



WHY ASSET MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY TEAMS FAIL TO DELIVER

A practical look at why technology delivery breaks down in asset management and what it takes to see projects through.

CERES FTS

Why Projects Slip Even When Teams Perform

Project delivery in asset management rarely fails all at once. A [Project Management Institute \(PMI\)](#) survey found that only 56% of projects finish on time and 62% stay within budget in the U.S. Nearly half of large IT programs are reset midstream, often more than once.

Compliance adds pressure. In one case, firms paid \$79 million in combined [Securities and Exchange Commission \(SEC\)](#) penalties for failing to preserve electronic communications.

Cloud initiatives show a similar pattern according to an [Azul](#) report:

- **37% of organizations** fail to realize meaningful cloud benefits
- **83% of CIOs** report overspending on cloud by around 30%

These are not isolated issues. They repeat in environments shaped by regulation, scale, and tight margins for error.



Signs a Project Isn't Moving Forward

Stalled delivery rarely presents itself as a clear failure. It looks like work that continues without fully resolving.

- A migration that continues to move forward but never fully completes
- A platform that functions but requires constant intervention
- Business users still dependent on developers for routine changes
- Teams working harder without improving outcomes

Over time, these conditions become the baseline. The problem spreads across systems and processes rather than appearing as a single breakdown.

Why Teams Stay Trapped in the Same Cycle

Delivery challenges are often built into the system:

- Dependencies surface late across misaligned teams
- Requirements shift as business and compliance needs evolve
- Validation happens late, when changes are expensive
- Risk tolerance at go-live drops to near zero



Regulatory pressure, legacy platforms, and siloed data add further complexity.

The result is a delivery environment that cannot absorb change without slowing down or restarting. For the person accountable, the impact extends beyond operations. It affects credibility.

Why Common Fixes Don't Work

When projects stall, the default response is to add people or bring in vendors. That rarely changes the outcome.

Why Staffing Doesn't Fix Delivery

Adding more people increases complexity.

- More handoffs
- More dependencies
- More interpretation between teams

The underlying delivery structure remains unchanged, so the same issues continue.

Why Traditional Vendors Miss

Many vendors often rely on:

- Generic delivery models
- Limited domain expertise in asset management systems
- Fragmented ownership across teams

They contribute to parts of the work, but no single group carries responsibility for the final outcome. Work gets done, but no one owns the result end to end.

The Real Gap

Technology teams in asset management have strong talent. The challenge lies in the delivery model. The issue is not talent. It is the model.

Most teams work within systems that are not designed to handle:

- Changing requirements
- Regulatory pressure
- Complex integrations
- Minimal tolerance for failure at cutover

Without a model designed for these conditions, delivery slows or resets.

Delivery Model Built for Real Conditions

Effective delivery starts with a different approach.

Better Starting Point

- › Work begins with validation rather than immediate scaling
- › Solutions are tested in real conditions before expanding
- › Teams are organized around outcomes instead of roles
- › A single group is accountable for delivery

What Changes

- › Problems surface earlier, when they are easier to resolve
- › Risk is addressed during delivery instead of at the end
- › Progress is measured through working systems

This shifts delivery from reactive to controlled.



CASE STUDY:

Stabilizing a Platform That Couldn't Scale

A global investment firm relied on separate deployments for each client. The platform became unstable and difficult to maintain.

WHAT CHANGED

- › Moved to a multi-tenant, cloud-native architecture
- › Introduced microservices and Kubernetes
- › Replaced a legacy system with a scalable platform



WHAT THE FIRM CAN DO NOW

- › Operate a unified platform
- › Onboard clients more efficiently
- › Run without recurring instability

RESULT

The platform was built and deployed in about nine months, including full productization. When delivery works, systems require less intervention.

When delivery is effective, systems operate without continuous intervention.

CASE STUDY:

Removing Risk From Configuration Migration

Another firm struggled with manual, high-risk configuration migrations.

WHAT CHANGED

- › Introduced automated tooling
- › Added validation and comparison checks
- › Built rollback with full tracking

WHAT THE TEAM CAN DO NOW

- › Move configuration safely across environments
- › Validate changes before execution
- › Roll back instantly when needed



WHAT THAT SOLVED

- › Reduced reliance on command-line tools
- › Lowered the risk of human error
- › Enabled consistent and repeatable migrations

RESOLVED

Delivered in about six months. The tool quickly became the preferred internal solution. Reducing risk made it possible to keep moving.

What Successful Delivery Has in Common

Despite different scopes, both examples follow the same structure:

- › Validation is built into delivery
- › Rollback paths are defined early
- › Architecture supports change
- › One team owns the outcome

Delivery improves when systems are built to handle change without disruption.

Where Delivery Breaks and What Fixes It

Problem	Industry Proof	How CERES Solves It
Projects run past deadlines and exceed budgets	Multi-month delays and cost increases are common in major US programs. [1]	Migration + portal work designed around validation, rollback, and operational resilience (MDT + SSP).
Compliance and data control failures carry real cost	SEC recordkeeping penalties reached hundreds of millions across firms. [2]	Tooling and workflows that make changes traceable, reversible, and less dependent on fragile processes (MDT, SSP).
Cost grows beyond expectations.	83% of US CIOs report cloud spend about 30% over forecast. [3]	Multi-tenant, scalable architecture that supports controlled growth and reduces operational overhead (SSP).

Before You Start Another Project, Ask This

If past efforts have stalled, the next decision matters more.

Ask:

1. How is risk validated before rollout?
2. What happens when requirements change?
3. Who owns the outcome?
4. How is rollback handled?
5. What similar work has this team completed?

These questions provide a practical way to assess delivery capability.



The Impact of Getting Delivery Right

When delivery aligns with real-world conditions:

- Projects reach completion
- Systems perform as expected
- Teams rebuild credibility
- Technology keeps pace with business needs

The gap is structural. Fix the structure, and progress follows.

What to Do if Your Project is Stalled

If a migration is delayed or a platform remains unstable, an outside perspective can help.

A focused review can identify what is blocking progress and what needs to change to move forward.

Contact CERES FTS

www.ceresfts.com

857.254.9725

info@ceresfts.com

CERES **FTS**

Sources

1. https://www.pmi.org/-/media/pmi/documents/public/pdf/learning/thought-leadership/pulse/pulse2021_regional_north-america_final.pdf
2. <https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2023-212>
3. <https://www.azul.com/newsroom/azul-report-finds-83-of-cios-are-spending-more-on-their-cloud-infrastructure-and-applications-than-anticipated/>