Operational Case Studies

Leadership & Problem-Solving Portfolio — Work sample

Critical Infrastructure Operations

Website : https://resistancezero.com/

> **Confidentiality Notice**
>
> *All case studies in this document are anonymized and generalized. No customer-identifiable, site-identifiable, proprietary configurations, or confidential operational data is disclosed. Specific metrics have been approximated to demonstrate scale of impact without revealing precise internal performance data. This document focuses on leadership methodology, problem-solving frameworks, and transferable operational competencies.*

Bagus Dwi Permana

Engineering Operations Leader | Data Center Infrastructure | Critical Systems

Experience Context: Concurrently maintainable data center facility, Southeast Asia region

Operational Scope: Live production environment with parallel expansion phase

Executive Summary

This portfolio presents 18 operational case studies demonstrating systematic problem-solving in mission-critical infrastructure environments. Each case illustrates structured thinking, root cause methodology, and leadership approach under real-world constraints where decisions directly impact availability, safety, and regulatory compliance.

The cases span multiple operational domains: safety and alarm management, maintenance transformation, cooling optimization, electrical system reliability, BMS performance, cross-functional coordination, and people leadership. All solutions were developed and executed while maintaining uninterrupted service.

Leadership Principles Demonstrated:

- Reliability over perfection — prioritizing achievable solutions that can be validated and sustained

- Safety over optics — decisions must hold up during real failures with limited resources
- Operability over design intent — systems must work for the people who operate them
- Ownership over escalation — taking accountability first, negotiating resources second
- Retention before capability — competency investment requires team stability first

Impact Summary (Generalized)

Operational Efficiency • Maintenance compliance: improved by >30 percentage points to near-full compliance • Nuisance alarms: reduced by >90% • False evacuations: eliminated during expansion phase	**Cost Optimization** • Annual savings: tens of thousands (currency) through in-house transition • Vendor dependency: significantly reduced • Energy waste: reduced through zone isolation
System Reliability • Cooling availability: preserved during grid events • Emergency systems: brought to full compliance • Power infrastructure: risk-mitigated across all streams	**People Leadership** • Team retention: improved to above-industry benchmark • Attrition: reduced by >80% • Capability growth: enabled through stability
Operational Resilience (Technical Debt Management) • Inherited defects: tens of thousands of construction snags managed in parallel with live operations • Incident resolution: ~1,500 debt-related incidents resolved over 2 years → reduced to ~500 (normal operations) • Customer impact: zero SLA breaches throughout remediation period	

Case Study Index

#	Case Title	Domain
1	Alarm Management During Construction	Safety & Compliance
2	Budget Execution Framework	Financial Operations
3	Maintenance Compliance Transformation	Maintenance
4	In-House Capability Development	Cost Optimization
5	Low Load Cooling Optimization	Energy Efficiency
6	Asset Preservation Strategy	Asset Protection
7	Live Load Transfer Protocol	Customer Operations
8	Emergency Lighting Remediation	Electrical Systems
9	Substation Compliance Program	Power Systems
10	Chiller Protection Logic Optimization	Cooling Systems
11	Fuel System Integrity Program	Generator Systems
12	Fire Suppression System Recovery	Fire Protection
13	BMS Performance Optimization	Controls & Monitoring
14	Operational Risk Register	Risk Governance
15	HVAC Zone Optimization	Energy Efficiency
16	Cross-Functional Alignment	Organization
17	Team Retention & Stability	People Leadership
18	Technical Debt Resolution at Scale	Operational Resilience

Section A

Safety, Compliance & Alarm Management

Case 1

Alarm Management During Construction

Situation

During facility expansion, fit-out activities generated significant nuisance alarms including multiple false fire evacuations that disrupted live operations. Each evacuation required customer notification, operational shutdown protocols, and post-incident reporting. The frequency was eroding confidence in the alarm system and creating alarm fatigue among operations staff.

Approach & Analysis

Applied structured root cause analysis (RCA) to identify contributing factors: permit-to-work process gaps, absence of fire zone isolation protocols during construction activities, and contractor awareness gaps regarding alarm implications. The permit system existed but lacked operational enforcement rigor.

Methodology Applied

Implemented Management of Change (MOC) approach: (1) Revised permit-to-work with mandatory operations sign-off, (2) Developed fire zone isolation matrix mapping work areas to detector zones, (3) Established mandatory contractor briefings covering alarm strategy and emergency procedures, (4) Created real-time communication protocol between contractors and control room. Applied PDCA cycle for continuous improvement.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Nuisance alarms reduced by >90% during subsequent expansion phase. False evacuations eliminated. Demonstrated that construction and operations can coexist through structured controls rather than accepting disruption as inevitable.

Case 8

Emergency Lighting System Remediation

Situation

A data hall experienced persistent emergency lighting failures over an extended period. Multiple contractors had assessed the situation but declined remediation due to diagnostic complexity. Symptoms included control logic inconsistencies and emergency fixtures failing to activate during blackout simulations—a direct safety and compliance concern.

Approach & Analysis

Engineering Operations assumed ownership and conducted systematic fault-tree analysis from distribution level to individual fixtures. Investigation revealed interconnected issues originating from commissioning phase: control logic conflicts, degraded backup components, and integration mapping errors. The complexity arose from these being interdependent—fixing one in isolation would not resolve system behavior.

Methodology Applied

Applied systematic troubleshooting methodology: (1) Circuit-by-circuit verification against design intent, (2) Component-level testing with documented acceptance criteria, (3) Integration validation with BMS, (4) Full functional simulation under actual blackout conditions, (5) Measured verification against regulatory illumination requirements. Documented all findings in technical report for audit trail.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Long-standing issue resolved. Emergency lighting brought to full regulatory compliance with documented evidence. Demonstrated that 'unsolvable' problems often require ownership transfer and systematic methodology rather than continued contractor cycling.

Case 9

Substation Compliance Remediation Program

Situation

The main electrical infrastructure had accumulated multiple compliance and reliability gaps that were identified in various reports but not systematically addressed. Issues spanned fire protection coverage, equipment protection systems, and maintainability concerns across multiple power distribution streams.

Approach & Analysis

Rather than treating findings as isolated defects, mapped them as interconnected risks affecting three dimensions: reliability (protection systems), safety (fire protection and maintenance access), and maintainability (operational procedures). This systemic view revealed that partial remediation would leave residual exposure.

Methodology Applied

Developed consolidated remediation program using risk-based prioritization: (1) Risk register with severity and likelihood scoring, (2) Phased implementation aligned with maintenance windows, (3) Vendor coordination for specialized scopes, (4) Acceptance criteria and test procedures for each mitigation, (5) Progress tracking with leadership visibility. Applied formal MOC process for all changes.

Outcome & Value Delivered

All power distribution streams now have documented risk status with clear ownership and remediation tracking. Demonstrated structured approach to inherited technical debt—systematic rather than reactive.

Case 14

Operational Risk Register Implementation

Situation

Lessons learned from incidents and design gaps were documented in various formats but not systematically tracked. When similar issues recurred, there was no mechanism to identify prior recognition or accountability for incomplete mitigation. Risks were effectively forgotten until they manifested as incidents.

Approach & Analysis

Identified root cause as absence of structured risk governance. Findings existed in static documents without regular review. Ownership was ambiguous—engineering might identify risks, but responsibility for driving remediation was unclear. Without living tracking, important-but-not-urgent items were perpetually displaced.

Methodology Applied

Implemented live risk register framework: (1) Standardized risk documentation with impact/likelihood assessment, (2) Named individual ownership (not team or role), (3) Realistic mitigation timelines aligned with operational constraints, (4) Monthly review cadence with leadership, (5) Direct linkage to capital planning for risk-based investment prioritization. Integrated with audit response process.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Risk governance now embedded in operational rhythm. Demonstrated that sustainable improvement requires tracking systems, not just good intentions.

Section B

Maintenance Operations & Cost Optimization

Case 2

Budget Execution Framework

Situation

Budget execution for operational and capital expenditure relied on disconnected tracking across finance, operations, and engineering teams. No integrated view linked budget allocation, execution program, and ownership—making it impossible to answer basic questions about spending trajectory or execution status.

Approach & Analysis

Root cause was lack of systematic linkage between budget (what money is available), program (what work is planned), and ownership (who ensures completion). Each was managed separately without reconciliation cadence. This led to forecast deviation, delayed maintenance, and year-end budget scrambles.

Methodology Applied

Built program-based execution framework integrating all three elements: (1) Single-source tracking with budget codes, planned dates, and assigned owners, (2) Weekly reconciliation of planned vs. actual progress, (3) Dashboard reporting for leadership visibility, (4) Early warning indicators for variance management. Used accessible tools (task management platform) rather than complex systems.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Budget accuracy improved with variances identified early enough for corrective action. Demonstrated that operational discipline comes from integration and cadence, not sophisticated tools.

Case 3

Maintenance Compliance Transformation

Situation

Work order compliance—percentage of planned maintenance completed on schedule with proper documentation—was significantly below acceptable levels. Roughly one-third of planned maintenance was either incomplete, late, or undocumented. For critical infrastructure, this created audit risk and equipment reliability concerns.

Approach & Analysis

Analysis identified process root causes rather than personnel issues: (1) Weak administrative workflow where orders were lost or forgotten, (2) Inadequate shift handover where in-progress work fell through during transitions. Technicians were capable, but the system did not support reliable execution.

Methodology Applied

Redesigned administrative workflow: (1) Standardized work order creation with required fields, (2) Clear assignment routing ensuring every order has an owner, (3) Shift handover checklist including open work order review, (4) Automated escalation approaching due dates, (5) Weekly compliance review with leadership. Focused on process design, not performance pressure.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Compliance improved by >30 percentage points to near-full compliance. Demonstrated that performance problems are often system problems—fix the process, and people perform.

Case 4

In-House Capability Development

Situation

The facility relied heavily on external vendors for routine maintenance, creating cost overhead (margins, mobilization), scheduling inflexibility, and knowledge drain. The operations team had technical capability but lacked documented procedures and management authorization to take ownership.

Approach & Analysis

Vendor dependency had developed during early operations when the team was learning systems. Over time, temporary support became embedded practice. The transition required building confidence through documentation, training, and demonstrated competency.

Methodology Applied

Executed structured transition plan: (1) Identified activities suitable for in-house execution based on complexity and safety, (2) Developed SOPs with step-by-step instructions and required materials, (3) Trained staff with documented competency verification, (4) Established spare parts inventory, (5) Maintained vendor relationships for specialized work. Phased approach—proved capability before expanding scope.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Achieved significant annual savings while improving response time and building team capability. Demonstrated that cost optimization and capability building can be complementary, not competing objectives.

Section C

Cooling Systems & Energy Efficiency

Case 5

Low Load Cooling Optimization

Situation

Cooling systems designed for full occupancy were operating significantly below design load during ramp-up phase. Equipment was running continuously regardless of actual demand, resulting in inefficient operation where energy consumption per unit of cooling was suboptimal.

Approach & Analysis

Control logic was commissioned for full-load scenarios. No operational strategy existed for the extended low-load period typical of data center ramp-up. Default behavior treated all capacity as immediately needed—operationally conservative but energetically wasteful.

Methodology Applied

Implemented staged cooling strategy: (1) Developed load thresholds determining optimal equipment online count, (2) Programmed staged operation with time delays preventing short-cycling, (3) Optimized setpoints for equipment operating closer to efficient range, (4) Established monitoring comparing actual vs. predicted demand. Balanced efficiency gains against operational margins.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Energy efficiency improved while maintaining cooling headroom. Demonstrated that design-state assumptions should be challenged during actual operations—efficiency requires active management, not passive acceptance.

Case 10

Chiller Protection Logic Optimization

Situation

Regional grid instability caused power quality events that triggered simultaneous shutdown of multiple cooling units, significantly reducing capacity during each event. Recovery required manual intervention, creating thermal risk during the restart period.

Approach & Analysis

Analysis revealed factory-default protection settings were overly conservative for local grid conditions. Equipment was being overprotected—shutting down not due to actual damage risk, but because alarm thresholds assumed more stable power than actually existed. The protective behavior was appropriate for design assumptions but not for operational reality.

Methodology Applied

Worked with OEM to analyze actual equipment protection requirements vs. configured settings. Implemented revised protection strategy that maintained equipment protection while preventing unnecessary full shutdowns. Re-tuned logic to allow graceful degradation and automatic recovery once conditions stabilized.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Cooling capacity now preserved during grid events. Recovery time significantly reduced through automatic restart capability. Demonstrated that vendor defaults should be validated against site conditions—'safe' settings can create operational risk if they cause unnecessary trips.

Case 15

HVAC Zone Optimization

Situation

HVAC systems were conditioning areas not yet occupied or rarely accessed—treating all zones equally regardless of actual utilization. The building automation maintained setpoints everywhere, consuming energy where no benefit was delivered.

Approach & Analysis

Control system was commissioned with all zones active, appropriate during construction. However, no process existed to review utilization patterns and adjust conditioning as usage became clear. The system cooled empty spaces because no one explicitly told it to stop.

Methodology Applied

Implemented dynamic isolation strategy: (1) Mapped zones by utilization category (active, intermittent, idle), (2) Programmed zone isolation reducing conditioning to idle areas, (3) Established setback conditions maintaining envelope protection without full conditioning, (4) Created occupancy-based override for zones needing activation, (5) Monitored for adverse effects. Balanced savings against humidity and equipment protection requirements.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Energy consumption reduced in idle zones while maintaining appropriate conditions where needed. Demonstrated that efficiency opportunities often exist in default behaviors that no one has questioned.

Case 6

Asset Preservation Strategy

Situation

Newly constructed areas not yet in service sat in zero-load condition, sometimes for extended periods. Equipment remained energized but idle, creating degradation risk for batteries, transformers, and rotating equipment before generating any operational value.

Approach & Analysis

Design and commissioning focus on readiness for immediate deployment, but sales cycles mean capacity may wait months or years before occupancy. No preservation strategy existed—the assumption was equipment would simply wait, but batteries discharge, transformers benefit from periodic loading, and rotating equipment needs exercise.

Methodology Applied

Implemented preservation program: (1) Periodic battery cycling at manufacturer-recommended intervals, (2) Transformer exercise using load banks to recommended minimums, (3) Cooling system rotation exercising mechanical components, (4) Environmental monitoring maintaining acceptable storage conditions, (5) Documentation tracking for warranty compliance. Treated idle assets as requiring active stewardship.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Asset degradation risk mitigated. Warranty compliance maintained. Demonstrated that operational responsibility extends to equipment not yet earning revenue—preservation protects capital investment.

Section D

Power & Fuel Infrastructure

Case 11

Fuel System Integrity Program

Situation

Routine fuel quality testing revealed contamination trending upward in the storage system—indicating ongoing ingress rather than one-time event. Fuel quality directly impacts generator reliability during emergencies when backup power is most critical.

Approach & Analysis

Site investigation identified the ingress path: access points designed for maintenance were not weatherproofed for site drainage conditions. Design assumptions did not account for actual rainfall patterns and surface water behavior.

Methodology Applied

Implemented multi-layer mitigation: (1) Weatherproofing upgrades for access points, (2) Drainage improvements directing surface water away, (3) Secondary containment and removal systems, (4) Increased testing frequency during high-risk periods, (5) Remediation of existing contamination through treatment. Addressed immediate issue while preventing recurrence.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Ingress path eliminated. Fuel quality restored and maintained. Generator reliability protected. Demonstrated that infrastructure assumptions should be validated against actual site conditions—design intent may not match operational reality.

Section E

Fire Protection & Building Systems

Case 12

Fire Suppression System Recovery

Situation

Pneumatic control systems for fire suppression were experiencing chronic pressure issues, causing support equipment to run nearly continuously. Extended runtime indicated system leakage and was causing premature wear and nuisance alarms.

Approach & Analysis

Detailed inspection identified multiple contributing factors: age-related degradation at connection points, vibration-induced stress where lines ran near operating equipment, and seal degradation. The system had been compensating for leakage with increased equipment runtime—masking the problem until equipment stress made it visible.

Methodology Applied

Implemented systematic recovery: (1) Pressure decay testing to locate all leak sources, (2) Connection repair and replacement program, (3) Vibration isolation where lines were exposed to mechanical stress, (4) Seal replacement for degraded components, (5) Full pressure verification to confirm leak-free operation, (6) Runtime monitoring to confirm normal cycling restored.

Outcome & Value Delivered

System integrity restored. Equipment runtime reduced to normal patterns. False alarms eliminated. Demonstrated that chronic 'nuisance' issues often indicate underlying problems that worsen if not addressed—symptoms should trigger investigation, not just workarounds.

Case 13

BMS Performance Optimization

Situation

The building management system interface was experiencing significant performance issues—slow response, delayed inputs, and occasional hangs. Operators reported that lag affected their ability to respond quickly to alarms and monitor system status. During incidents, the interface became an obstacle rather than a tool.

Approach & Analysis

Analysis revealed the interface was overloaded with complex graphical elements prioritizing aesthetics over functionality. Each screen required significant processing to render. Graphics had been specified by stakeholders wanting impressive visuals without considering operational performance requirements.

Methodology Applied

Worked with integrator to redesign following high-performance HMI principles: (1) Simplified graphics conveying same information with reduced processing load, (2) Consistent visual hierarchy prioritizing alarm status and critical values, (3) Reduced decorative elements to those serving operational purposes, (4) Optimized navigation minimizing clicks to key information, (5) Operator testing to verify acceptable response times.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Interface response improved significantly. Operators navigate efficiently during normal operations and incidents. Demonstrated that control room aesthetics should serve operators, not impress visitors—function over form for critical systems.

Section F

Coordination & Organizational Alignment

Case 7

Live Load Transfer Protocol

Situation

Commissioning activities required transferring live customer load between sources—high-risk activity where errors could result in outage and SLA breach. Commissioning needed to complete work for project milestones while operations needed to protect availability. These objectives were in tension.

Approach & Analysis

Previous transfers were executed without structured coordination, relying on informal communication. No documented plan specified sequence, decision points, abort criteria, or roles. Each transfer was ad-hoc, with risk management depending on individual experience.

Methodology Applied

Developed structured protocol: (1) Transfer plan template documenting sequence, timing, and decision points, (2) Customer coordination with advance notification and real-time communication, (3) Clear abort criteria—conditions requiring transfer stoppage and safe-state return, (4) Defined roles: transfer authority, execution team, monitoring team, (5) Post-transfer review capturing lessons. Converted tribal knowledge to repeatable process.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Transfers now executed with documented plans, customer alignment, and clear accountability. Zero availability breaches from transfer activities. Demonstrated that high-risk activities require explicit coordination—assuming alignment creates risk.

Case 16

Cross-Functional Alignment Framework

Situation

Engineering, finance, and planning functions were operating in silos with limited visibility into each other's priorities. Engineering planned without budget visibility, finance decided without operational context, planning scheduled without execution input. Frequent conflicts, delays, and escalations resulted.

Approach & Analysis

Each function had optimized its own processes without integration. Meetings were status updates rather than collaborative planning. Conflicts escalated to leadership rather than being resolved at working level—consuming management time and creating delays.

Methodology Applied

Implemented integrated framework: (1) Shared planning cadence with weekly cross-functional sessions, (2) Common visibility where all teams see same information, (3) Decision rights clarity—what each function can decide independently vs. requiring input, (4) Escalation protocol defining what rises to leadership, (5) Metrics tracking cross-functional outcomes rather than individual function performance.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Execution improved with fewer delays and conflicts. Leadership escalations reduced. Demonstrated that integration requires explicit design—hoping functions will coordinate naturally creates friction.

Section G

People Leadership & Team Development

Case 17

Team Retention & Stability

Situation

Prior to my leadership, the engineering team experienced severe attrition significantly exceeding industry norms. Departures included experienced members whose institutional knowledge was difficult to replace. Constant churn prevented stable competency development—each resignation triggered recruitment cycles, onboarding overhead, and productivity gaps.

Approach & Analysis

Exit feedback revealed factors beyond compensation: blame-oriented incident response, limited decision authority requiring excessive escalation, unclear growth paths, and workload imbalance causing burnout among high performers. The environment was reactive rather than supportive.

Methodology Applied

Implemented supporting leadership model: (1) Non-blaming incident management focusing on system failures rather than individual fault, (2) Delegated decision authority within clear boundaries, (3) Visible growth paths with skill matrices and development roadmaps, (4) Workload monitoring and active rebalancing, (5) Regular informal connection reducing hierarchy friction, (6) Collective problem-solving positioning challenges as shared rather than assigned. Focused on creating environment where people choose to stay.

Outcome & Value Delivered

Attrition reduced by >80% to above-industry retention benchmark. Stable team enabled execution of in-house capability development, cost optimization, and reliability improvements that would have been impossible under high-churn conditions. Demonstrated that people leadership is operational leadership—technical excellence means nothing if the team delivering it keeps leaving.

> **Leadership Philosophy**
>
> *"Competency investment is ineffective if employee retention is low."*
>
> The approach follows a deliberate sequence: Retention → Competency → Leverage → Sustainable Results. Supporting leadership—setting guardrails rather than controlling, creating psychological safety without losing accountability—enables technical operations that command-and-control cannot sustain.

Section H

Operational Resilience & Technical Debt Management

Case 18

Technical Debt Resolution at Scale

Situation

The facility was handed over with a massive construction punchlist—tens of thousands of documented defects/snags requiring remediation. The business decision was made to proceed with handover despite incomplete construction closeout, driven by customer retention priorities and commercial timelines. This meant accepting operational ownership of a facility with significant known (and unknown) technical debt, with remediation to occur in parallel with live customer operations.

Approach & Analysis

The scale of inherited defects meant that issues would continue surfacing over time—many problems were latent, not visible at handover but emerging as systems were stressed under real operational conditions. Over approximately two years, this manifested as roughly 1,500 incident tickets generated from defects surfacing during operations. Each incident required investigation to determine whether it was a new issue or a symptom of underlying construction debt, then appropriate remediation while protecting live customer services.

Methodology Applied

Implemented structured technical debt management: (1) Defect-to-incident correlation tracking to identify patterns and prioritize root cause remediation over repeated symptom treatment, (2) Risk-based prioritization matrix weighing customer impact, safety criticality, and remediation complexity, (3) Parallel execution model allowing operations team to maintain service while systematically closing construction gaps, (4) SLA protection protocols ensuring customer commitments were never compromised during remediation activities, (5) Stakeholder communication maintaining transparency with customers about improvement activities without creating concern, (6) Contractor coordination for items requiring original installer involvement while maintaining operational control.

Outcome & Value Delivered

All approximately 1,500 inherited-debt incidents resolved systematically. Current operational state (2025): approximately 500 tickets representing normal operational volume rather than legacy debt. Zero SLA breaches throughout the entire remediation period despite the scale of underlying issues. Demonstrated that massive technical debt can be managed through disciplined prioritization and parallel execution—accepting imperfect handover does not mean accepting operational failure.

> **Operational Resilience Principle**
>
> *"Business reality sometimes requires accepting imperfect handover. Operational leadership means managing that reality without compromising customer commitments."*
>
> The choice was not between perfect handover or operational chaos—it was between delayed customer deployment or disciplined parallel execution. Choosing the latter required systematic tracking, clear prioritization, and relentless focus on protecting what matters most: customer service continuity.

Closing Statement

> This portfolio demonstrates how I approach operational leadership: **systematic problem-solving, structured methodology, and sustainable improvement.**
>
> Each case reflects the same underlying approach: take ownership of problems others avoid, apply root cause methodology rather than symptom treatment, implement solutions that work under real constraints, and build systems that sustain improvements beyond individual effort.
>
> *Infrastructure reliability requires stable, capable teams. Technical excellence and people leadership are not separate competencies—they are interdependent. The goal is dependability in practice, not perfection on paper.*

Bagus Dwi Permana • baguspermana7@gmail.com • Available for discussion