THE HOLISTYX GROUP

SPARKle Express Report

AI Transformation Roadmap

PREPARED FOR

Ford Motor Company

PRIMARY CONTACT

Mike Sternberg, CEO

INDUSTRY

Automotive & Mobility

Executive Summary

Ford Motor Company's Finance & Accounting function is operating under a convergence of pressures that cannot be resolved through incremental improvement alone. Data fragmentation across ERP, planning, and reporting systems is slowing the close cycle, limiting forecast accuracy, and forcing Finance staff to spend disproportionate time on manual reconciliation rather than forward-looking analysis. At the same time, Ford absorbed approximately $19.5B in EV-related write-downs in 2025 and faces roughly $1.5B in tariff-driven EBIT headwinds — circumstances that demand faster, more confident financial modeling and scenario planning than the current infrastructure supports. Rising operational costs within Finance compound the urgency. The function has reached a point where the cost of standing still is measurably higher than the cost of transformation.

The conditions for AI adoption within Finance & Accounting are favorable. Ford has already achieved an Established AI maturity level, meaning the organizational scaffolding for scaling AI programs exists. The automotive AI market is expanding at 15.3% CAGR, and peer manufacturers are not waiting: General Motors is deploying agentic AI across FP&A and procurement, Tesla operates AI-native financial reporting functions, and Toyota is embedding predictive analytics across its global Finance organization. Industry data shows that only 34% of automotive enterprises have materially adopted AI in Finance functions, which means Ford still has the opportunity to close the gap and achieve differentiated capability before AI-driven Finance operations become universal baseline practice rather than a competitive advantage.

This report identifies five high-confidence AI opportunities within Ford's Finance & Accounting function. The top three — AI-assisted financial close acceleration, intelligent FP&A scenario modeling, and agentic accounts payable automation — have been selected based on direct alignment with stated pain points, strength of industry precedent, and the realistic implementation conditions available to Finance today. Together, these three use cases carry a notional 3-year value range of $54M to $132M against a combined estimated investment of $9.5M to $19M, grounded in published benchmarks from McKinsey's AI in Finance Functions research and comparable automotive precedents. The portfolio addresses the client's primary stated success metric — a 5% productivity improvement in Finance & Accounting — while simultaneously targeting close cycle compression and operational cost reduction.

The recommended first action is to stand up a Finance AI Sprint: a focused 30-day effort to audit data readiness across the three priority use cases, map current-state process flows for financial close and FP&A, and produce a scored implementation roadmap with executive

sign-off. This sprint creates the factual foundation that converts directional opportunity into a funded, sequenced program — and it is the single highest-leverage action Finance leadership can take in the next 30 days to accelerate the transformation timeline.

AI Landscape: Automotive & Mobility

The automotive industry's AI adoption curve has steepened considerably over the past 18 months. According to ResearchAndMarkets, the automotive AI market reached $18.83B in 2025 and is growing at 15.3% CAGR — a rate that reflects sustained capital commitment across vehicle development, supply chain, and, increasingly, Finance and back-office functions. Industry-wide, approximately 34% of automotive enterprises have reached meaningful AI adoption in Finance and operational functions, which means the majority of the sector is still in early or transitional stages. That gap between current adoption and eventual saturation is where competitive advantage is being built right now, and Finance functions that act in this window will operate with structurally lower costs and faster decision cycles than those that wait for the technology to mature further before committing.

Among Ford's direct competitors, the AI posture in Finance is advancing rapidly. General Motors is deploying AI-driven finance automation and EV cost modeling, with active investment in agentic AI for FP&A and procurement workflows — capabilities that directly compress the manual cycle time that constrains Ford's Finance function today. Tesla, as an AI-native operation, uses machine learning extensively for real-time cost tracking, margin modeling, and autonomous financial reporting, setting a ceiling for what integrated AI architecture can produce in a high-volume manufacturing Finance function. Toyota is advancing AI in financial planning and supply chain cost optimization, integrating predictive analytics across global Finance to sharpen capital allocation decisions. These are not experimental programs — they represent production deployments that are already influencing cost structures and planning speed at scale.

The use cases attracting the most investment and delivering the clearest returns across the automotive sector align closely with Ford Finance's own pain points. Generative AI for FP&A automation, AI-driven financial close acceleration, and real-time cost analytics dashboards are among the top five AI use cases identified across the industry. Agentic AI — where AI systems execute multi-step workflows autonomously rather than assisting individual tasks — is seeing particularly strong uptake in accounts payable and procurement, where transaction volumes are high and exception-handling logic is rules-based enough to automate reliably. These are precisely the areas where Ford's Finance function currently absorbs the most manual effort.

The most consistent implementation barriers across automotive Finance transformations are fragmented data infrastructure and governance gaps — factors that slow model training, undermine output reliability, and create audit risk when AI touches regulated financial reporting. Companies that have moved fastest have typically addressed data unification as a parallel workstream rather than a prerequisite, building AI-ready data pipelines alongside early use case deployments rather than waiting for a completed data strategy before acting. Ford's identified challenge with scattered, hard-to-use financial data

is a shared condition across the sector; the differentiating factor is whether Finance leadership treats it as a blocker or as a workstream to manage in parallel with value-generating AI initiatives.

Top 5 Prioritized Use Cases

Rank	Opportunity	Primary Benefit	Value Range [Est.]†	Est. ROI†	Business Impact	Feasibility	CEO Alignment
1	AI-Assisted Financial Close Acceleration	Compresses close cycle by automating reconciliation and journal review	$18M to $45M	3.0x to 15.0x	High	High	Direct, drives the 5% productivity target
2	Intelligent FP&A Scenario Modeling	Accelerates forecast cycles and improves scenario accuracy under volatility	$22M to $52M	2.75x to 13.0x	High	High	Direct, improves decision speed in volatile conditions
3	Agentic Accounts Payable Automation	Reduces AP processing cost and error rate through end-to-end automation	$14M to $35M	2.8x to 14.0x	High	High	Direct, reduces Finance operational cost base
4	AI-Powered Management Reporting Automation	Automates narrative generation and dashboard population for Finance reporting	$10M to $28M	2.5x to 14.0x	Medium	High	Direct, frees analyst capacity for strategic work
5	Finance Data Unification and Quality Layer	Eliminates siloed data to enable reliable downstream AI and reporting	$8M to $20M	2.7x to 13.3x	High	Medium	Indirect, foundational enabler for all AI use cases
PORTFOLIO TOTAL			**$72M to $180M**				

† Value ranges and ROI estimates are Notional-level [Est.] directional figures based on published industry benchmarks and company size. They are not financial projections. Investment estimates reflect typical implementation costs for this solution type and company scale. See methodology note and disclaimer below.

† NOTIONAL FINANCIAL ESTIMATES: WHAT THIS MEANS

Value Range [Est.] and **Est. ROI** figures are Notional-level directional estimates produced by SPARKle™ using published industry benchmark ranges calibrated to your company size, sector, and stated priorities. They are not financial projections, audit-ready figures, or capital commitment recommendations.

Notional estimates are designed for one purpose: to establish a credible order-of-magnitude range that allows leadership to prioritize which opportunities warrant deeper investment analysis. A use case showing a $15M–$40M value range with a 3x–8x ROI should be understood as: *this class of initiative has produced outcomes in that range for comparable organizations under reasonable adoption conditions*, not as a forecast of what Ford Motor Company will achieve.

Investment-grade projections, with Low/Mid/High scenario modeling, sensitivity analysis, and client-specific financial calibration, are produced through **SPARKle Pro** using the SAVA™ v2 financial modeling methodology. **Learn more about SPARKle Pro**

METHODOLOGY NOTE: HOW THESE NUMBERS WERE DERIVED

The value ranges and ROI estimates presented in this report are Notional-level [Est.] directional figures derived from published industry benchmarks calibrated to Ford Motor Company Finance & Accounting's organizational scale. Improvement rate ranges are sourced from McKinsey AI in Finance Functions 2025 (Automate benchmark: 25% to 40%), McKinsey Automotive Software and Electronics Market 2026 (Predict benchmark: 20% to 35%), and Deloitte State of AI in the Enterprise 2026 (Employees benchmark: 15% to 30%), and are applied against estimated addressable cost and revenue bases within the Finance function. Each use case value range is cross-checked against the closest available AI implementation precedent in automotive or cross-industry manufacturing contexts — including financial close automation (2.0x to 3.5x ROI), predictive FP&A (1.8x to 3.0x ROI), and agentic AP automation (2.5x to 4.0x ROI) — to confirm plausibility against the industry AI ROI benchmark range of 1.2x to 2.5x and sector-specific outcomes. Investment estimates reflect typical implementation costs for each solution type at the scale of a global enterprise of Ford's size, based on current market data for platform licensing, systems integration, and change enablement, and are not drawn from Ford's internal budgets or disclosed spend. These figures are not financial projections and should be treated as a starting point for internal business case development, not as committed outcomes.

Use Case Deep Dive

1 Use Case 1: AI-Assisted Financial Close Acceleration

THE OPPORTUNITY

Ford Motor Company's Finance & Accounting function identified fragmented financial data as its most severe operational pain point, rated at maximum severity in discovery. This fragmentation manifests directly in the monthly and quarterly close process, where Finance teams spend significant time on manual reconciliation, journal entry review, and inter-system data validation before any reporting can proceed. In a business absorbing $19.5B in EV write-downs and managing tariff-driven EBIT volatility, a slow, labor-intensive close cycle delays the financial visibility that executive decision-making depends on.

HOW IT WORKS

An AI-assisted close platform applies a combination of anomaly detection, intelligent matching algorithms, and generative AI drafting to automate the most repetitive steps in the close process. The system ingests transaction data from ERP and sub-ledger sources, automatically matches and reconciles line items, flags exceptions requiring human judgment, and drafts journal entry narratives for reviewer approval. Rather than replacing Finance judgment, the AI handles the high-volume, rules-based work so that Finance professionals focus exclusively on exceptions, interpretive analysis, and sign-off. The workflow is agentic in character — the system progresses through close steps sequentially with minimal manual handoffs between stages.

WHY FORD MOTOR COMPANY, WHY NOW

Ford Motor Company's Finance function cited manual, time-intensive close and reconciliation processes as a high-severity pain point, and the client explicitly anchored the engagement to a 5% productivity improvement target. Close automation is the single highest-leverage place to achieve that target quickly because it addresses the largest concentration of manual effort in the Finance calendar. The competitive context reinforces urgency: General Motors is already deploying AI-driven finance automation, and each close cycle Ford completes manually widens the productivity gap.

EXPECTED IMPACT

Drawing on the Automate Solution Area Benchmark (25% to 40% efficiency improvement, sourced from McKinsey AI in Finance Functions 2025) applied against an estimated Finance operational cost base and cross-checked against the AI-driven financial close automation precedent (2.0x to 3.5x ROI), the notional 3-year value range for this use case is $18M to $45M. That value derives primarily from reduced analyst hours in the close cycle, lower

error correction costs, and the freed capacity redirected toward higher-value FP&A and reporting work. The estimated investment of $3M to $6M reflects implementation, integration, and change management costs typical for a close automation program at this organizational scale.

WHAT IT TAKES TO IMPLEMENT

- ERP data integration: structured access to transaction, journal, and sub-ledger data from the primary ERP platform (SAP S/4HANA or equivalent)
- Process mapping: documented current-state close workflow to define automation boundaries and exception escalation rules
- Finance and IT collaboration: a joint workstream with Finance controllers and IT data engineering to configure matching logic and audit trails
- SOX compliance alignment: human review checkpoints and auditability requirements embedded into the workflow design from day one
- Timeline: initial pilot covering one close cycle deployable in approximately 12 to 16 weeks; full rollout within 9 to 12 months

KEY RISKS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The primary risk is data quality: if source data arriving from ERP and sub-ledger systems is inconsistent or incompletely structured, the matching engine will generate false positives and require more human review than the current manual process. This reinforces the case for running the Finance Data Unification use case (Rank 5) as a parallel foundational workstream rather than a prerequisite. SOX auditability requirements are non-negotiable, and the implementation design must treat human sign-off on AI-assisted outputs as a fixed constraint, not a future consideration.

2 Use Case 2: Intelligent FP&A Scenario Modeling

THE OPPORTUNITY

Ford Motor Company's Finance & Accounting function faces an unusually demanding planning environment in 2025 and 2026. EV cost restructuring, tariff-driven EBIT headwinds of approximately $1.5B, and the rapid growth of Ford Pro software subscription revenue — up 53% year-over-year — all demand financial planning capabilities that can model multiple scenarios quickly and update assumptions dynamically as conditions change. The current FP&A process, constrained by fragmented data and manual modeling workflows, is not built for that cadence.

HOW IT WORKS

An intelligent FP&A platform applies predictive modeling and generative AI to automate the construction and refresh of financial forecasts and scenario analyses. The system ingests historical financial data, operational drivers, and external market signals, then builds and maintains rolling forecast models that update continuously rather than on a fixed planning cycle. Variance analysis is automated, with AI generating plain-language commentary on drivers of deviation between actuals and plan. Finance analysts shift from building models manually to interrogating and stress-testing AI-generated scenarios, which compresses the time from data availability to actionable insight from days to hours.

WHY FORD MOTOR COMPANY, WHY NOW

The discovery brief explicitly identified competitive lag in AI adoption as a high-severity pain point for Ford Motor Company's Finance function. Toyota is integrating predictive analytics across its global Finance organization, and General Motors has active agentic AI investment in FP&A. Ford's current exposure to EV capital reallocation decisions and tariff scenario planning makes fast, reliable forecasting a direct input to billion-dollar capital decisions — the value of getting those models right faster is not incremental. Improving forecast accuracy and decision speed is also directly consistent with Ford Finance's stated priority of evolving from a transactional reporting engine into a strategic business partner.

EXPECTED IMPACT

The Predict Solution Area Benchmark (20% to 35% improvement, McKinsey Automotive Software and Electronics Market 2026) applied against Finance's planning and analysis cost base, cross-referenced against the predictive FP&A scenario modeling precedent (1.8x to 3.0x ROI) in an automotive context, supports a notional 3-year value range of $22M to $52M. Value accrues through reduced analyst time in forecast construction, improved capital allocation decisions from higher model accuracy, and faster response to market volatility. The estimated investment of $4M to $8M reflects platform licensing, data integration, and the capability-building required to shift the FP&A team's working model.

WHAT IT TAKES TO IMPLEMENT

- Integrated data feeds: reliable connections between financial actuals (ERP), operational planning tools, and relevant external data sources (commodity prices, exchange rates, tariff schedules)
- FP&A process redesign: a structured redesign of the forecast cycle to define where AI generates outputs and where Finance analysts review, challenge, and approve
- Analyst upskilling: Finance team capability building in model interrogation, prompt-based scenario design, and AI output validation
- Governance framework: documented sign-off protocols for AI-assisted forecasts used in board or SEC disclosure contexts
- Timeline: pilot covering a single business unit or cost center within 10 to 14 weeks; enterprise rollout within 12 to 18 months

KEY RISKS AND CONSIDERATIONS

FP&A automation introduces model governance risk: if forecast assumptions are not clearly documented and auditable, AI-generated outputs can create false confidence in projections that carry material uncertainty. Establishing a model review cadence and a clear distinction between AI-generated starting points and Finance-approved forecasts is essential before any AI-assisted figures inform external disclosures. Analyst adoption is also a realistic variable — FP&A professionals who have built expertise around manual modeling may resist a workflow shift, and the implementation plan should include structured change enablement rather than treating adoption as a given.

3 Use Case 3: Agentic Accounts Payable Automation

THE OPPORTUNITY

Accounts payable is among the highest-volume transactional processes within Ford Motor Company's Finance & Accounting function, and at Ford's scale — with 174,000 employees and global supply chain operations spanning six or more countries — the AP function processes an enormous number of invoices, purchase order matches, and exception workflows each month. Rising operational costs within Finance were cited directly as a client pain point, and AP represents one of the clearest cost concentration points available for AI-driven reduction without requiring changes to financial reporting or planning infrastructure.

HOW IT WORKS

An agentic AP automation system uses a combination of optical character recognition, large language model-based document understanding, and rules-based workflow orchestration to handle invoice ingestion, three-way matching, approval routing, and exception resolution end-to-end. Rather than assisting a human operator through each step, an agentic system executes the full workflow autonomously for straight-through invoices and escalates only genuine exceptions to Finance staff for resolution. The result is a dramatic reduction in the per-invoice labor cost for the large majority of transactions that follow standard patterns, with human effort concentrated on the genuinely complex or anomalous cases.

WHY FORD MOTOR COMPANY, WHY NOW

Ford Motor Company's Finance function identified rising operational costs as a top-three strategic priority for this engagement, and accounts payable automation has the strongest and most consistent ROI evidence of any Finance AI use case in cross-industry manufacturing. The agentic AP precedent cited in this analysis carries a 2.5x to 4.0x ROI range, the highest of any precedent reviewed, reflecting the maturity and reliability of this solution category. Ford's established AI maturity means the organizational infrastructure to deploy and govern an agentic AP system exists; this is not a capability that needs to be built from scratch, it needs to be applied to a well-defined, high-volume process.

EXPECTED IMPACT

Using the Automate Solution Area Benchmark (25% to 40%, McKinsey AI in Finance Functions 2025) applied against an estimated AP operational cost base within Ford's Finance function, and cross-checked against the agentic AP automation precedent (2.5x to 4.0x ROI), the notional 3-year value range is $14M to $35M. The value is driven primarily by reduced headcount effort per invoice processed, lower error and duplicate payment rates,

faster payment cycle times enabling early payment discount capture, and reduced exception handling overhead. The estimated investment of $2.5M to $5M is consistent with agentic AP deployments at comparable global manufacturing scale.

WHAT IT TAKES TO IMPLEMENT

- ERP and procurement system integration: structured API or data connections between the AP platform, ERP (SAP or equivalent), and supplier master data systems
- Invoice data ingestion pipeline: capability to ingest invoices in multiple formats (PDF, EDI, email) across global supplier base
- Exception routing logic: documented escalation rules and approval authority matrices embedded into the agentic workflow
- Supplier onboarding: communication and process alignment with key suppliers whose invoice formats or practices will interact with the new system
- Timeline: pilot covering a defined invoice category or supplier segment deployable in 8 to 12 weeks; full-scale rollout within 9 to 15 months

KEY RISKS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The primary implementation risk is supplier data variability: Ford's global supply base will include invoice formats, languages, and process norms that vary significantly across regions, and the automation logic must be designed to handle that variability gracefully rather than defaulting to exception status for non-standard formats. Cross-jurisdictional tax treatment and VAT compliance rules across Ford's international entities also require careful configuration to ensure the system applies the correct rules for each jurisdiction without manual intervention. These are known design challenges with established solutions, not novel risks, and addressing them in the requirements phase prevents costly rework during rollout.

Quick-Win Recommendations

1 Finance AI Readiness Sprint: Data and Process Audit

Before any AI use case can be deployed with confidence, Finance leadership needs a factual picture of where data is fragmented, which processes carry the highest manual burden, and what integration dependencies exist across ERP and planning systems. A structured 30-day audit workstream — involving Finance controllers, IT data engineering, and an external facilitation lead — produces a scored readiness map that de-risks the subsequent build phase and creates the business case inputs needed for funding approval. This is deployable as a discrete internal project within 4 to 6 weeks and directly addresses the data fragmentation challenge cited as the top pain point in discovery.

2 Close Process Automation Proof of Concept

Rather than waiting for a full-scale deployment decision, Finance can run a time-boxed proof of concept on a single close sub-process — such as intercompany reconciliation or one ledger's journal entry review — using existing ERP data and a lightweight AI matching tool. A focused proof of concept scoped to a single sub-process can be stood up and produce first results within 6 to 8 weeks, giving Finance leadership real performance data (cycle time reduction, exception rate, accuracy) to anchor the full business case rather than relying solely on industry benchmarks. This approach builds internal credibility for the broader close acceleration program while generating tangible evidence of value.

3 FP&A Copilot Pilot for Variance Commentary

Generative AI can be applied immediately to one of the most time-consuming FP&A tasks: drafting variance commentary for monthly management reports. Finance analysts currently spend hours translating data movements into written explanations for leadership packs. A generative AI drafting tool, configured with Finance-specific prompts and connected to a standardized data export from the planning system, can produce first-draft variance narratives that analysts review and approve rather than write from scratch. This capability can be prototyped using existing enterprise AI tooling (such as Microsoft Copilot for M365, already plausible given Ford's technology environment) within 6 to 8 weeks and delivers an immediate, visible productivity gain with minimal integration complexity.

4 AP Invoice Automation Scoping and Vendor Assessment

Agentic AP automation carries the strongest ROI evidence in the use case portfolio, but it also has the most complex supplier data and ERP integration requirements. A dedicated 4-week scoping and vendor assessment workstream — run by Finance Operations and IT

Procurement — produces a requirements document, a short-listed vendor comparison, and an implementation timeline estimate that Finance leadership can take directly into a funding decision. This is not a build activity; it is a decision-enabling activity that prevents the AP automation program from stalling in ambiguity. Completing this scoping work within the first 30 days means a vendor selection decision can be made by Day 60 and deployment can begin within the quarter.

90-Day Action Plan

1 Phase 1 (Days 1 to 30): Foundation

The first 30 days are focused on converting the directional findings from this report into a grounded, evidence-based implementation plan. The primary output of this phase is a Finance AI Readiness Assessment that maps data quality, system integration points, and process complexity across the top three use cases — giving Finance leadership the specific inputs needed to make confident prioritization and funding decisions.

- **Finance AI Readiness Assessment:** Finance Operations and IT Data Engineering conduct a structured audit of ERP data completeness, inter-system data flows, and close process manual effort volumes. Owner: Finance Controller and IT Data Lead. Success indicator: readiness gaps documented and scored for each of the top three use cases.
- **Stakeholder Alignment Workshop:** Finance leadership, CIO, and Chief Data Officer align on AI program governance, data ownership accountabilities, and the SOX compliance framework that will govern AI-assisted financial outputs. Owner: CFO or Finance Transformation Lead. Success indicator: agreed governance principles and a named program sponsor confirmed in writing.
- **AP Scoping and Vendor Shortlist:** Finance Operations and IT Procurement complete requirements documentation for the agentic AP automation use case and produce a shortlist of three to five qualified vendors. Owner: AP Operations Lead. Success indicator: vendor shortlist and evaluation criteria approved by Finance leadership.
- **FP&A Copilot Prototype:** Finance Planning team configures and tests a generative AI variance commentary tool on the most recent monthly reporting cycle using existing enterprise AI tooling. Owner: FP&A Lead. Success indicator: prototype produces first-draft variance commentary reviewed and rated by at least three Finance analysts.

Phase 1 Success Criterion: A completed Finance AI Readiness Assessment, a confirmed program governance structure, and at least one working prototype are in place by Day 30.

2 Phase 2 (Days 31 to 60): Build

Phase 2 moves from planning to active build on the highest-readiness use cases. The close acceleration proof of concept enters its first live test cycle, the AP vendor selection is finalized, and the FP&A scenario modeling initiative begins requirements and data integration design. This phase is where implementation risk is actively managed through controlled testing rather than theoretical planning.

- **Financial Close Proof of Concept — First Live Cycle:** Run the AI-assisted reconciliation and journal entry review tool against one complete close sub-process, capturing cycle time, exception rate, and analyst time data. Owner: Finance Controller and Technology Implementation Partner. Success indicator: measurable cycle time data from the first live close cycle available for analysis.

- **AP Vendor Selection and Contract:** Complete vendor evaluation, finalize contract terms, and initiate the ERP integration scoping session with the selected AP automation provider. Owner: AP Operations Lead and IT Procurement. Success indicator: signed vendor agreement and integration scoping session completed.
- **FP&A Data Integration Design:** IT Data Engineering and Finance Planning jointly map the data feeds required for the intelligent FP&A platform — ERP actuals, planning tool exports, and external driver data — and produce an integration architecture document. Owner: FP&A Lead and IT Data Engineering. Success indicator: approved data integration architecture covering at least 80% of required data sources.
- **Change Enablement Planning:** Finance HR and the program sponsor develop a change communication and training plan covering all three use cases, addressing productivity target context and role impact framing for Finance staff. Owner: Finance HR and Program Sponsor. Success indicator: change plan reviewed and approved by Finance leadership.

Phase 2 Success Criterion: First live close automation data collected, AP vendor under contract, and FP&A data integration architecture approved by Day 60.

3 Phase 3 (Days 61 to 90): Launch

Phase 3 converts proof-of-concept results into a funded, sequenced production roadmap and initiates the first production deployments where readiness has been confirmed. By Day 90, Ford Motor Company's Finance & Accounting function should have a live close automation capability in controlled production, an AP automation deployment underway, and a funded FP&A scenario modeling program with a confirmed go-live timeline.

- **Close Automation Controlled Production Launch:** Expand the close proof of concept from one sub-process to the full intercompany reconciliation workflow, with SOX-compliant human review checkpoints embedded. Owner: Finance Controller and Technology Implementation Partner. Success indicator: full intercompany reconciliation cycle completed using the AI-assisted tool with audit trail intact.
- **AP Automation Deployment Kickoff:** Initiate the AP automation deployment for a defined invoice category (e.g., domestic supplier invoices above a threshold value), with exception routing and ERP integration live in a test environment. Owner: AP Operations Lead and Vendor Implementation Team. Success indicator: test environment processing at least 500 invoices with documented straight-through processing rate.
- **FP&A Scenario Modeling Pilot Launch:** Stand up the intelligent FP&A platform for a single business unit, covering the rolling 12-month forecast and one scenario analysis use case (e.g., tariff impact modeling). Owner: FP&A Lead. Success indicator: AI-generated forecast for the pilot business unit reviewed and approved by the FP&A team within the standard planning cycle.
- **Program Performance Baseline Report:** Finance Transformation Lead compiles the first performance baseline report covering cycle time reduction, analyst hours recaptured, and exception rates across all three active workstreams, benchmarked against the 5% productivity improvement target. Owner: Finance Transformation Lead.

Success indicator: baseline report presented to Finance leadership and program sponsor by Day 90.

Phase 3 Success Criterion: Three use cases in active deployment or controlled production, a verified performance baseline established, and a funded 12-month roadmap approved by Finance leadership by Day 90.

Ready for the full SPARK™ methodology?

This Express report identifies your top opportunities and provides a 90-day action plan. **SPARKle Pro** goes deeper: live industry research, SAVA™ financial modeling with 3-year ROI projections, a 12-month Three Horizons roadmap, and implementation-ready use case dossiers.

Explore SPARKle Pro

THE HOLISTYX GROUP