what is being proposed is a procurement, and it should be governed, resourced, and honestly described as one.

There is no shame in a procurement. Organisations need new systems, and replacing aging infrastructure is legitimate and necessary work that a downturn often makes more urgent rather than less. The damage comes from calling it transformation, because the label sets an expectation of returns that a technology replacement was never structured to deliver. And in a year like this one, it is precisely that unmet expectation, compounded across a decade and a dozen programmes, that boards are now being asked, belatedly and expensively, to explain.