ENGAGEMENT BRIEF · CS-0041 · ANONYMIZED · ON REFERENCE

BASELINE REVISION

A reorganization that had already happened, described for the first time — in language the board and the executive team would both sign.

The client

A Tier-1 industrial manufacturer (E.G.I.M.) with an installed base across the Midwestern United States and assembly operations in two European jurisdictions. At engagement opening the firm employed approximately 11,400 people across 23 sites; by month nine it employed approximately 11,400 people across 26 sites. The intervening three sites had not been added by acquisition. Reported annual revenue: USD 4.6B.

The challenge

An enterprise-wide reorganization announced in Q1 2024 with a nine-month horizon had slipped its delivery date twice and was referred to internally by a different name than the one used in the press release. Three working groups continued to meet under the original charter; two had quietly disbanded; one had been re-formed under a different sponsor. After declining three drafts of a one-page operating-model description, the audit committee chair retained external counsel — and then retained us, with a brief that read, in full: *"describe the firm as it now is, in language the board and the executive team will both sign."*

PRACTICE
Transition Advisory

SECTOR
Industrial manufacturing

REGION
Midwestern U.S. · DE · CZ

DURATION
14 months (Oct 2024 – Dec 2025)

LEAD PARTNER
K. Lovelace

ENGAGEMENT FILE
CS-0041

APPROACH

01
Observe

Discovery interviews across the executive team and both European subsidiaries. The firm's stated structure was mapped against its operational reality; discrepancies — including the three additional sites — were documented without judgment.

02
Map

Stakeholder inventory rebuilt from six classes to eight, including two classes whose claims on the reorganization predated its announcement. The Coherence Index™ was administered at baseline and at month twelve.

03
Align

A single operating-model description drafted, tested against each working group's lived structure, and revised until the board and the executive team could sign the same page — the engagement's only fixed deliverable.

OUTCOME

A board pack that finally matched the firm.

The board accepted the operating-model diagnostic on first review, the transition cadence on second review, and the stakeholder alignment map without amendment. The Q4 2025 investor letter referenced "a clarified operating posture" and was the first quarterly communication in eighteen months that did not require a follow-up clarification. Two divisions were formally reassigned to locations not previously listed in the proxy statement, on advice of counsel; the corporate sites register has since been re-filed.

1st	26 / 23	8	+71
BOARD REVIEW AT WHICH THE DIAGNOSTIC WAS ACCEPTED	SITES IN OPERATION VS. PREVIOUSLY DISCLOSED	STAKEHOLDER CLASSES MAPPED (VS. 6 PRIOR)	EXECUTIVE-TEAM NPS (POST)

> *"Describe the firm as it now is, in language the board and the executive team will both sign." — the brief, quoted in full*

Related practice: Transition Advisory (liminalconsultants.com/services/transition-advisory). Methodology: Five Frameworks working paper. The engagement remains on reference, subject to the retention clauses in our legal disclosures. Metrics are observed where observation was possible.