

The Operating Gap

Why Good Real Estate Strategies Underperform in Execution

The investment thesis does not execute itself.

Nina-Lee Jewell Alhambra

Founder & Managing Partner

JEWELL ADVISORY GROUP

SEPTEMBER 2026

jewelladvisor.com

Executive Summary

Real estate organizations are exceptionally disciplined about underwriting assets. They model rent growth, occupancy, operating expenses, capital needs, financing, downside cases, renovation premiums, tax exposure and exit assumptions. Yet many investment processes stop just before the question that ultimately determines whether those assumptions become results: what operating system will make the thesis executable?

That missing layer is the operating gap. It is not simply a property-management problem, an asset-management problem, a technology problem or an organizational-design problem. It is the enterprise risk created when investment strategy, operating execution and accountability are not designed as one connected system. More precisely, the gap forms when an underwriting assumption is not translated into explicit operating ownership, measurable leading indicators, decision thresholds and an escalation path.

The gap is most visible after an acquisition, during rapid growth, in a stressed portfolio, through a property-management transition, or when an organization introduces new technology without changing the underlying decision architecture. But the underlying issue begins earlier. It begins when an underwriting assumption enters the investment case without a clear operational owner, leading indicator, decision threshold and escalation path.

The current market makes this more consequential. CBRE reported average U.S. multifamily rent growth of 0.5% year over year in Q2 2026 and maintained a 1.4% average annual rent-growth forecast for 2026 at midyear. Yardi Matrix reported 0.4% annual advertised-rent growth in August. At the same time, CBRE recorded \$3.4 billion of entity-level multifamily transactions in Q2, up from zero a year earlier. In a lower-growth, uneven market, value creation depends less on broad market lift and more on the quality and speed of execution. [1][2]

Technology raises the stakes further. Deloitte's 2027 Commercial Real Estate Outlook, based on a survey of 950 industry leaders, reports that more than 90% expect to increase spending on data and technology. Yet only 72% reported completing preliminary data mapping and source verification for AI systems, and fewer than half had implemented more advanced process and security controls. Better tools can improve decision speed, but they cannot compensate for weak ownership, inconsistent definitions or unclear governance. [4]

For institutional owners, investors and boards, the implication is straightforward: operating risk is investment risk. The operating system should be underwritten, governed and reviewed with the same seriousness as the capital structure.

1. Underwriting Defines the Thesis. Execution Tests It.

An investment committee approves a set of assumptions. The operating platform inherits a set of obligations - and then generates new evidence about whether those assumptions still hold. Execution therefore does more than deliver the plan; it tests the investment case in real time.

The distinction matters. Underwriting is designed to test whether an asset or portfolio can generate an acceptable return under defined assumptions. Execution is the process of turning those assumptions into operating behavior across people, properties, vendors, systems and decisions. The first is analytical. The second is organizational.

A model can assume 95% occupancy. It cannot assign leasing accountability. It can assume renovation premiums. It cannot determine whether unit turns, procurement, capital approvals and pricing decisions move fast enough to achieve the planned velocity. It can assume expense growth. It cannot decide who challenges contracts, who validates utility trends, who escalates insurance exposure or when a variance becomes a portfolio-level decision.

This is why good strategies can underperform without the original strategy being obviously wrong. The gap may sit in the handoff from acquisitions to asset management; between asset management and property management; between finance and operating teams; between technology and process; or between executive leadership and the decisions that remain unresolved below it.

The operating gap is therefore not the difference between a good asset and a bad operator. It is the difference between an investment thesis and an organization designed to execute that thesis repeatedly.

The model is not the operating system.

From underwriting assumption to operating requirement

If the thesis assumes...	The operating system must define...	What should be visible early...
Occupancy / rent growth	Leasing ownership, pricing authority, concessions discipline and renewal strategy	Traffic-to-lease conversion, exposure, renewal decisions, effective rent
Expense control	Budget ownership, contract authority, purchasing standards and variance escalation	Category-level variance, recurring exceptions, controllable vs. structural cost
Renovation / value-add	Unit selection, scope, turn timing, capital approval and post-work pricing	Cycle time, cost per turn, achieved premium, downtime and ROI
CapEx execution	Priority rules, funding gates, project ownership and schedule control	Committed vs. spent, schedule slippage, risk to operations and cash flow
Collections / receivables	Screening, receivables ownership, payment-plan authority, escalation and legal/process standards	Receivables aging, collection rate, payment-plan performance, bad debt and write-offs
Refinance / exit	Valuation cadence, debt monitoring, consent requirements and decision rights	Debt maturity risk, hold/sell scenarios, capital needs, trigger dates

2. The Operating System Between Thesis and Results

The operating system is not a single department. It is the set of connected mechanisms through which the enterprise converts investment intent into repeatable action. In a scaled real estate platform, at least eight elements must work together.

Investment direction. The current thesis for the asset or portfolio: what creates value, what destroys value, what is changing, and what management is trying to accomplish now - not only what was approved at acquisition.

Asset management. The owner-side function that converts operating facts into investment decisions, challenges performance, updates strategy, prioritizes capital and connects property-level activity to portfolio outcomes.

Property operations. The execution engine for leasing, maintenance, resident experience, staffing, collections, purchasing and day-to-day delivery.

Capital. The mechanisms that fund and govern repairs, renovations, development obligations, reserves and value-creation initiatives.

People and organizational design. Roles, capacity, skills and spans of accountability aligned to the work the platform actually requires.

Governance and decision rights. Clarity about who recommends, who decides, who executes, who must be consulted, and what happens when performance leaves plan.

Data and technology. A controlled source of information that supports action - not simply more dashboards. Systems matter only when definitions, access, ownership and workflows are clear.

Performance cadence and accountability. The recurring rhythm through which assumptions, actual results, forecasts, risks, decisions and actions are reconciled.

When these elements are aligned, the organization can detect deviation quickly, understand the cause, make a decision, assign action and update the forecast. When they are not aligned, the enterprise often produces more reporting but less clarity. Issues move sideways across functions. Property management becomes the default explanation for every miss. Asset management becomes a reporting layer rather than an investment function. Finance owns numbers without owning operating assumptions. Technology automates fragments of a process that nobody fully owns.

The result is not always dramatic failure. More often, it is leakage: slower decisions, inconsistent execution, capital deployed late, recurring variances normalized, weak forecasts, duplicated work, and leadership attention consumed by problems that should have been resolved at a lower level.

3. Where the Operating Gap Actually Forms

Failure Pattern 1 - The handoff is treated as an event

Acquisition closes, the operating team receives a model and diligence files, and responsibility is considered transferred. The problem is that an investment thesis is not a static packet of assumptions. It changes through closing adjustments, capital discoveries, lease-up conditions, financing constraints, staffing decisions and market movement. If the handoff does not explicitly transfer the current thesis, unresolved risks, data ownership, decision calendar and accountable operators, the organization begins ownership with information but without a shared operating position.

Failure Pattern 2 - Asset management monitors instead of governs

In weaker models, asset management receives reports, asks questions and follows up on variances. In stronger models, asset management owns the asset strategy, translates results into investment implications, recommends capital decisions, challenges operating assumptions and ensures that deviations have accountable actions. The distinction is not semantic. Monitoring describes activity. Governance defines accountability.

Failure Pattern 3 - Property management becomes the universal diagnosis

Property management is often where performance problems surface first, so it is also where organizations tend to place blame. But occupancy, expenses, collections, staffing and service outcomes can reflect upstream decisions about product, capital, pricing, incentives, organization design, technology, reporting, ownership expectations or decision speed. Replacing an operator without diagnosing the ownership system can simply move the same problem to a new management company.

Failure Pattern 4 - Reporting is mistaken for a decision system

A platform can have excellent dashboards and still manage poorly. The essential question is not whether information exists. It is whether the right people review the same facts at the right cadence, understand what changed, know what decision is required, and can see who owns the next action. Reporting that does not change a decision or clarify accountability is documentation, not management.

Failure Pattern 5 - Technology is layered onto an unresolved process

Organizations often respond to operating friction by adding software, dashboards, automation or AI. Technology can reduce manual work and improve visibility, but only after the enterprise has defined the underlying workflow. If source data is inconsistent, decision rights are unclear or nobody owns an output, automation scales ambiguity. Deloitte's 2027 outlook captures this tension: more than 90% of surveyed CRE executives expect to increase data and technology spending, but fewer than half reported more advanced process and security controls for AI-enabled systems. [4]

Failure Pattern 6 - Scale outruns organizational design

A structure that works at ten assets can break at fifty. A platform that succeeds with one property manager may need a different governance model with five. A founder-led decision process that feels fast during early growth can become a bottleneck once the organization spans markets, strategies and capital partners. Scale changes the work. The operating model has to change with it.

4. Why the Gap Matters More Now

The operating gap exists in every cycle, but market conditions determine how much room organizations have to absorb it. Today, that room is narrow.

Lower rent growth increases the value of execution

CBRE reported average U.S. multifamily rent growth of 0.5% year over year in Q2 2026 and maintained a 1.4% average annual rent-growth forecast for the year at midyear. Yardi reported 0.4% annual advertised-rent growth in August, while noting that lease-up inventory remained elevated and performance continued to vary sharply by market. In that environment, performance differences are increasingly created through occupancy discipline, renewal execution, collections, controllable expenses, capital decisions and asset-level strategy - not broad market appreciation alone. [1][2]

Portfolio and entity transactions put integration into the investment case

The return of larger combinations makes the operating system part of the transaction thesis itself. In September 2026, Independence Realty Trust and Centerspace announced an \$8.1 billion combination covering more than 44,000 apartments. The announced rationale includes approximately \$24 million of annualized synergies, integration of best practices, technology and operating systems, with full integration expected over the twelve months following closing. Those benefits do not arise because the legal transaction closes. They depend on the combined operating platform executing the integration. [3]

The same logic applies below public-company scale. Every portfolio acquisition, management-company change, recapitalization or platform build creates an integration burden. The question is whether that burden is underwritten as deliberately as the financial structure.

AI increases decision speed - and therefore the cost of weak governance

AI can accelerate reporting, forecasting, research, leasing workflows and operating analysis. But faster output is not the same as better judgment. If organizations automate before they define data ownership, exception rules, approval rights and accountability, they can create faster versions of the same operating ambiguity. The governance layer becomes more important as technology becomes more capable, not less.

5. Operating Risk Is Investment Risk

Boards and investment committees tend to spend significant time on market assumptions, basis, leverage, capital structure, downside cases and exit values. They should apply similar discipline to the operating architecture that sits between those assumptions and realized returns. That does not mean boards should manage property operations. It means they should be able to see whether management has converted the investment thesis into explicit ownership, measurable indicators, decision rights and an operating cadence capable of protecting the thesis.

The practical shift is to ask operating questions before performance breaks, not after. That does not mean turning the investment committee into a property-operations meeting. It means identifying the assumptions whose realization depends on enterprise behavior and ensuring those assumptions have an executable ownership structure before capital is fully exposed.

The operating control loop

ASSUMPTION	OWNER	INDICATOR	THRESHOLD	DECISION	ACTION	FORECAST
------------	-------	-----------	-----------	----------	--------	----------

For every material underwriting assumption, the owner should be able to trace a simple control loop: assumption → accountable owner → leading indicator → threshold → decision → action → forecast update. The loop matters because a variance can be visible without being managed. If any link is missing, the organization may know that performance is off plan while still lacking the authority, timing or information required to correct it.

This is the distinction between reporting and control. Reporting explains what happened. A control system establishes what must be watched, who can act, when escalation is required and how the investment view changes once new information is known.

Testing the thesis when operating evidence changes

The control loop should test whether the investment assumptions still hold. A recoverable execution delay and an impaired investment assumption require different responses. Before committing additional capital, management should distinguish what it can correct through operating action from what has changed in the economics of the investment.

Consider a hypothetical renovation program. If unit delivery is delayed but completed units achieve the expected premiums at the expected cost, leadership may need to resolve procurement or staffing constraints and revise the timing of cash flows. If completed units consistently miss the assumed premium while costs rise, faster delivery alone will not restore the original economics. Management should reassess the remaining scope, expected incremental returns and competing uses of capital before authorizing the next tranche.

The COO coordinates the response across operations, asset management, finance and capital teams within the firm's governance structure. Management brings decision-makers a current forecast, feasible alternatives, their tradeoffs, the required authority and a date for reassessment. Boards oversee material risk and management's response at agreed thresholds; they do not run the renovation program. The test is whether new evidence changes a decision while there is still a meaningful choice to make.

Questions an institutional owner should be able to answer

- Which underwriting assumptions require the most operating execution to be achieved?
- Who owns each assumption after close - and is that ownership explicit?
- What leading indicators show that the thesis is moving off plan before the financial variance becomes material?
- Which decisions can property management make independently, and which require asset-management or executive approval?
- How quickly can the organization move from variance to diagnosis to decision to action?
- Does asset management own the current strategy, or primarily coordinate reporting?
- Are budget, forecast, capital plan and asset strategy using the same operating assumptions?
- What is the escalation path for unresolved cross-functional issues?
- Are technology and AI initiatives attached to defined workflows and controls?
- Can the board see whether management is protecting or revising the thesis as evidence changes - not only whether the quarter met budget?

These questions turn the operating model from an organizational topic into an investment-control discipline. They also expose a common misconception: operating infrastructure is not overhead layered onto the asset. At institutional scale, it is part of the mechanism by which value is created and protected.

6. The Real Cost of the Gap

The operating gap rarely appears as a single line item. Its cost is distributed across the portfolio, which is one reason it can persist for years.

Delayed response. Performance deteriorates for several reporting cycles before the organization agrees on the cause or assigns corrective action.

Forecast credibility. Operating assumptions, budgets and forecasts become disconnected, reducing confidence in decision support and capital planning.

Capital drift. Projects are approved without a clear link to the current asset strategy, or good projects move too slowly to protect value.

Management churn. Property managers are changed repeatedly when the underlying ownership model, governance or decision rights remain unresolved.

Executive bottlenecks. Decisions concentrate at the top because roles below are unclear, underpowered or not trusted.

Technology proliferation. New systems are added to fix symptoms, creating more data and process complexity without changing accountability.

Talent fatigue. High performers compensate for structural weaknesses until the work becomes dependent on heroics rather than institutional capability.

None of these costs necessarily invalidates the investment thesis. Together, however, they can erode the speed, consistency and judgment required to realize it.

7. Institutionalizing Execution

Closing the operating gap does not require building bureaucracy. It requires building a system that makes the investment thesis observable and executable.

The strongest platforms are explicit about four things: what the strategy is now, who owns the decisions that move it, what information is required to manage it, and what happens when results deviate from plan. They connect asset management, property operations, finance, capital, technology and leadership around those questions rather than allowing each function to manage a separate version of the portfolio.

That discipline is especially important during periods of scale, integration or transformation. The organization should be able to absorb a new asset without inventing a new reporting architecture, change a property manager without losing the asset thesis, add technology without losing control of the process, and grow without forcing every exception to the executive team.

The objective is not perfect prediction. Real estate will always contain uncertainty: markets change, costs move, residents behave differently than models assume, construction schedules slip, regulation changes and capital markets reprice risk. A strong operating system does not eliminate uncertainty. It allows the organization to see change earlier, make better decisions and respond with discipline.

For a board or investment committee, the practical test is therefore not whether management has a dashboard. It is whether the organization can demonstrate a line of sight from the assumptions that justified the capital allocation to the decisions, owners and operating evidence that now govern the asset.

The investment thesis is the starting case. The operating system is how the enterprise executes it - and determines when the case must change.

A minimum operating architecture

At minimum, an institutional platform should make the following mechanisms visible and repeatable. The objective is not bureaucracy; it is a common operating language that allows the enterprise to scale without losing the investment thesis in translation.

Management mechanism	Institutional standard
Asset direction	A current thesis for each material asset or portfolio, updated when assumptions change.
Operating ownership	Named accountability for the operational variables that drive the thesis.
Decision rights	Clear thresholds for property, asset-management, finance and executive decisions.
Performance cadence	A recurring cycle linking actuals, forecast, market context, risks, decisions and actions.
Capital governance	Prioritization based on strategy, risk, return and timing - not only budget availability.
Data control	Defined sources, owners, definitions and review standards for decision-critical information.
Escalation	Known triggers and routes for issues that cannot be resolved at the normal operating level.
Learning loop	Realized performance compared with underwriting and current strategy to improve future decisions.

Conclusion

For investors and boards, the operating gap is ultimately a governance question: has the organization built the institutional machinery required to convert capital allocation into realized performance?

The answer cannot be found in the underwriting model alone. It sits in the quality of the handoff, the authority of asset management, the clarity of property-management accountability, the discipline of capital planning, the reliability of data, the design of decision rights and the operating cadence through which leadership acts.

Real estate performance is never purely financial and never purely operational. It is the result of an investment strategy moving through an operating system. The organizations that treat those two disciplines as one management problem will be better positioned to protect value, integrate growth and perform through changing cycles.

Selected Evidence & Public Sources

[1] CBRE, “Strong Absorption Drives Down Multifamily Vacancy Rate,” U.S. Multifamily Figures Q2 2026, July 29, 2026; and “U.S. Real Estate Market Outlook Midyear Review 2026 - Multifamily,” August 2026. Q2 average monthly rent increased 0.5% year over year; multifamily investment volume totaled \$34.9B; entity-level transactions totaled \$3.4B versus zero a year earlier. CBRE maintained a 1.4% average annual rent-growth forecast for 2026 at midyear.

[2] Yardi Matrix, “National Multifamily Market Report - August 2026,” September 11, 2026. Average U.S. advertised asking rent increased 0.4% year over year in August to \$1,773; approximately 1.2 million units remained in lease-up.

[3] Independence Realty Trust / Centerspace, “Independence Realty Trust and Centerspace to Merge in \$8.1 Billion Combination,” September 9, 2026. The companies cited approximately \$24M of annualized synergies, additional operating synergies through technology and operating-system integration, and an expected twelve-month full-integration period after closing.

[4] Deloitte, “2027 Commercial Real Estate Outlook,” published September 24, 2026, based on a survey of 950 CRE executives and direct reports. More than 90% expect to increase data and technology spending; 72% reported preliminary data mapping and source verification for AI systems; fewer than half reported implementing stronger process and security controls.

CBRE Q2 2026 · CBRE Midyear 2026 · Yardi August 2026 · IRT / Centerspace · Deloitte 2027 CRE Outlook

About the Author

Nina-Lee Jewell Alhambra is Founder & Managing Partner of Jewell Advisory Group and a senior real estate executive whose experience spans investment strategy, acquisitions, asset management, operations, organizational transformation, affordable and workforce housing, and institutional platform leadership. Jewell Advisory Group focuses on the operating decisions that determine whether real estate investment strategy translates into performance.

Book a Discussion | jewelladvisor.com | 424-744-0943