$ operators_view --mechanisms=7

How AI-native firms can 5x past incumbents.

Sequoia, Redpoint, HBR, McKinsey have made the investor's case.

Here are 7 mechanisms — seen from inside one.

SWIPE →

LARRY GALAN

$ define 5x --scope

5x on what, exactly?

[01] **speed-to-decision**

[02] **cost-per-workflow**

Not vibes. Not “AI makes you faster.”

Structural advantages that incumbents cannot copy — even when they see them coming.

REASON 01 / 07

No tool bloat.

Fresh-start orgs consolidate ruthlessly. No Teams for one department, Slack for another. No tool chosen because the 2019 hires already knew it. **AI picks the best tool per task — not the most familiar one.**

INCUMBENT

Teams | Slack | Jira | Asana | Notion | Confluence

one per department,
chosen years ago

AI-NATIVE

ONE STACK

best tool per task,
chosen by AI

One stack. Zero translation layers.


LARRY GALAN

REASON 02 / 07

Open source + AI = ownership.

Self-host an open-source CRM like **Twenty** in a day — then extend the actual code, because AI can read, modify, and rebuild every line of it.

RENT

> months-long deployment

> per-seat pricing, forever

> customize via procurement cycles

OWN

> self-hosted in a day

> auto-import + enrich every contact

> call notes → a living knowledgebase

> customization in **hours**

You don’t rent your systems. You own them.

REASON 03 / 07

The bottleneck was never headcount.

Decisions used to route through hierarchy, politics, and whoever held the most context in the room. **No single human sees what the model has.** It synthesizes more signal than any of us — and takes ego out of the call.

66

handoffs between 12 people.
Every one adds politics + ego. $n(n-1)/2$

≈0

friction when AI weighs the full context and offers the likely-best call.

The edge isn't fewer humans. It's decisions without the ego tax.

LARRY GALAN

REASON 04 / 07

Software becomes disposable.

A custom internal tool now costs **an afternoon**, not a quarter. That changes everything.

build → use for a month → throw it away

✗ Legacy orgs adapt their workflows to their software.

✓ **AI-native orgs generate software from their workflows.**

LARRY GALAN

REASON 05 / 07

Process debt > tech debt.

Everyone talks about legacy code. Nobody talks about legacy process.

THEN — A BUG REPORT **3 WEEKS**

complaint → ticket → triage meeting → backlog → sprint → fix ships

NOW — SAME BUG **HOURS**

error logged → AI finds root cause → drafts the PR → human reviews, merges

often before the customer even notices.

Incumbents keep the old approval chains and add AI. Cost without speed.

REASON 06 / 07

The experimentation ratio.

When trying something costs ~zero, the constraint shifts from execution to **taste**.

AI-NATIVE

50 experiments shipped

INCUMBENT

2 experiments scoped

same quarter.

Compounding weekly, that's not a linear edge. That's the engine behind the 5x.

REASON 07 / 07

Who keeps the AI savings?

BILL HOURS

1,000 hrs × $300/hr
= $300K

AI cuts it to 300 hrs.
New invoice:

~~$300K~~ **$90K**

SAVINGS → THE CLIENT

SELL OUTCOMES

Flat price for the
same deliverable.

AI cuts the cost.
The price stays:

$250K

SAVINGS → YOUR MARGIN

Same technology. Opposite result.

The pricing model decides — and starting with the right one is faster than switching to it.

The 5x isn't one advantage. It's seven that compound.

01 tool consolidation
02 open-source ownership
03 ego-free decisions
04 disposable software
05 process debt, deleted
06 the experimentation ratio
07 outcome pricing

Most are structural — visible to incumbents, **hard to copy without rebuilding the operating model.**

Which of these do you see differently?

And if you're inside a firm repricing around outcomes — I'd genuinely love to hear how it's going.

↻ REPOST IF THIS REFRAMED AI-NATIVE FOR YOU

LARRY GALAN