

Decision Logic Snapshot

When a business problem keeps becoming yours
without authority, equity or a defined role

Sample case: Senior operator - informally supporting a partner-owned UAE contracting business

Please read first

This document is based on an anonymised real case used with permission. Names, company and project identifiers, and selected details have been changed or generalised. It is published to show how a Decision Logic Snapshot works. Nothing here is legal, financial, employment or relationship advice.

WHAT YOU ASKED ME

How do I stop being pulled into my partner's business problems without damaging our relationship? Am I being used, or am I creating part of the problem myself?

MY SHORT ANSWER

The core problem is not that you care too much, and it is not yet proven that he is deliberately using you. The problem is that you repeatedly absorb operational responsibility without matching authority, ownership or a defined role. Separate help from responsibility: decide what you own, what you only advise on, and what consequence must remain with the person who made the decision.

Written after a focused Decision Session · Delivered within 48 hours · Anna P. Kovalerskaya, Black Phoenix Strategies

What you came in with

You are not an owner of the company, yet you keep getting pulled into client meetings, delivery problems and operational rescue. You see risks early, warn the owner, and often end up stepping in when the issue becomes real. The work is not constant, but the responsibility follows you far beyond the hours you spend on it.

Here is what you told me, and what each fact means in practice.

What you told me	What it means in practice
You are not an owner of the company and you do not control its corporate decisions.	You can influence outcomes without having the formal rights that normally accompany accountability.
You are still visible in meetings, correspondence and problem-solving when a major project is under pressure.	Clients and counterparties can experience you as part of management even when your legal or commercial authority is limited.
The owner sometimes makes commitments and the follow-through is weaker than the commitment.	You are exposed to the gap between what was promised and what is actually being executed.
You often identify delivery risks early, raise them, and later watch the same risks materialise.	Your judgement is useful, but repeated warnings can pull you toward taking ownership of decisions that were never yours.
The amount of work is not enormous every week, but the mental and reputational load is larger than the hours suggest.	The real cost is not timesheets. It is being psychologically “on call” for problems you cannot fully control.
Your personal relationship is not one-way. There is care, practical support and reciprocity outside the company.	“He is simply using me” is too crude to explain the whole situation. The business boundary can be poor even when the relationship has real reciprocity.
You have described similar imbalances in earlier ventures, where you carried a large share of work, cash or rescue responsibility.	This case may be one instance of a broader transaction pattern rather than a one-off argument about one project.

THE FIRST THING I WOULD CHANGE ABOUT THE QUESTION

You are asking “how do I make him follow through, and am I being used?” The question underneath it is: “what responsibility am I willing to carry when I do not control the decision - and what business boundary protects both the project and the relationship?”

What is actually going on

Four things are happening at the same time. Together they turn informal help into recurring responsibility.

1 · Your competence is functioning as an emergency system. You spot problems early and can often fix them. That is valuable - but it also means the business learns that when something starts to break, you will step in before the full consequence reaches the person who owns the decision.

2 · Responsibility and authority are split. You can be visible to clients and materially involved in outcomes, but you do not own the company, control its cash, make every operational decision or hold formal authority equal to the responsibility you sometimes absorb. The company can therefore use your judgement without giving you the structure that normally goes with accountability.

3 · The personal relationship and the business role are sitting on top of each other. Because this is not just a business relationship, saying no to work can feel like rejecting the person. That makes an ordinary professional boundary emotionally expensive, so the boundary is delayed until irritation is already high.

4 · Consequences keep moving toward the person most willing to carry them. The owner can make a commitment, delay an action or ignore a warning. You then face a choice: let the problem materialise in front of a client, or intervene. Each rescue protects the immediate outcome but makes the same structure easier to repeat.

THE LOOP YOU ARE LIVING IN

You see the risk -> you warn the owner -> the decision remains his -> follow-through is weak or delayed -> the problem becomes visible -> you step in to protect the outcome -> the immediate crisis improves -> your rescue becomes part of how the system expects to operate -> the next warning again feels like your problem.

None of this requires the owner to be deliberately exploiting you. A system can become asymmetric simply because one person repeatedly closes the gap and the other person comes to rely on that gap being closed.

Where your own thinking is working against you

What you do	Why it costs you
You move from adviser to rescuer when the risk becomes real.	The system learns that responsibility can remain vague because you will close the operational gap.
You keep explaining the risk after the decision-maker has already chosen not to act.	You spend energy trying to control an outcome without controlling the decision right.
You let the personal relationship justify professional availability.	A request that would be negotiated with any other owner can arrive as an emotional obligation instead.
You treat stepping back as if it means abandonment.	That makes even a reasonable boundary feel morally harsher than it is.
You measure fairness after the contribution has already become unequal.	By the time resentment appears, the arrangement has often been running on the imbalance for long enough that changing it feels like conflict.

SOMETHING YOU SAID THAT DOES NOT ADD UP

You describe yourself as “only helping,” but clients can see you in meetings, correspondence and recovery work. You also say the final decisions are his, yet you repeatedly protect the result when those decisions go wrong. Responsibility is migrating toward you even though authority is not.

What this means. The issue is not whether you should care less. It is whether seeing a problem automatically makes you responsible for solving it. Right now those two things are too close together.

Your three options, and what each one really asks of you

Option	What you get	What could go wrong	What has to be true first
A · Continue as you are	No immediate confrontation. Projects keep benefiting from your judgement and rescue capacity.	The same pattern continues: unclear ownership, repeated intervention, rising resentment and reputational exposure without control.	You would have to accept that the current imbalance is the price you are willing to pay - without expecting the owner to operate differently.
B · Withdraw completely	A clean break between you and the company. Your time and attention return to you immediately.	You may overcorrect, create avoidable delivery damage or turn a business boundary into a relationship crisis.	Existing commitments would need a proper handover, and you would need to be comfortable with problems materialising without your intervention.
C · Create a defined, bounded role	You can still contribute where your judgement adds value, while responsibility, authority and expectations become visible.	The owner may resist the structure. Some problems may surface once you stop rescuing them. The relationship may temporarily feel less comfortable.	Scope, authority, external representation, escalation rules and compensation must be explicit enough to survive the next urgent project.

What I think today

I would choose C. I would not continue the current informal arrangement, and I would not disappear from the business overnight. I would replace the undefined role with a bounded one: clear scope, clear authority, clear external representation and a clear line between advice and ownership of consequences.

The point is not to punish anyone or prove who is right. It is to find out whether the business and the relationship can function when your competence is no longer available as unlimited insurance.

What I would do next: make the boundary operational

A boundary that exists only in your head will collapse under the next urgent project. Put it into the way work is actually assigned and decisions are actually made.

- 1 · Write the role on one page. Separate three categories: what you own, what you advise on, and what is explicitly not yours. If a task has no owner, that does not automatically make you the owner.
- 2 · Stop making or carrying external commitments without matching authority. If a client or contractor asks for a commitment that belongs to the owner, route it to him or confirm the delegation in writing before you take responsibility for the answer.
- 3 · Use a one-warning rule for decisions you do not own. State the risk, the likely consequence and the action you recommend. If the owner chooses differently, record the decision and stop trying to rescue the decision unless new facts emerge or the issue falls inside your agreed scope.
- 4 · Finish the current project through a defined handover, not open-ended availability. List the items you are already responsible for, complete or transfer them, and identify who owns every next step after that date.
- 5 · Attend meetings for a reason, not because the situation feels unsafe without you. Before each meeting ask: what decision am I there to make, what information am I there to provide, and what authority do I have once I leave the room?
- 6 · If the company wants ongoing operational accountability from you, formalise it. That means title, authority, scope, compensation, decision rights and a clear reporting line. If the owner does not want to formalise those things, keep your role advisory rather than operational.
- 7 · Separate the relationship conversation from the project conversation. Do not negotiate the meaning of the relationship in the middle of a client crisis. Agree the business boundary when neither of you is trying to save a delivery.
- 8 · Review the arrangement after 60 days. Measure what actually changed: how often you were pulled back in, what failed without you, whether decisions became clearer, and whether conflict increased or decreased once responsibility was visible.

The pattern underneath this company problem

You described similar structures in more than one earlier venture. The people and industries changed; the transaction logic did not.

- You contributed a large share of the money, work, rescue capacity or reputational risk.
- Formal ownership, authority or upside was not always proportional to that contribution.
- The arrangement stayed soft because partnership, loyalty or the feeling of not carrying everything alone had value in itself.
- When the other side underperformed, you increased your own effort instead of allowing the structure to expose the gap.
- The immediate problem was solved, but your additional effort became the new baseline.
- Resentment arrived later, when you were already carrying responsibilities that had never been consciously agreed.

This does not prove a personality type, and it does not prove that every counterpart was acting in bad faith. It does show a repeatable transaction-design problem: you can give relationship value, trust or equality before you have priced the downside of what happens if performance is not equal.

The practical change is not “trust nobody.” It is: never let goodwill decide authority, downside, compensation and exit mechanics for you.

WHAT THE TEST TELLS YOU

If the company continues to function when you stop rescuing outside your scope, the boundary is working. If performance falls because your invisible labour was holding the system together, you have learned that your role was substantive and should either be formalised or ended. If the personal relationship destabilises simply because you stop absorbing business consequences, that is separate evidence about the relationship - not a reason to remove the boundary.

One rule to keep

Seeing the risk gives you information. It does not automatically give you ownership of the consequence.

07

What the problem is, and what it is not

You said	What I think is closer to the truth
“He uses me.”	There is real reciprocity in the personal relationship. The business arrangement is the part that allows your competence to be used without clear rules.
“If I see the problem and do nothing, I am letting it fail.”	You may be observing a risk whose consequence belongs to the person who owns the decision. Seeing is not the same as owning.
“He needs to listen to me.”	If you are only advising, he is allowed to ignore the advice and own the result. If you are accountable for the result, you need matching authority.
“I do not want work conflict to damage the relationship.”	The undefined role is already importing work conflict into the relationship. A clear boundary may protect it better than permanent accommodation.
“I only help occasionally.”	The hours may be limited. The cognitive, reputational and rescue responsibility can still be significant.
“The project may fail if I step back.”	That is possible. It is also information. A business that works only because an unofficial person repeatedly catches the consequences has a structural problem that rescue keeps hidden.

THE ORDER I WOULD DO THIS IN

1 · Define what you own, advise on and exclude -> 2 · Complete a written handover for the current project -> 3 · Stop external commitments without authority -> 4 · Formalise authority/compensation if the company wants ongoing accountability -> 5 · Run the boundary for 60 days and judge the system by what actually happens, not by what either of you promises.

The part people get wrong. Total withdrawal can feel like the cleanest boundary, but it may simply be the opposite extreme of over-involvement. The better test is whether you can remain supportive without becoming the automatic operating layer underneath someone else's decisions.

08

What I am not sure about

This is what I think after one conversation. These are the facts that could materially change the recommendation:

- I have not reviewed the company formation documents, your employment/visa documents or any formal delegation of authority. If your name or title creates legal or contractual exposure, that needs local legal review.
- I have not reviewed the live project contracts, client correspondence or commitments made in writing. The commercial boundary may be clear while the correct handover still depends on what has already been promised.
- I have only heard your side of the business relationship. The owner may describe the division of labour, your authority or his expectations differently.
- I do not yet know the true economic value of your contribution: time spent, revenue protected, problems prevented, or what it would cost the company to replace the work you currently do informally.
- I do not know how the owner will respond once the boundary becomes operational rather than verbal. That response is important evidence, but it should not be predicted in advance.
- I have not assessed the personal relationship independently. The fact that there is real reciprocity outside the business is important; it is also why I would avoid reducing the entire situation to “he uses you.”
- If you decide to formalise an ongoing role, the right employment, corporate, tax and compensation structure should be checked with the relevant specialists.

One last thing. Your ability to see a problem before other people see it is an asset. The expensive version of that asset is assuming that every problem you can see is therefore yours to solve. The boundary is not between caring and not caring. It is between insight and responsibility.

Based on an anonymised case. Names, company and project identifiers, and selected details have been changed or generalised. Any recommendation would change if the facts change or documents show a different picture. Strategic and analytical advisory: not therapy, coaching, legal, financial or employment advice.

Anna P. Kovalerskaya · Black Phoenix Strategies · Dubai · London · annakovalerskaya.com