The CEO as Early Warning System

Why Large Service Organizations Only See Problems When It's Too Late

Most large service organizations experience operations as stable most of the time.

Dashboards are green. Contracts are active. Service providers meet their obligations. Incidents are closed within agreed timeframes. From a distance, the system appears to be under control.

And then, occasionally, something reaches the CEO.

It may be a major customer complaint, an internal user working on a critical project, a regulatory concern, a public outage, or an issue that refuses to disappear despite repeated fixes. When that happens, pressure spikes. Meetings are convened. Providers are challenged. Somebody gets blamed explicitly or at least implicitly. Explanations are demanded. Usually, the issue is resolved — or at least contained.

From the outside, this looks like effective leadership under pressure. From the inside, it feels exhausting but familiar. This is how service organizations function; and almost every organization these days is a service organization.

Until they don't.

The problem is not that issues escalate. Escalation is inevitable in complex systems. The problem is when escalation becomes the first moment the organization recognizes that an issue is systemic.

If the first time an organization understands an issue as systemic is when it reaches the CEO, escalation is not an exception. It is the detection mechanism. In that case, the CEO is not managing anomalies. They are functioning as the early warning system.

This is uncomfortable to acknowledge.

Boards prefer to believe they oversee controlled environments. Executives prefer to believe escalations result from execution failures. Service providers prefer to believe that meeting contractual metrics equals success. All of these beliefs can coexist — until reality forces them to collide.

That collision happens because most operational systems are designed to reassure, not to learn.

When Everything Becomes an Incident

In many organizations, the incident system has quietly become the universal entry point for work.

Users submit incidents not only for outages, but for requests, demands, recurring frustrations, workarounds, and minor enhancements. This is often described as misuse. It is not. It is adaptation.

Incidents guarantee response. They carry urgency, visibility, and obligation. Other channels may exist — request portals, change processes, enhancement backlogs — but under pressure, people route demand through the mechanism that reliably produces action.

When a system responds consistently in one place, all demand flows there, regardless of how it is labeled.

This behavior is rational. Users are not undermining governance; they are navigating it. The organization, meanwhile, continues to interpret this demand through categories: incident, request, problem, enhancement. These distinctions matter on paper. Under pressure, they collapse.

What remains is work.

Work that must be handled quickly. Work that must be assigned. Work that must be closed.

And because all of it is handled under the same constraints, a more important distinction disappears: whether the work is genuinely new, or whether it is the same work being done again.

Why Categorization Fails Under Pressure

Organizations invest heavily in classification. Taxonomies are refined. Fields are added. Categories are debated. The belief is that if issues are labeled correctly, patterns will emerge.

This belief holds in stable, cooperative environments. It fails in complex ones.

Categories assume shared meaning. They assume consistency across teams and providers. In multi-provider environments, these assumptions do not hold. Different vendors interpret categories differently. Different teams optimize against different incentives. Support agents operate under time pressure with explicit instructions to process tickets — not to reflect.

Two incidents that are structurally identical are easily described differently. Two genuinely different issues may share the same category. Over time, classification degrades into noise.

What does not degrade is resolution.

Under pressure, people reuse what works. They copy previous fixes, repeat known workarounds, and route issues to individuals or teams known to resolve them quickly. This reuse is not coordinated. It is emergent.

Two issues are not the same because they share a label. They are the same because they are solved the same way.

Invisible Repetition

The most significant work in service organizations is repeated work.

The same fixes are applied again and again. The same explanations are given to different users; on occasions solving the issue and on others not so much. The same causes are addressed locally without ever being named globally.

Yet repetition remains largely invisible.

It remains invisible because it is distributed. Each provider sees only its own slice of reality. Each agent sees only their queue. Each manager sees only their metrics. From any single vantage point, repetition looks like coincidence.

Repetition disappears when it is spread thinly enough across organizational boundaries.

Central reporting does not solve this. Aggregated views are optimized for reassurance. They show volume, compliance, and trend lines. They smooth variability. They answer the question: How are we doing?

They do not answer a more important question: Are we doing the same work again and again?

Recognition only occurs when repetition accumulates enough impact to cross a threshold. When enough users are affected. When enough fixes fail to hold. When reputational risk becomes visible.

That threshold is often the CEO.

Escalation Is a Signal, Not a Surprise

CEO escalations are typically treated as anomalies. Something went wrong. Someone failed. Control broke down.

In reality, escalations are delayed signals.

They mark the moment when scattered operational patterns finally concentrate. What appears sudden at the top has often been repeating quietly at the edges for months or years.

Seen this way, escalation is effective — but expensive. It works because it temporarily suspends normal constraints. Attention converges. Incentives realign. Cooperation or collaboration as it is often called is enforced.

The system responds.

Then the pressure dissipates. Normal behavior resumes. Repetition continues.

This creates an illusion: that escalation proves control rather than revealing blindness.

If leadership only learns when issues become personal, public, or reputational, learning is happening far too late.

Why Learning Cannot Be Mandated

Organizations often respond by trying to impose learning.

They introduce new processes. They mandate documentation. They demand collaboration across providers. They launch initiatives labeled operational excellence or continuous improvement.

These efforts usually fail.

They fail not because the intent is wrong, but because learning does not respond to authority in complex systems. It responds to pressure.

When incentives are misaligned, mandates produce compliance, not insight. Providers protect their metrics. Agents do what they are measured on. Additional reflection becomes overhead — and overhead disappears first under load.

Learning requires feedback. Feedback requires signals that are visible and meaningful to the people doing the work. Without that, reflection is optional. Optional work does not survive pressure.

This is why asking people to identify recurring issues rarely works. Recognition is cognitively expensive. Under time pressure, it is unrealistic.

The system must do the recognizing.

Reuse Reveals Structure

There is one signal that survives pressure: reuse.

When people reuse the same resolution, route issues to the same teams, or apply the same workaround repeatedly, they reveal something real about the system. They converge on what works.

This convergence is not planned. It emerges because failure is costly and time is scarce.

The repeated use of resolution that works creates structure.

It reveals which issues are systemic. It reveals which services exist in practice, regardless of formal definitions. It reveals where ownership already exists, even if it has never been assigned.

We do not decide what is the same. Reality does — through reuse.

This changes the intervention strategy entirely. Instead of asking the organization to categorize better, we observe how it behaves. Instead of prescribing ownership, we identify where work already gravitates. Instead of designing services upfront, we let them emerge from repeated use.

Most importantly, reuse provides earlier signal — long before escalation.

The Smallest Possible Intervention

Observing reuse does not require alignment, cooperation, or transformation.

It does not require changing KPIs. It does not require retraining agents. It does not require redefining services.

It requires only that reuse be made visible.

This is the smallest possible intervention: changing what the system notices, not how people behave.

Because it is observational, it is low risk. Because it is reversible, it does not threaten existing power structures. Because it operates on work already being done, it adds no friction.

If the insight proves useless, it can be discarded. If it proves useful, it becomes difficult to ignore.

Ownership Without Assignment

One of the most persistent myths in service organizations is that ownership must be assigned.

In practice, ownership already exists — informally.

Ownership emerges where work piles up. Where issues are routed quickly. Where fixes are reliable. Where knowledge accumulates. Formal structures usually follow this reality rather than create it.

By observing reuse, these natural ownership patterns become visible. They can then be acknowledged, supported, or formalized — but only after they are understood.

This reverses the usual logic. Instead of designing ownership and hoping behavior follows, behavior reveals ownership.

The same is true of services themselves. Many undeclared services exist long before they appear in catalogs. They exist because people rely on them repeatedly. Reuse makes them real.

Governance Without Illusion

At board level, this reframes governance.

Governance is not about eliminating risk. It is about knowing where risk is accumulating early enough to act deliberately.

Dashboards optimized for reassurance delay that knowledge. Escalations optimized for action deliver it too late.

A board that only learns through escalation has outsourced governance to embarrassment.

Making repetition visible shortens the distance between operational reality and executive awareness. It replaces surprise with anticipation. It does not eliminate escalation — but it changes its role.

Escalation becomes a choice, not a shock.

Learning Under Pressure

The central mistake organizations make is assuming that learning requires calm.

In reality, learning must survive pressure — or it will not survive at all.

Systems that depend on alignment, goodwill, or reflection are fragile. Systems that learn as a side effect of efficiency endure.

Observing reuse is one such mechanism. It respects incentives. It operates under load. It reveals structure without demanding agreement.

The question for leaders is not whether their organization is controlled. It is whether it learns before the cost of learning becomes public.

As long as escalation remains the first signal, the answer is no.

And the CEO will continue to function as the early warning system.

—

Koffi M GANKE