

GOING LIVE WITH WHAT SURVIVED

A Capital Governance Briefing for CFOs

Plateau Strategy · Capital Governance Series · April 2026

The go/no-go decision feels like the finish line.

It isn't. It's the moment the room decides whether to acknowledge what actually happened — or proceed as if the program delivered what was approved.

1. What survived to go-live is the functionality required to run the business at minimum. What didn't survive is the capability that was supposed to generate the return. It was deferred. Quietly. One descope decision at a time.
2. The technical debt accumulated to reach go-live will carry a cost on every subsequent program that touches the same systems. That cost isn't in the business case. It isn't in the go-live plan. It will appear in the next funding request.
3. Sunk cost governs. The organization goes live. The board is told the program delivered. The gap between what was promised and what was delivered is managed as a narrative not a capital question.
4. Phase 2 doesn't have to repeat Phase 1. But it will — unless the governance architecture that allowed the drift is addressed before the next business case is written.
5. The CFO is not governing a portfolio of well-run programs. They are governing a portfolio of well-reported ones. That distinction is where capital goes to die. [#CFO](https://plateaustategy.com/capital-briefings) [#ROITheater](https://plateaustategy.com/capital-briefings) [#DigitalTransformation](https://plateaustategy.com/capital-briefings)

What survived to go-live is the functionality required to run the business at minimum. What didn't survive is the capability that was supposed to generate the return.

PLATEAU STRATEGY

Capital Governance

It was deferred. Quietly.

One descope decision at a time.

The technical debt accumulated to reach go-live will carry a cost on every subsequent program that touches the same systems. That cost isn't in the business case. It isn't in the go-live plan. It will appear in the next funding request.

Sunk cost governs. The organization goes live. The board is told the program delivered. The gap between what was promised and what was delivered is managed as a narrative not a capital question.

Phase 2 doesn't have to repeat Phase 1. But it will — unless the governance architecture that allowed the drift is addressed before the next business case is written. The same bottom-up budget process. The same PMO structure. The same absence of traceability between requirements and the return.

The CFO is not governing a portfolio of well-run programs. They are governing a portfolio of well-reported ones. That distinction is where capital goes to die.

Capital leakage on your watch doesn't stay on the balance sheet.

It shows up in your compensation review. Then your contract renewal. Then your LinkedIn status.

That's not a threat. It's a fact every CFO knows and nobody says.

The CFO who governs the real program leads the next five years. The one who governs the reported one spends them explaining the last five. That's not a threat. It's a fact every CFO knows — and nobody says.

Stop Funding Projects. Start Defending Capital.

Most CFOs govern the reported program. P² governs the real one.

allan.salek@plateaustategy.com · 617-304-9407 · plateaustategy.com