PART 13

# Robotic Process Automation, Workflow, and Hyperautomation

*Pure robotic process automation is in decline. The category is being absorbed by intelligent process automation, integration platforms, and embedded automation in enterprise platforms. The CFO must understand the difference.*

*The Finance Technology Stack*
*A CFO's Strategic and Architectural Guide*

# The Rise and Fall of Pure Robotic Process Automation

The robotic process automation category has the unusual distinction of being the most overhyped category of the previous decade and the most under-delivered. The category emerged in the mid-2010s with extraordinary promises about the digital workforce that would automate routine work across the finance function and the broader enterprise. The vendors raised substantial capital. The implementation partners built large practices. The analyst community produced reports projecting transformation. The enterprises invested billions of dollars in licenses and implementations. The results, ten years on, are sobering.

The honest reckoning with the robotic process automation experience is that the category produced real but limited benefits for most enterprises that invested in it. The category did automate certain routine tasks that had previously required human attention. The category did reduce certain operational costs. The category did accelerate certain processes. The category did not produce the transformation the early promises suggested. The category did produce a substantial inventory of fragile bots that require continuous maintenance. The category did produce a substantial vendor relationship cost that many enterprises continue to question. The category did produce skepticism among finance leaders that affects how they evaluate the successor categories that are now emerging.

The reckoning is important because the lessons matter for the categories that have emerged in robotic process automation's wake. Intelligent process automation, hyperautomation, integration platform as a service, and the emerging agentic platforms all build on the foundation that robotic process automation established while addressing the limitations the original category revealed. The chief financial officer who treats these successor categories as if they were the same as robotic process automation will make poor decisions in all of them. The chief financial officer who treats them as if they had nothing to do with robotic process automation will miss the architectural continuities that connect them. The work of this part is to lay out the category landscape with awareness of both the lineage and the evolution.

The strategic position the chief financial officer should hold on automation in 2026 is calibrated rather than enthusiastic or skeptical. Automation is a real capability that produces real value when deployed appropriately. The category landscape has matured beyond the simple robotic process automation framing. The relationship between automation and the broader architecture has become more sophisticated, with process mining as the prerequisite, integration platforms as the connective tissue, and the emerging artificial intelligence capabilities as the next horizon. The chief financial officer who reasons about automation strategically rather than transactionally will produce an automation portfolio that contributes to the function. The chief financial officer who

continues to evaluate each automation opportunity as if it were a robotic process automation use case from 2018 will produce a portfolio that captures only a fraction of the available value.

The work of this part is to provide that strategic framing. The part treats the category landscape with the honest reckoning the field deserves, examines the process mining discipline that should precede automation investment, surfaces the architectural decisions, and provides the diligence questions. The reader will leave with the framing to lead the automation agenda with awareness of what the category has become rather than with assumptions inherited from what it once promised to be.

# The Honest Reckoning with Robotic Process Automation

Before treating the category landscape, the masterclass owes the reader an honest reckoning with the robotic process automation experience of the past decade. The reckoning matters because the lessons shape how the chief financial officer should approach the current category. The lessons include the structural limitations of the original technology, the implementation patterns that succeeded and failed, the vendor dynamics that distorted the field, and the cultural realities that the early promises did not anticipate.

## What Robotic Process Automation Actually Was

Pure robotic process automation in its original form was a category of software that automated user interface interactions with existing applications. The bot would log into the same applications that a human user would use, navigate the same screens, click the same buttons, and process the same transactions, with the bot replacing the human at the keyboard. The category was positioned as a transformative technology because it could automate work across legacy applications that lacked modern application programming interfaces, without requiring modifications to those applications. The positioning was technically accurate and operationally significant in cases where the legacy application landscape was the binding constraint on automation.

The positioning also obscured several structural limitations. The bots that automated user interface interactions were inherently fragile, because they depended on the user interface remaining stable. A minor update to an application's user interface, the kind of update that vendors deploy routinely, would break the bots that depended on the previous interface. The bots required continuous maintenance to remain operational. The maintenance cost grew over time as the bot portfolio expanded and as the underlying applications evolved. The total cost of ownership across a multi-year horizon often exceeded the savings the bots produced.

The category also exhibited a structural pattern in which the bots automated narrow tasks rather than full processes. The bot would automate the data entry from one system to another. The bot would automate the report generation. The bot would automate the file processing. Each bot addressed a specific task within a broader process, but the process as a whole continued to require human coordination across the bots and the residual manual work. The enterprises that pursued aggressive automation programs accumulated large inventories of narrow bots that automated tasks but did not transform processes. The cumulative effect on operational performance was often modest relative to the investment.

## Where Robotic Process Automation Succeeded

The category did produce real successes in specific contexts. The successes share recognizable characteristics. The processes that were automated were high-volume, high-frequency, and structurally repetitive. The user interfaces involved were stable and not subject to frequent changes. The applications involved were legacy systems where modern integration was not feasible. The bots were implemented with disciplined governance that maintained them as the environment evolved. The implementation teams understood the limitations of the technology and designed around them.

Specific finance use cases where robotic process automation succeeded include the periodic processing of bank statements into the general ledger when bank integrations were limited, the automated handling of expense report routing when expense management platforms were rudimentary, the periodic data extraction from legacy systems for reporting purposes, and the automated handling of certain compliance and regulatory submissions. In each of these cases, the conditions favored the technology and the implementations were disciplined.

## Where Robotic Process Automation Failed

The category also produced substantial failures, with patterns that reveal the structural issues. The failures share recognizable characteristics. The processes selected for automation were not well-suited to the technology. The user interfaces involved were unstable, producing high maintenance burden. The bots were deployed without the governance to maintain them. The implementation teams oversold the capability and undersold the maintenance cost. The cumulative bot inventory grew faster than the maintenance capacity, producing a portfolio of fragile, partially functional bots.

Specific patterns of failure include the automation of processes that were poorly designed in the first place, with the consequence that the bots accelerated the bad process rather than improving the overall outcome. The automation of processes where the underlying application was about to be replaced, with the consequence that the bot became obsolete before the investment was recovered. The automation of processes where the variability of inputs exceeded the bot's tolerance, with the consequence that the bot required substantial human intervention for the exception cases. The acquisition of robotic process automation licenses without the implementation discipline to deploy them effectively, with the consequence that the licenses sat unused while the vendor relationship costs continued.

## The Lessons

The lessons from the robotic process automation experience matter for the categories that have emerged in its wake. The first lesson is that automation requires understanding the underlying

process before applying the technology. Process mining, treated later in this part, is the discipline that addresses this lesson. The second lesson is that the technology choice matters. The categories of automation have differentiated substantially, and the right technology for a particular use case is rarely the original robotic process automation pattern. The third lesson is that governance matters. An automation portfolio without governance becomes a maintenance burden that consumes more value than the automation produces. The fourth lesson is that the integration architecture matters. Automation that operates through integration with the underlying systems is more durable than automation that operates through user interface interaction, and the integration architecture should be a deliberate decision rather than a consequence of the available technology. The chief financial officer who carries these lessons into the current category will reason about automation with awareness of what produces value and what produces cost.

# The Current Category Landscape

The category that emerged from robotic process automation has differentiated into several distinct subcategories. The differentiation reflects both the limitations of the original pattern and the emergence of better-suited technologies for different use cases. The chief financial officer who reasons about automation in 2026 must distinguish among the subcategories rather than treating them as variations of a single technology.

## The Robotic Process Automation Platforms

The dedicated robotic process automation platforms continue to operate, though their positioning has shifted substantially from the original framing. UiPath has been the dominant platform in the category and has invested heavily in extending beyond pure robotic process automation into broader automation capabilities including artificial intelligence integration, process mining, and integration platform capabilities. The platform is now positioned as a comprehensive automation platform rather than as a pure bot platform. Automation Anywhere has followed a similar trajectory, extending the platform into broader capabilities and repositioning around the intelligent automation framing. Blue Prism, acquired by SS&C in 2022, has continued to serve the enterprise segment with a focus on the governed deployment of bots in regulated industries.

Microsoft Power Automate has built a substantial position by integrating automation capabilities with the broader Microsoft platform. The platform supports both the bot-style automation that competes with UiPath and Automation Anywhere, and the workflow automation that operates through the Microsoft Graph and the Power Platform. The integration with the broader Microsoft ecosystem has been a substantial competitive advantage, particularly for enterprises committed to Microsoft platforms across business applications.

The robotic process automation platforms have evolved substantially. The original limitations of user-interface-dependent bots have been addressed through integration capabilities that allow the platforms to use application programming interfaces where available and to fall back to user interface interaction only where necessary. The platforms have integrated artificial intelligence capabilities that allow the bots to handle variation in inputs more gracefully than the original pattern. The platforms have added orchestration capabilities that connect the individual bots into broader process flows. The category in 2026 is materially more capable than the category in 2018, and the chief financial officer who carries forward assumptions from the earlier period will misjudge the current capability.

## The Integration Platform as a Service Category

Parallel to the robotic process automation platforms, the integration platform as a service category has emerged as a different approach to automation. Rather than automating user interface interactions, the integration platforms connect applications through their application programming interfaces and orchestrate the flow of data and actions across the connected applications. The pattern produces automation that is more durable than the original robotic process automation pattern because it does not depend on user interface stability, more scalable because integration platforms can handle higher volumes than user interface automation, and more transparent because the integration logic is visible and modifiable.

The category leaders include Workato, which has built a strong position in the enterprise segment with a focus on business process automation through integration. Tray.io, which serves the mid-market and lower enterprise segments with a modern integration platform. Zapier, which dominates the small business and lower mid-market segments with a broad library of pre-built connectors and a simple user experience. n8n, which has emerged as an open-source alternative with growing commercial adoption. Make, formerly Integromat, which competes with Zapier in similar segments. The category has matured substantially and serves a wider range of use cases than the original robotic process automation category.

Beyond these dedicated platforms, the broader integration platform category includes the enterprise integration platforms treated in Part Seventeen including MuleSoft, Boomi, and Informatica. The boundary between integration platforms and automation platforms is increasingly blurred, with the enterprise integration platforms supporting automation use cases and the automation platforms supporting integration use cases. The chief financial officer who reasons about automation should reason about the broader integration architecture in parallel, because the two categories increasingly serve the same use cases through different architectural approaches.

## The Document Automation Category

A specialized category that has emerged is document automation, which addresses the specific problem of extracting structured data from unstructured documents. The category is particularly relevant to the finance function because the volume of unstructured documents that finance processes is substantial. Invoices arrive as PDFs or images. Contracts arrive in various formats. Bank statements arrive in formats that require extraction. Tax documents arrive in formats that require interpretation. The traditional handling of these documents required substantial manual effort. The document automation platforms address the specific problem through specialized technology.

The category leaders include ABBYY, which has been a long-standing leader in document processing with strong positions in invoice processing and broader document automation.

Hyperscience, which has built a position in document understanding with advanced machine learning capabilities. Kofax, which serves the enterprise segment with broad document processing capability. The document automation capabilities embedded in the broader accounts payable automation platforms like AppZen and Tipalti compete with the dedicated document platforms for the specific accounts payable use case. The category has been transformed by the advances in large language models and computer vision, with the capabilities in 2026 substantially exceeding what the category could deliver even three years ago.

## The Embedded Automation in Enterprise Platforms

Increasingly, the enterprise platforms themselves are embedding automation capabilities that compete with the dedicated automation platforms. The major enterprise resource planning systems have invested substantially in workflow automation embedded within their platforms. The financial planning and analysis platforms have added automation capabilities for the planning workflows. The close acceleration platforms have automation as a core capability. The procure-to-pay platforms have substantial automation embedded. The customer relationship management platforms have automation through the broader workflow capabilities.

The implication is that some of the use cases that historically would have required dedicated automation platforms can now be served by the embedded capabilities of the enterprise platforms. The implication does not eliminate the role of dedicated automation platforms, but it does change the architectural calculus. The chief financial officer who reasons about automation in 2026 must consider whether each candidate use case is better served by the embedded capabilities of the platform where the work occurs, by a dedicated integration platform that orchestrates across platforms, or by a dedicated robotic process automation platform that automates the residual interface-based work that the other approaches cannot reach.

# Process Mining: The Prerequisite to Credible Automation

The most important lesson from the robotic process automation experience is that automation requires understanding the underlying process. The lesson sounds obvious, but the implementation history demonstrates how often it was ignored. Enterprises automated tasks they did not understand, within processes they had not examined, using bots designed by people who did not have access to the actual process data. The results were predictably poor. The discipline that addresses this gap is process mining, and it is the prerequisite to credible automation in 2026.

## What Process Mining Is

Process mining is the discipline of extracting the actual process flow from the event logs produced by enterprise systems. The discipline differs fundamentally from process documentation, which captures how the process is supposed to work according to the people who designed it or who manage it. Process mining captures how the process actually works according to the data the systems record. The two views often differ substantially. The documented process may show a clean linear flow. The actual process may show extensive loops, exceptions, deviations, and variations that the documentation does not acknowledge. The difference between the documented and the actual is where most automation projects encounter their problems.

The platforms that support process mining work by ingesting event logs from the operational systems including the enterprise resource planning system, the close acceleration platform, the procure-to-pay platforms, and the order-to-cash platforms. The platforms reconstruct the process flow from the event sequences. The platforms produce visualizations that show the actual paths the process takes, the frequencies of each path, the durations of each step, the bottlenecks where work accumulates, and the deviations from the documented process. The visualizations expose the operational reality that the documentation conceals.

## The Process Mining Platforms

The category is dominated by Celonis, which has built the leading position with a comprehensive process mining platform that has expanded to include execution capabilities that act on the process insights. The platform is widely used across the enterprise segment, with substantial adoption in finance functions for the procure-to-pay, order-to-cash, and close acceleration processes. Soroco offers task mining capabilities that complement process mining by examining the actual user interactions with applications rather than only the events the systems record. ABBYY Timeline provides process mining as part of ABBYY's broader document automation

platform. UiPath Process Mining is integrated with the broader UiPath automation platform. The category continues to evolve with substantial investment and continues to add new entrants.

## Why Process Mining Matters for Automation

Process mining matters for automation for several reasons that the early robotic process automation programs ignored. The mining surfaces the actual process complexity that automation must accommodate, including the exception paths and the variations that the documented process does not acknowledge. The mining identifies the specific steps where automation will produce the most value, by quantifying the volume and the cost of each step. The mining provides the baseline against which the post-automation results can be measured, supporting the business case validation that most automation programs lack. The mining surfaces the process redesign opportunities that may produce more value than automation of the existing process, addressing the pattern in which automation accelerates a bad process rather than improving the overall outcome.

The chief financial officer who treats process mining as a prerequisite to automation will produce automation programs that capture value reliably. The chief financial officer who treats process mining as an optional supplementary activity will produce automation programs that repeat the failure patterns of the previous era. The discipline is one of the more important architectural commitments the chief financial officer makes for the automation agenda.

# The Architectural Decisions Across Automation

Several architectural decisions span the automation category and must be held deliberately.

## The Build Versus Buy Versus Orchestrate Decision

The first architectural decision is the choice among building automation directly into the enterprise platforms, buying dedicated automation platforms, and orchestrating across platforms through integration architectures. The three approaches address different use cases and produce different operational characteristics.

Building automation into the enterprise platforms means using the embedded workflow and automation capabilities of the platforms where the work occurs. The approach captures the integration coherence that comes from automation within the same platform that holds the data and supports the process. The approach is constrained by the capabilities of the embedded automation, which may not match what dedicated automation platforms can offer for specific use cases.

Buying dedicated automation platforms means acquiring platforms like UiPath, Automation Anywhere, Microsoft Power Automate, Workato, or Tray.io to address use cases that the embedded capabilities cannot reach. The approach captures the depth and flexibility that dedicated platforms provide. The approach produces additional integration burden because the dedicated platforms must integrate with the enterprise platforms where the work occurs.

Orchestrating across platforms means using integration platforms or the integration capabilities of dedicated automation platforms to coordinate work across multiple enterprise platforms. The approach captures the value of automating end-to-end processes that span multiple systems. The approach requires sophisticated integration architecture and produces the highest implementation complexity of the three patterns.

Most enterprises operate a hybrid that combines elements of all three approaches. The right balance depends on the specific use cases, the maturity of the enterprise platforms, the talent profile of the automation team, and the strategic value of automation in the specific business context. The chief financial officer who holds this decision deliberately will produce a hybrid that is honestly optimized. The chief financial officer who follows the dominant pattern of a single vendor or approach will produce an architecture that over-serves some use cases and under-serves others.

## The Centralized Versus Distributed Automation Decision

The second architectural decision is the operating model for the automation program. A centralized model holds the automation capability in a central team that develops, deploys, and maintains automations across the enterprise. A distributed model embeds automation capability in the business functions that operate the automated processes. A hybrid model combines a central team for the platforms, the standards, and the governance with distributed teams for the use case development and deployment.

The dominant trend has been toward the hybrid model after early experiments with both pure centralization and pure distribution revealed limitations. The pure centralized model produced bottlenecks that constrained the rate of automation deployment. The pure distributed model produced fragmentation that produced inconsistent governance and accumulated maintenance debt. The hybrid model balances the platform and governance discipline of centralization with the use case responsiveness of distribution.

The chief financial officer who designs the operating model deliberately will produce an automation program that operates at scale. The chief financial officer who allows the operating model to drift will produce a program that either bottlenecks at the central team or fragments across the distributed teams.

## The Maintenance and Governance Decision

The third architectural decision is the maintenance and governance discipline for the automation portfolio. The discipline addresses how individual automations are monitored once deployed, how they are maintained as the underlying systems evolve, how they are retired when they become obsolete, and how the portfolio as a whole is governed. The discipline is the discipline that the early robotic process automation programs failed to establish and that produced the maintenance burden the category accumulated.

A serious automation governance discipline includes the inventory of automations with the metadata required to maintain them, the monitoring infrastructure that detects when automations fail or degrade, the change management process that addresses automation impacts when the underlying systems change, the retirement protocol for automations that are no longer needed, and the periodic review that examines the portfolio for rationalization opportunities. The chief financial officer who establishes this discipline at the beginning of the automation program will operate an automation portfolio that delivers value reliably across the years. The chief financial officer who treats governance as something to be added later will repeat the maintenance burden pattern of the previous era.

# The Diligence Questions

The diligence questions for the automation category address both the platform decisions and the architectural choices that determine whether the automation program delivers value.

## Questions to Ask of Platform Vendors

How does your platform handle the specific use cases we need to automate, including the integration with our specific source systems, the volume and complexity of the work, the exception handling requirements, and the audit and compliance requirements? How does your platform integrate with our broader technology architecture, including the data layer, the enterprise platforms, and the existing integration infrastructure? What is your roadmap for artificial intelligence integration into the automation capabilities, and how does your platform compare to the broader artificial intelligence platforms? What is your typical implementation duration and cost for a use case of our complexity, and what is the typical maintenance cost across a multi-year horizon? How does your platform support the governance discipline we will need to operate, including the inventory, monitoring, change management, and retirement protocols? What is your customer concentration in our segment, and what is your customer retention rate over the past five years? How does your platform handle the operational reality that our underlying systems will evolve, and what is the typical maintenance burden customers experience?

## Questions to Ask of Reference Customers

What was your implementation experience, and what would you do differently in retrospect? How does the platform handle the use cases you have automated, and what use cases have you found difficult or impossible to automate effectively? What is your maintenance burden, and how has it evolved as your automation portfolio has grown? What is your governance discipline, and what would you change about it if you were starting over? How does the platform integrate with your broader technology architecture, and what integration issues have you encountered? How is your relationship with the vendor, and how has the vendor responded as your needs have evolved? What is your day-two operating model, and how is the platform owned and operated within your finance function? How would you evaluate the platform now against the platforms you did not select, and how would you evaluate it against doing the work without dedicated automation technology?

## Questions to Ask of One's Own Team

What is the actual state of our processes before automation, and have we conducted process mining to understand what the automation will be operating against? What is our process improvement opportunity that may produce more value than automation of the existing process? What is our team capacity to operate an automation program, including the capacity to develop, deploy, maintain, and govern the portfolio? What is our governance discipline for the automation program, and is it adequate for the multi-year operational reality? What is our integration architecture, and how does it support or constrain the automation patterns we are considering? What is our cultural posture on automation, including the relationship with the people whose work the automation will affect? What is our investment philosophy, and are we treating automation as a tactical cost reduction or as a strategic capability building?

# Operating Implications

The automation program is operated continuously, with the platforms supporting the automated processes across the years. The operating implications follow from this continuous operational reality.

## The Automation Center of Excellence

Most successful automation programs operate through a structure that the industry calls an automation center of excellence. The structure combines a central team that holds the platform expertise, the governance discipline, and the broader strategic perspective on the automation portfolio with the distributed business teams that develop and deploy the specific use cases. The structure addresses the limitations of pure centralization and pure distribution and is the dominant pattern at enterprises that have built successful automation programs.

The center of excellence holds responsibility for the platform selection, the governance discipline, the architectural standards, the security and compliance requirements, the talent development, and the strategic prioritization of automation investment. The center operates as a service provider to the business functions, supporting the development of use cases while maintaining the standards that the program requires. The chief financial officer who establishes a serious center of excellence will produce an automation program that scales. The chief financial officer who attempts to operate automation without the center structure will produce a program that either bottlenecks or fragments.

## The Talent Profile

The automation program requires a talent profile that combines technical capability with business understanding. The technical capability includes the platform-specific expertise required to develop and maintain the automations. The business understanding includes the process knowledge required to design automations that fit the actual operational reality. The talent is in modest supply and has become more sought after as automation programs have matured. The chief financial officer who invests in the talent development will produce a sustainable program. The chief financial officer who treats automation talent as a commodity to be acquired transactionally will discover that the program depends on talent that the market does not reliably provide.

## The Continuous Portfolio Management

The automation portfolio requires continuous management across the years. The portfolio accumulates over time as use cases are developed and deployed. The portfolio requires monitoring to detect failures and degradation. The portfolio requires maintenance as the underlying systems evolve. The portfolio requires rationalization as some automations become obsolete and others become candidates for consolidation. The portfolio requires strategic evolution as the category landscape evolves and as new capabilities become available.

The continuous portfolio management is the discipline that distinguishes mature automation programs from the early programs that accumulated maintenance debt. The discipline requires explicit investment in the form of the center of excellence structure, the governance protocols, and the operational rhythm of portfolio review. The chief financial officer who recognizes the requirement and invests accordingly will produce an automation portfolio that delivers value reliably. The chief financial officer who treats the portfolio as a collection of individual projects rather than as a managed portfolio will produce the accumulation pattern that characterized the previous era.

# Synthesis

The robotic process automation category has the distinction of being the most overhyped category of the previous decade and the most under-delivered. The honest reckoning with the experience reveals the structural limitations of the original technology, the implementation patterns that succeeded and failed, and the lessons that matter for the categories that have emerged in its wake. The chief financial officer who carries these lessons forward will reason about the current category with awareness of what produces value and what produces cost.

The category has differentiated into several distinct subcategories. The dedicated robotic process automation platforms continue to operate but have evolved substantially, with UiPath and Automation Anywhere extending into broader automation capabilities and Microsoft Power Automate building a substantial position through the Microsoft ecosystem integration. The integration platform as a service category has emerged with Workato, Tray.io, Zapier, n8n, and Make providing an alternative architectural approach that uses application programming interfaces rather than user interface automation. The document automation category with ABBYY, Hyperscience, and Kofax addresses the specific problem of extracting structured data from unstructured documents. The embedded automation capabilities of the enterprise platforms compete with all of the dedicated approaches for specific use cases.

Process mining is the prerequisite to credible automation. The discipline of extracting the actual process flow from event logs differs fundamentally from process documentation and surfaces the operational reality that automation must accommodate. Celonis dominates the category, with Soroco, ABBYY Timeline, and UiPath Process Mining as competitors. The chief financial officer who treats process mining as a prerequisite will produce automation programs that capture value reliably. The chief financial officer who treats it as optional will repeat the failure patterns of the previous era.

Three architectural decisions span the automation category. The build versus buy versus orchestrate decision determines the architectural approach for each use case. The centralized versus distributed automation decision determines the operating model of the program. The maintenance and governance decision determines whether the automation portfolio delivers value reliably across the years or accumulates the maintenance burden that characterized the early programs.

The operating implications include the automation center of excellence structure that combines centralized platform expertise with distributed use case development, the talent profile that combines technical and business capabilities, and the continuous portfolio management that distinguishes mature programs from the accumulation pattern of the previous era.

The next part treats artificial intelligence and agentic systems in finance, the category that is reshaping the broader finance technology stack in 2026 and that intersects substantially with the automation category treated in this part. The architectural reasoning developed in this part carries forward, with the recognition that artificial intelligence is producing capabilities that are reshaping what is possible in automation and that are simultaneously emerging as a distinct category that operates alongside and increasingly through the automation category. The strategic framework for reasoning about artificial intelligence in finance is the work of Part Fourteen.