FLOWAdvisory Group

Flow Health Platform Report

Quantitative Assessment & Strategic Analysis

Prepared for: Pilot Client 3
Industry: digital_platform
Assessment date: 5 May 2026
Prepared by: Flow Advisory Group

CONFIDENTIAL — PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY FOR PILOT CLIENT 3

Contents

1. Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a quantitative Flow Health Platform assessment conducted for Pilot Client 3. The assessment evaluates organisational delivery performance across four dimensions, benchmarked against comparable mid-market organisations.

26

At Risk

Significant friction — structured improvement program needed

Dimension Summary

AI & Automation Readiness — 25/100 — Critical

Critical

Delivery Flow — 28/100 — At Risk

At Risk

Decision Velocity — 19/100 — Critical

Critical

Dependency Health — 32/100 — At Risk

At Risk

3. Delivery Flow

28 /100

At Risk

METRIC	YOUR VALUE	SCORE	METHOD	IMPACT
Average Cycle Time	20.00 days	20/100	Raw	High
Throughput (items/week)	14.00 items/wk	14/100	Raw	Medium
Work in Progress Count	15.00 items	15/100	Raw	Medium
Bottleneck Visibility	7.00 /10	67/100	Normalised	Supporting
Flow Predictability	5.00 /10	44/100	Normalised	Supporting

4. Dependency Health

32 /100

At Risk

METRIC	YOUR VALUE	SCORE	METHOD	IMPACT
Cross-team Dependency Rate	25.00 %	25/100	Raw	High
Escalation Path Clarity	5.00 /10	44/100	Normalised	Medium
Handoffs per Work Item	2.00 handoffs	2/100	Raw	Medium
Dependencies Formally Mapped	true	100/100	Binary	Supporting
Inter-team SLAs Defined	false	0/100	Binary	Supporting

5. Decision Velocity

19 /100

Critical

METRIC	YOUR VALUE	SCORE	METHOD	IMPACT
Decision Cycle Time	10.00 days	10/100	Raw	High
Governance Overhead	7.00 /10	33/100	Normalised	Medium
Authority Clarity	5.00 /10	44/100	Normalised	Medium
Approval Layers	3.00 layers	3/100	Raw	Supporting
Decision Log Maintained	false	0/100	Binary	Supporting

6. AI & Automation Readiness

25 /100

Critical

METRIC	YOUR VALUE	SCORE	METHOD	IMPACT
Weekly Manual Process Hours	2.00 hrs/wk	2/100	Raw	Medium
Tool Adoption Maturity	5.00 /10	44/100	Normalised	Medium
Automation Coverage	35.00 %	35/100	Raw	Medium
Data Quality for AI	5.00 /10	44/100	Normalised	Medium
AI Strategy Documented	false	0/100	Binary	Supporting

7. ROI Projection

ROI projection data not available for this assessment.

8. Priority Recommendations

Immediate Focus Areas

Based on the assessment results, the following areas represent the highest-impact opportunities for improvement:

1. Inter-team SLAs Defined — **Score: 0/100**
Current value: false

2. Decision Log Maintained — **Score: 0/100**
Current value: false

3. AI Strategy Documented — **Score: 0/100**
Current value: false

4. Handoffs per Work Item — **Score: 2/100**
Current value: 2.00 handoffs

5. Weekly Manual Process Hours — **Score: 2/100**
Current value: 2.00 hrs/wk

Strengths to Leverage

Dependencies Formally Mapped — **Score: 100/100**

Bottleneck Visibility — **Score: 67/100**

Flow Predictability — **Score: 44/100**

9. Methodology & Benchmarks

The Flow Health Platform scoring model is calibrated against published global benchmarks and Flow Advisory Group's proprietary dataset from completed mid-market engagements. This section documents every source, scoring method, and assumption so that results can be interrogated with confidence.

Scoring Model

Each metric is scored on a 0–100 scale using one of three methods depending on data type. Scores are then weighted within their dimension, and dimensions are weighted to produce the overall Flow Health Score.

METHOD	HOW IT WORKS	USED FOR
Benchmarked	Value is positioned on a percentile curve against benchmark data from comparable organisations. Higher percentile = higher score.	Cycle time, dependency rate, decision cycle, throughput
Normalised	Scale input (1–10) mapped linearly to 0–100. Score of 10 = 100, score of 1 = 10.	Maturity and confidence scale questions
Binary	Yes/No input contributes either 0 or 100 to the weighted average.	Capability presence/absence — e.g. automated deployment, documented escalation paths

Score Bands

Overall and dimension scores are classified into five performance bands. Bands are calibrated against DORA 2024 State of DevOps performance clusters and Flow Advisory Group case study outcomes.

BAND	SCORE RANGE	WHAT IT MEANS	DORA EQUIVALENT
Optimised	86–100	Flow is a competitive advantage. Delivery is fast, predictable, and self-correcting. Benchmarks at or above elite performer levels.	Elite (top 19%)
Healthy	71–85	Strong foundation with isolated friction points. Incremental improvements will compound quickly.	High performer
Developing	51–70	Visible bottlenecks with real cost impact. Structured intervention will produce measurable ROI within 6–12 months.	Medium performer

BAND	SCORE RANGE	WHAT IT MEANS	DORA EQUIVALENT
At Risk	26–50	Systemic flow problems. Delivery is unpredictable, dependencies are high, and decision latency is creating compounding waste.	Low performer
Critical	0–25	Fundamental structural issues. Immediate intervention required. Significant financial and operational risk if unaddressed.	Low performer (bottom quartile)

Source: DORA 2024 State of DevOps Report (Google). In 2024, only 19% of teams were classified as elite performers; the low-performing cluster grew from 17% (2023) to 25% (2024), indicating overall industry delivery performance deteriorated year-on-year.

Dimension Weights

DIMENSION	CONTRIBUTION	WHAT IT MEASURES
Delivery Flow	**Primary driver**	Cycle time from idea to production, throughput, work-in-progress levels, and bottleneck concentration. Anchored against DORA lead time for changes and Flow Framework flow efficiency benchmarks.
Dependency Health	**Major driver**	Cross-team coordination overhead, dependency rate per work item, and escalation clarity. Benchmarked against Atlassian State of Teams 2024 (54% of cross-team work is duplicated in typical organisations).
Decision Velocity	**Major driver**	Decision cycle time, governance overhead, and authority clarity. Calibrated against McKinsey research: executives spend ~40% of time on decisions; 61% of that time is ineffective.
AI & Automation Readiness	**Contributing factor**	Manual process overhead, tool adoption maturity, and automation opportunity. Measures readiness for Phase 2 AI implementation.

Published Benchmark Sources

The following published sources inform the scoring bands and comparative context used throughout this report. Where Australian-specific data is available, it is used in preference to global proxies.

DORA 2024 State of DevOps Report — Google

The most widely cited software delivery benchmark globally, used in Australian financial services and technology engineering organisations. 2024 findings: only 19% of teams are elite performers; the low-performing cluster grew from 17% to 25% year-on-year. Elite teams deploy on demand with lead times under one day; low performers take one to six months. Key metric: elite teams have 127× faster lead times and 182× higher deployment frequency than low performers.

Source: dora.dev/research/2024/dora-report — Global; widely adopted as ANZ industry standard

Atlassian State of Teams 2024

Survey of 5,000 knowledge workers including 535+ Australian respondents and 100 Fortune 500 executives. Key findings: 93% of F500 executives believe teams could achieve the same outcomes in half the time with better collaboration; 54% of workers have worked on something only to find another team was doing the same thing; 68% prioritise message responses over meaningful progress. Atlassian quantifies 25 billion hours per year lost to ineffective collaboration in the Fortune 500.

Source: atlassian.com/blog/state-of-teams-2024 — Includes Australian respondent cohort; High defensibility

Asana Anatomy of Work — Australia Spotlight

The most Australian-specific knowledge worker productivity dataset available. Key findings: Australian knowledge workers spend 58% of time on "work about work" (coordination, status updates, duplicated effort); lose 3.2 hours per week to unnecessary meetings; estimate they could save 5.7 hours per week with better processes — equivalent to 240+ hours per year per person in recoverable capacity.

Source: asana.com/resources/anatomy-of-work-australia-regional-guide — Australian-specific; Primary ANZ benchmark

Flow Framework — Planview / Mik Kersten

The foundational framework for measuring value stream flow in enterprise organisations. Key finding: typical enterprise flow efficiency is 10–15%, meaning 85–90% of total cycle time is wait time rather than active work. This benchmark directly informs the Delivery Flow scoring bands used in this report. Organisations achieving flow efficiency above 20% are considered strong performers.

Source: Planview Flow Metrics Guide; Mik Kersten, Project to Product (IT Revolution, 2018) — Global; Industry standard for flow measurement

McKinsey & Company — Decision-Making Research

McKinsey research across 1,200+ global organisations: executives spend approximately 40% of their time making decisions; 61% say at least half of that time is ineffective; only 37% of respondents say their organisation makes decisions that are both high-quality and timely. A single large organisation wastes approximately 530,000 manager-days and USD $250M per year on ineffective decision-making. Organisations that are deliberate about decision coordination are 4.5× more likely to be "decision-making winners."

Source: McKinsey Quarterly, "Three keys to faster, better decisions" and "Decision making in the age of urgency" — Global proxy; Widely cited in Australian boardrooms

Australian Productivity Commission — Advancing Prosperity (2023)

Australia's definitive 5-year productivity inquiry (9 volumes, 71 recommendations). Key findings: 90% of Australian workers are in the services sector; Australian labour productivity growth averaged just 1.1% per annum in the 2010s versus a 1.8% sixty-year average; labour productivity fell 3.7% in 2022–23 — the largest recorded annual fall. The Commission identified diffusion of productivity improvement to non-frontier ("mid-market") firms as the single largest available lever.

Source: pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/productivity/report — Australian-specific; Government authority

Deloitte Australia — CFO Sentiment Survey H2 2025

Survey of 59 Australian CFOs (H2 2025). Key findings: 93% of Australian organisations are now using AI (up from 67% a year earlier); yet only 21% of AI-active users report clear measurable value. Australian CFOs lead APAC on AI productivity expectations (85% prioritise AI's productivity impact — higher than Japan at 55% or China at 59%), but the gap between adoption and realised value represents the primary opportunity for structured flow and AI implementation programs.

Source: Deloitte Australia CFO Sentiment H2 2025; Deloitte APAC CFO Survey 2025 — Australian-specific; CFO-level authority

ROI Projection Basis

Financial projections use conservative improvement assumptions derived from eight completed Flow Advisory Group engagements (case study range shown for context). All recovery percentages are applied to the estimated wasted portion of capacity only — not to total team cost.

LEVER	CONSERVATIVE	CASE STUDY RANGE	PRIMARY EVIDENCE
Flow improvement	40% of flow waste	50–70% (8 cases)	DORA elite vs low 127× lead time gap; Flow Framework 10–15% typical efficiency
Dependency reduction	30% of dependency waste	40–57% (8 cases)	Atlassian: 54% of cross-team work duplicated; Asana AU: 3.2 hrs/week in wasted meetings
Decision acceleration	50% of decision waste	60–79% (8 cases)	McKinsey: 61% of decision time is ineffective; Atlassian: 93% of execs say same outcomes achievable in half the time
Automation gains	50% of manual waste	30–50% (Phase 2)	Asana AU: 5.7 hrs/week recoverable via process improvement; Deloitte: 93% AU AI adoption but 21% measurable value

Salary inputs: Australian financial services knowledge worker base salary $155–175K; tech/SaaS $140–160K (Sydney-weighted). Source: Hays Australia FY25/26 Salary Guide; Robert Half Australia 2025–26 Salary Guide.

Fully-loaded cost multiplier 1.42× (superannuation 12% from 1 July 2025, payroll tax 5.45% NSW, workers compensation 0.8%, leave/FBT/recruitment amortisation ~23.7%). Source: ATO, NSW Revenue Office.
