

SAME AI. DIFFERENT OPERATING MODEL.

Acme's demand forecasting initiative, run twice. The technology never changed – the operating model around it did.

V1 – THE FIRST PASS

-3% ROI

$\$4.25\text{M} \times 42\% \text{ adoption} \times 48\% \text{ coverage} = \857K realized
 $\$857\text{K realized} - \880K True Cost

V2 – THE REDESIGN

159% ROI

$\$4.25\text{M} \times 73\% \text{ adoption} \times 78\% \text{ coverage} = \2.42M realized
 $\$2.42\text{M realized} - \935K True Cost

WHAT ACTUALLY MOVED · THE FOUR BRIDGES

ADOPTION

42% → 73%

Incentive plan rebuilt – planners had been paid to beat the model. Champions, not mandates: overrides fell 58% → 19%.

COVERAGE

48% → 78%

Workflow redesigned around the model instead of bolted beside the spreadsheets.

REUSE, COUNTED RIGHT

→ cost credit

Initiative 1's pipeline and monitoring carried forward – avoided build inside True Cost, not bonus value.

TRUE COST

\$880K → \$935K

Champion model and incentive redesign. Build, run, and governance stayed put.

The difference between -3% and 159% wasn't the AI. It was the operating model around it.