

INNOVATION BEYOND AI

THE SAASPOCALYPSE

How AI Is Dismantling the $300B Software-as-a-Service Empire

NABIL EL MAHYAOUI

The SaaSpocalypse

The SaaSpocalypse

How AI Is Dismantling the $300B Software-as-a-Service Empire

Nabil El Mahyaoui

A must-read ebook for founders, investors, and operators

Copyright © 2026 Nabil El Mahyaoui.
All rights reserved.

Contents

1 The Subscription Illusion **1**

1.1 The Cathedral of Recurring Revenue . . 3

1.2 The Feature Factory 5

1.3 The $300 Billion Question 7

2 The Marginal Cost Collapse **10**

2.1 What SaaS Actually Sells 11

2.2 The Intelligence Premium 13

2.3 The Moat Evaporation 15

2.4 The Compression of Value. 17

2.5 The Stranded Assets 19

3 The Agent Displacement 21

3.1 The Stack Collapse 22

3.2 The Interface Inversion 25

3.3 The Vertical Collapse 27

3.4 The Build vs. Buy Inversion 29

3.5 The Timing Problem 31

4 The New Topology 34

4.1 From Software-as-a-Service to Service-as-Software 35

4.2 The Three Survivors 37

4.3 The Outcome Economy 40

4.4 The Geopolitical Dimension 43

4.5 The Human Residue 45

5 Epilogue: A Memo to the Builders 48

5.1 If You Are a Founder. 49

5.2 If You Are an Investor 52

5.3 If You Are an Operator 54

5.4 The Acceleration. 55

5.5 A Final Observation 56

References 59

1

The Subscription Illusion

For two decades, the technology industry has operated under a single, unassailable orthodoxy: that software, delivered as a service and billed monthly, represents the most elegant business model ever devised by capitalist ingenuity. It was, in every measurable sense, a *perfect* model. Recurring revenue. Negative churn. Gross margins north of eighty percent. Capital efficiency that made industrial-age tycoons weep.

The SaaS model was not merely a business strategy. It was a *theology*—a system of belief so internally consistent and so lavishly rewarded by the market that questioning it felt not just contrarian, but heretical.

And like all theologies, it contained within it the seeds of its own unravelling.

> *"When the tide goes out, you find out who's been swimming naked."*

The tide is going out. And the nakedness that it reveals is not a temporary embarrassment but a structural exposure—a fundamental misalignment between what SaaS companies *sell* and what customers actually *need*.

1.1 The Cathedral of Recurring Revenue

To understand why the SaaSpocalypse feels so disorienting, one must first appreciate the sheer elegance of the cathedral that is collapsing.

The SaaS model, pioneered by Salesforce in the early 2000s and perfected by a generation of founders who followed, solved a genuine problem: enterprise software was expensive, fragile, and locked customers into multi-year procurement cycles that benefited no one except the vendors' sales teams.

SaaS democratised access. It replaced capital expenditure with operating expenditure. It turned software from a product into a *relationship*—one measured in Monthly Recurring Revenue (MRR), Net Revenue Retention (NRR), and Customer Lifetime Value (LTV).

The metrics were intoxicating. A SaaS company with 120% NRR was not merely retaining its customers; it was *growing* without acquiring new ones. A company with a LTV/CAC ratio above 3x was printing money. And because the marginal cost of serving an additional customer was essentially zero—the code was already written, the servers already running—every new dollar of revenue dropped almost directly to the bottom line.

Venture capitalists understood this arithmetic with near-religious fervour. Between 2010 and 2022, over $500 billion in venture funding flowed into SaaS companies. Multiples of 20x, 30x, even 50x forward revenue were not anomalies; they were the *norm* for fast-growing SaaS businesses.

The logic was self-reinforcing: high multiples enabled cheap capital, cheap capital funded

aggressive growth, aggressive growth justified high multiples. It was a perpetual motion machine—powered not by physics, but by faith.

1.2 The Feature Factory

But beneath the financial elegance lay a structural weakness that few were willing to name: the vast majority of SaaS products were not *good*.

They were adequate. They were functional. They solved the problem they claimed to solve, more or less, most of the time. But they were also bloated, unintuitive, and shackled to the incentive structure of the subscription model itself.

Consider the economics. A SaaS company that charges $50 per user per month needs to justify that charge *every month*. The most reliable way to do so is to ship features—not because customers need them, but because the appearance of progress prevents the procurement team from asking uncomfortable questions at renewal time.

This created the Feature Factory: a development culture optimised not for user value, but for the visual impression of value. Every quarter, the product team ships a new dashboard, a new integration, a new "AI-powered" widget. The product grows heavier, the interface more cluttered, the documentation more labyrinthine.

The customer, meanwhile, uses approximately 15% of the features they are paying for. Surveys consistently show that enterprise soft-

ware users feel overwhelmed, undertrained, and frustrated by the tools they are forced to adopt. They endure the complexity because switching costs are high, because the data is locked in, because "nobody ever got fired for buying Salesforce."

This is not a market functioning efficiently. It is a market held together by friction, inertia, and the absence of a credible alternative.

The alternative has arrived.

1.3 The $300 Billion Question

The global SaaS market surpassed $300 billion in annual revenue in 2025. It employs millions of people—engineers, designers, salespeople, customer success managers, implementation consultants. It undergirds the operational in-

frastructure of virtually every company on Earth.

And it is built on two assumptions that are no longer true.

The first assumption: *that software requires a persistent, managed application layer between the user and the outcome*. That you need Jira to manage projects, Zendesk to handle support tickets, HubSpot to run marketing campaigns, Notion to organise knowledge.

The second assumption: *that the marginal cost of intelligence is high*. That understanding context, parsing ambiguity, and taking action on behalf of a user requires human labour or, at minimum, meticulously hand-coded logic.

AI agents—systems that can reason, plan, use tools, and execute multi-step workflows

autonomously—invalidate both assumptions simultaneously.

When an agent can read your email, draft a response, update the CRM, create the follow-up task, and schedule the next meeting in a single invocation, the question is no longer "which SaaS tool should I use?" The question is: *"Why do I need the SaaS tool at all?"*

That is the $300 billion question. And the industry does not have a good answer.

2

The Marginal Cost Collapse

Every great disruption in economic history follows the same pattern: a technology emerges that drives the marginal cost of something valuable toward zero, and the industries built on the *scarcity* of that something are annihilated.

The printing press destroyed the scribal monopoly. The steam engine destroyed the artisan economy. The internet destroyed the

distribution bottleneck for information, music, journalism, and retail. In every case, the incumbents protested that the new technology was inferior, that it lacked nuance, that customers would always prefer the handcrafted original.

In every case, the incumbents were wrong.

We are now witnessing the same pattern, applied with devastating precision to the marginal cost of *cognitive labour*—the very commodity that SaaS companies package and sell.

2.1 What SaaS Actually Sells

Strip away the marketing, the branding, the conference keynotes, and what does a SaaS

product actually provide? It provides a *structured interface for a cognitive task*.

Salesforce is a structured interface for managing customer relationships. Jira is a structured interface for tracking work. Zendesk is a structured interface for resolving support tickets. HubSpot is a structured interface for executing marketing campaigns.

In each case, the software does not *do* the work. It *organises* the work. It provides forms, workflows, dashboards, and notifications that help human beings perform cognitive tasks more efficiently.

This is important. SaaS does not automate cognition. It *scaffolds* it. The human remains in the loop—reading, deciding, clicking, typing, approving, escalating. The software merely reduces the friction of these activities.

And therein lies the vulnerability.

2.2 The Intelligence Premium

For two decades, the marginal cost of intelligence remained stubbornly high. Even as compute costs plummeted according to Moore's Law, the cost of *understanding*—of parsing context, making judgements, and taking appropriate action—remained anchored to the price of human labour.

This created what economists call a "premium good": intelligence was expensive, and any tool that could substitute even a fraction of human cognition could charge accordingly.

Consider the economics of a customer support operation. A Tier-1 support agent costs $45,000 per year. They can handle perhaps

40 tickets per day. Each ticket costs roughly $5.60 in direct labour. Zendesk charges $49–$215 per agent per month to manage these interactions. The total cost of resolving a support ticket, including the human, the tool, and the overhead, is $8–$15.

Now consider what happens when a large language model can resolve 70% of those tickets autonomously, with no human intervention, at a marginal cost of $0.02 per ticket.

The maths is not subtle. It is catastrophic.

The intelligence premium—the gap between the cost of human cognition and the cost of machine cognition—has collapsed from orders of magnitude to near-zero in the span of three years. And it is still falling.

2.3 The Moat Evaporation

SaaS companies built their competitive advantages—their "moats"—on three pillars:

Data network effects. The more customers who use the product, the better the product becomes. Salesforce's recommendation engine improves with every interaction. LinkedIn's graph becomes more valuable with every connection.

Switching costs. Once your team has spent six months configuring Jira, importing data, building custom workflows, and training staff, the cost of migrating to a competitor is prohibitive. The data is locked in. The processes are encoded. The institutional knowledge is embedded in the tool.

Integration ecosystems. A mature SaaS product connects to hundreds of other tools via APIs, creating a web of dependencies that makes extraction painful. Your CRM talks to your marketing automation, which talks to your billing system, which talks to your ERP.

Each of these moats is being systematically dismantled by AI.

Data network effects lose their power when a foundation model, trained on the entirety of human knowledge, can provide superior recommendations without any customer-specific data accumulation. The model does not need to observe *your* customers to understand customer behaviour. It already knows.

Switching costs evaporate when an AI agent can read the documentation of any tool, interact with any API, and migrate data between

systems without human intervention. The lock-in that once required a six-month implementation project can be undone in an afternoon.

Integration ecosystems become irrelevant when the agent *is* the integration layer. It does not need a pre-built connector between Salesforce and Slack. It simply logs into both, reads the relevant data, and performs the action. The API is not a moat; it is a surface the agent can traverse.

2.4 The Compression of Value

What remains when the intelligence premium collapses and the moats evaporate?

The honest answer: not much.

A SaaS company that can no longer differentiate on intelligence, that can no longer retain customers through switching costs, and that can no longer shelter behind its integration ecosystem is, in economic terms, a *commodity*. And the iron law of commodities is that margins converge toward zero.

This is not theoretical. It is already happening.

Freshdesk competes with Zendesk at half the price. Notion competes with Confluence at a fraction. Linear competes with Jira by doing less, better, cheaper. And behind all of them, a wave of AI-native startups is building products that replace entire SaaS categories for the cost of an API call.

The compression is accelerating. Where SaaS once commanded 80% gross margins, the new generation of AI-powered alternatives oper-

ates at 90%+ margins on a fraction of the revenue—because the revenue required is itself a fraction. When the cost of delivering the outcome drops by 95%, the price the market will bear drops accordingly.

This is not a recession in the SaaS market. It is a *phase transition*—a fundamental change in the economic physics of software.

2.5 The Stranded Assets

The most painful consequence of this transition is the stranding of human capital.

The SaaS industry employs an estimated 4–5 million people globally. Many of these roles—customer success managers, implementation consultants, tier-1 support agents, QA testers, low-level sales development representatives—

exist precisely because the software they support is not intelligent enough to function without human mediation.

When the software becomes intelligent, these roles do not evolve. They *disappear*.

This is not the gradual displacement of the industrial revolution, where workers had generations to retrain. This is a compression of decades into years, of years into quarters. A customer success team that was essential in January may be redundant by June—not because the company is failing, but because the AI can now onboard, train, and retain customers more effectively than any human team.

The economic term for this is "creative destruction." The human term is devastation.

3

The Agent Displacement

There is a moment in every technological revolution when the abstract becomes concrete—when the theoretical possibility hardens into an operational reality that can no longer be dismissed, debated, or deferred.

For the SaaS industry, that moment arrived not with a press release or a product launch, but with a quiet architectural shift: the emer-

gence of the *AI agent* as a first-class computational primitive.

An agent is not a chatbot. It is not an assistant. It is not a feature bolted onto an existing application to justify a price increase. An agent is a *system* that can perceive its environment, reason about goals, formulate plans, invoke tools, and execute multi-step workflows with minimal or no human oversight.

The distinction matters immensely. A chatbot answers questions. An agent *does work*.

3.1 The Stack Collapse

To appreciate the magnitude of what agents represent, consider the typical SaaS stack of a mid-market B2B company in 2024:

CRM (Salesforce) + Marketing Automation (HubSpot) + Project Management (Asana) + Customer Support (Zendesk) + Internal Wiki (Confluence) + Communication (Slack) + Analytics (Looker) + Billing (Stripe) + HR (Workday) + IT Management (ServiceNow)

Ten products. Ten subscriptions. Ten interfaces. Ten sets of credentials. Ten data silos. Ten vendor relationships. Ten renewal negotiations per year. The average mid-market company spends $4,000–$8,000 per employee per year on SaaS subscriptions. For a 500-person company, that is $2–$4 million annually—a line item that ranks alongside office rent in the operating budget.

Now consider the agent architecture. An agent with access to the company's data layer—

email, calendar, documents, databases, APIs—can perform the *functions* of all ten tools without any of them.

Need to update the CRM after a sales call? The agent listened to the call, extracted the key points, updated the contact record, created the follow-up task, and drafted the next email. Time elapsed: four seconds. SaaS tools involved: zero.

Need to resolve a support ticket? The agent read the ticket, searched the knowledge base, identified the root cause, drafted a response, and if the solution required a code change, opened a pull request. Human involvement: a final review click.

Need a weekly business review? The agent queried the billing system, the CRM, the support logs, and the product analytics, synthe-

sised the data, and generated a narrative report with actionable recommendations. No dashboard required. No analyst required.

The stack does not simplify. It *collapses*.

3.2 The Interface Inversion

Every SaaS product is, at its core, an *interface*. It presents data, accepts input, and routes actions through predefined workflows. The interface *is* the product.

AI agents invert this relationship entirely.

In the SaaS model, the human adapts to the software. You learn Salesforce's taxonomy (Leads, Contacts, Opportunities, Accounts). You learn Jira's workflow engine (Backlog, In Progress, In Review, Done). You learn Hub-

Spot's campaign builder, Notion's block system, Figma's component hierarchy.

Each tool imposes its own ontology—its own way of structuring reality—and the human must bend their mental model to fit. This is not a minor friction. Studies estimate that knowledge workers spend 20–30% of their time *navigating* software rather than doing meaningful work: searching for the right screen, entering data in the required format, reconciling information between tools.

The agent model eliminates this entirely. The user expresses intent in natural language. The agent translates that intent into actions across whatever systems are necessary. There is no interface to learn, no ontology to adopt, no workflow to configure.

The interface is language itself.

This is not merely more convenient. It represents a fundamental redistribution of cognitive load. In the SaaS model, the user bears the burden of translation—converting their intent into the software's language. In the agent model, the machine bears that burden. The user simply says what they want.

3.3 The Vertical Collapse

The SaaS industry organised itself into *verticals*—specialised categories of software for specific functions. There was a vertical for CRM, a vertical for ERP, a vertical for HCM, a vertical for SCM. Within each vertical, companies competed on features, integrations, and enterprise readiness.

This categorisation was never natural. It was an artefact of the limitations of software archi-

tecture. Because building a general-purpose system that could handle any business process was technically infeasible, the industry carved reality into manageable segments and built specialised tools for each.

AI agents do not respect these boundaries.

An agent that can reason generally does not care whether the task at hand is "CRM" or "project management" or "customer support." These are human labels for human categories. The agent sees only data, goals, and available actions. It moves fluidly across what were once rigid vertical boundaries, performing whatever sequence of operations the task requires.

The implication is that the SaaS vertical itself—the foundational organising principle of a $300 billion industry—is dissolving. Not grad-

ually, but rapidly, as agents demonstrate that the categories were always artificial.

3.4 The Build vs. Buy Inversion

For twenty years, the conventional wisdom in enterprise technology was unambiguous: *buy, don't build*. The reasoning was sound. Building custom software was expensive, risky, and slow. SaaS products were battle-tested, frequently updated, and supported by dedicated teams. The total cost of ownership almost always favoured the subscription.

AI has inverted this calculus.

When an AI agent can generate a custom internal tool in minutes—a support ticket system tailored exactly to your workflow, a CRM that matches your sales process precisely, a report-

ing dashboard that answers exactly the questions you care about—the "buy" option is no longer obviously superior.

The custom tool has no unnecessary features. It has no learning curve, because it was designed for *your* team. It has no vendor lock-in, because you own the code. It has no per-seat pricing, because it runs on your infrastructure. And it can be modified instantly, because the agent that built it can also maintain it.

The "buy" side of the equation still has advantages: scale, security, compliance, ecosystem. But these advantages diminish with every improvement in AI coding capability. When the agent can generate production-grade code, write tests, handle security best practices, and deploy to cloud infrastructure autonomously, the gap between "buy" and "build" narrows to nothing.

The SaaS vendor's nightmare is not a better competitor. It is the realisation that every customer is now, potentially, their own software company.

3.5 The Timing Problem

The incumbents are not unaware. Every major SaaS company has an "AI strategy." They are adding copilots, assistants, and automation features to their existing products. Salesforce has Einstein. Microsoft has Copilot. ServiceNow has Now Assist. HubSpot has Breeze.

But this strategy contains a fatal timing problem.

Adding AI to an existing SaaS product improves the product incrementally. It makes the search faster, the data entry easier, the re-

porting more intelligent. These are real improvements. But they operate *within* the existing paradigm—they make the software a better version of what it already is.

The threat is not incremental improvement. The threat is *paradigm replacement*. It is not that Salesforce with AI is worse than Salesforce without AI. It is that the *concept* of a CRM—a dedicated application for managing customer relationships—may itself become obsolete.

The incumbents are optimising for the local maximum while the landscape shifts beneath them. They are adding AI to their products; the disruptors are using AI to eliminate the *need* for products.

This is the classic innovator's dilemma, expressed in its purest form. The incumbents cannot cannibalise their own revenue model.

They cannot tell their shareholders that the $200/user/month product they sell will be replaced by a $20/month agent that does more. They are trapped by their own success, imprisoned by the very metrics—ARR, NRR, LTV—that once made them the darlings of Wall Street.

4

The New Topology

Destruction is only half the story. The more interesting question—the strategically consequential question—is what emerges from the rubble.

The SaaSpocalypse does not leave a vacuum. It creates a new topology of software, economics, and human-machine collaboration that looks radically different from the landscape we have known. Understanding this topology is essen-

tial for anyone who intends to build, invest, or survive in the post-SaaS world.

4.1 From Software-as-a-Service to Service-as-Software

The inversion is not merely semantic. It represents a fundamental restructuring of the value chain.

In the SaaS model, the vendor sells *software*—a tool that enables the customer to perform a service. The customer still does the work. The software merely facilitates.

In the emerging model, the vendor sells *the service itself*—the outcome, the completed task, the resolved ticket, the generated report, the onboarded customer. The software is invisible. It is the mechanism by which the service is de-

livered, but the customer never sees it, never learns it, never configures it.

This is "Service-as-Software": the packaging of what were once human-delivered professional services into AI-executed workflows that operate at software speed and software margins.

Consider the implications. A consulting firm charges $300 per hour for a junior analyst to build a market research report. The report takes 40 hours. Total cost: $12,000. A Service-as-Software company charges $500 for the same report, generated by an AI agent in 20 minutes, with quality that matches or exceeds the human output.

The margins for the SaaS provider are irrelevant in this comparison. What matters is the

margin for the *service* provider—and that margin, powered by AI, approaches 95%.

This is why the most consequential companies of the next decade will not look like SaaS companies at all. They will look like service businesses—but with the unit economics of software.

4.2 The Three Survivors

Not all SaaS categories will perish. Three categories possess structural advantages that may survive the transition, albeit in radically transformed form.

Systems of Record. Some software serves primarily as a *canonical data store*—the authoritative source of truth for critical business information. Your accounting system (the general

ledger), your HR system (employee records), your compliance system (audit trails)—these are not workflow tools. They are *regulated repositories*.

Agents will interact with these systems, but they are unlikely to replace them. The reason is not technical but legal: regulations require that certain data be stored in specific formats, with specific access controls, audit trails, and retention policies. An agent cannot be the system of record because an agent is not a durable, auditable, legally compliant data store.

Systems of record will survive, but their revenue model will shift. They will charge for data storage and compliance guarantees, not for the interfaces that sit atop the data. The workflow layer—the screens, the forms, the dashboards—will be replaced by agents. The data layer will persist.

Real-time Collaboration. Tools that enable synchronous human interaction—video conferencing, whiteboarding, pair programming, collaborative design—serve a fundamentally different purpose than workflow SaaS. They do not automate cognition; they *connect* cognitions. They are social infrastructure, not cognitive scaffolding.

AI will enhance these tools (real-time transcription, intelligent summarisation, automated follow-ups), but it will not replace the act of two humans thinking together in real time. The value of these tools is the presence of other humans, and no agent can substitute for that.

Developer Infrastructure. The irony of the SaaSpocalypse is that the AI agents dismantling the SaaS industry are themselves built on a substrate of developer tools: cloud infras-

tructure, databases, orchestration frameworks, observability platforms.

This substrate becomes *more* valuable, not less, as agent adoption accelerates. More agents means more compute, more data, more API calls, more infrastructure. AWS, Vercel, Supabase, Datadog—these companies are selling pickaxes in a gold rush. Their revenue model is consumption-based, which means it *grows* with agent adoption rather than being displaced by it.

4.3 The Outcome Economy

The deepest strategic shift is the transition from a *seat-based economy* to an *outcome-based economy*.

SaaS pricing is, at its core, a tax on headcount. You pay per seat, per user, per employee. The more people in your organisation, the more you pay. This made sense when the software was a tool *for* people—when each user represented a unit of cognitive work being facilitated.

In the agent economy, headcount is irrelevant. What matters is the *outcome*—the resolved ticket, the closed deal, the shipped feature, the completed audit. The natural pricing model is therefore *per outcome*, not per seat.

This is not merely a pricing change. It is a realignment of incentives that has profound consequences.

In the seat-based model, the vendor's incentive is to maximise the number of seats—to make the software indispensable to as many

people as possible, regardless of whether those people are deriving value. This is why SaaS companies employ armies of "customer success" managers whose real job is to prevent churn, not to ensure success.

In the outcome-based model, the vendor's incentive is to maximise the *efficiency* of the outcome. The fewer resources consumed per outcome, the higher the margin. The vendor is incentivised to make the system smarter, faster, and more autonomous—to *eliminate* human involvement, not to expand it.

This creates a virtuous cycle for the customer and a terrifying one for the incumbent. Every improvement in the AI reduces the cost per outcome, which pressures the SaaS vendor's per-seat pricing, which drives customers toward the outcome-based alternative, which

generates more data for the AI, which further improves the cost per outcome.

4.4 The Geopolitical Dimension

The SaaSpocalypse is not occurring in a vacuum. It intersects with a geopolitical realignment that amplifies its strategic significance.

The United States currently dominates the global SaaS market. Seven of the ten largest SaaS companies by revenue are American. The SaaS model itself was, in many respects, an American invention—a product of Silicon Valley's unique combination of venture capital, technical talent, and cultural tolerance for disruption.

AI agents threaten to redistribute this advantage.

A country that lacks a domestic SaaS ecosystem—that has historically been a *consumer* of American software rather than a producer—can now leapfrog the entire SaaS era. It can build agent-native service companies that compete directly with American SaaS incumbents, without ever having built the SaaS infrastructure itself.

This is analogous to how African nations leapfrogged landline telephony and went directly to mobile, or how Chinese consumers leapfrogged credit cards and went directly to mobile payments. The absence of legacy infrastructure becomes an *advantage*, not a handicap.

For the first time in decades, the structural dominance of American enterprise software is not merely being challenged by competition. It is being made irrelevant by a paradigm shift

that renders the entire competitive landscape moot.

4.5 The Human Residue

In every economic transition, the most difficult question is not "what will the technology do?" but "what will the humans do?"

The SaaS industry created an entire professional class: the SaaS operator. These are the revenue operations specialists, the growth hackers, the product managers, the solution architects, the customer success leaders who built their careers on mastering a specific tool or a specific workflow.

Many of these skills are becoming obsolete. Not because the people are untalented, but because the problems they solve are being auto-

mated. The solution architect who spent years mastering Salesforce's configuration language is being displaced not by a better architect, but by an agent that can configure any system in minutes.

The human residue of the SaaSpocalypse will be measured in millions of careers disrupted, billions in retraining costs, and an immeasurable quantity of psychological dislocation. People who defined themselves by their expertise in a particular tool will need to find new sources of professional identity.

Some will become agent operators—people who design, deploy, and supervise AI agent workflows. Some will retreat to domains where human judgement remains irreplaceable: high-stakes negotiation, creative direction, ethical oversight, relationship management. Some will struggle.

The market is efficient at creating new equilibria. It is not efficient at being humane about the transition.

5

Epilogue: A Memo to the Builders

This essay began with an illusion and ends with a choice.

The illusion was that the subscription model—the monthly tithe paid to a software vendor for the privilege of using their interface—represented a permanent feature of the technological landscape. It did not. It was a phase, a local optimum, a way station between the

era of packaged software and the era of autonomous intelligence.

The choice is what you do now.

5.1 If You Are a Founder

Stop building SaaS. I mean this literally and specifically.

Do not build another application with a login screen, a dashboard, and a per-seat pricing page. That architecture is a relic. It will take you three years to reach product-market fit, and by then the paradigm will have shifted so far that your product will launch into a market that no longer exists.

Instead, build for outcomes. Ask yourself: what *job* does the customer need done? Not what *tool* do they need, but what *result* do they

require? Then build an agent that delivers that result—directly, autonomously, and priced on the value of the outcome, not the number of humans involved.

The companies that will define the next decade are not SaaS companies with AI features. They are AI companies that happen to deliver their value through software. The distinction is not cosmetic. It is architectural, economic, and strategic.

Build vertically. The horizontal SaaS play—the tool that serves every industry, every use case, every geography—is dead. Horizontal tools survive only at massive scale (Microsoft, Google), and even they are under pressure. The winning strategy is deep vertical specialisation: an agent that understands the specific workflows, regulations, and vocabulary of a

single industry better than any generalist tool ever could.

A legal-tech agent that can draft contracts, review clauses, manage filings, and predict litigation outcomes for mid-market law firms. A healthcare agent that can triage patients, manage prior authorisations, and generate clinical documentation. A construction agent that can generate project estimates, manage subcontractor workflows, and ensure regulatory compliance.

These are not features of a SaaS product. They are *replacements* for entire categories of professional labour, delivered at software speed and software cost.

5.2 If You Are an Investor

Reprice everything.

The multiples that sustained the SaaS era—10x, 20x, 30x forward revenue for high-growth, high-retention businesses—were predicated on the assumption that recurring revenue was durable. That assumption is cracking.

A SaaS company with 120% NRR and 80% gross margins looks like a fortress. But if an AI-native competitor can deliver the same outcome at 10% of the price, that fortress is sitting on sand. The NRR will compress. The gross margin will be attacked not by cost inflation but by price deflation. The LTV/CAC ratio, that sacred metric, will invert as customers demand outcome-based pricing that caps their exposure.

The new metrics that matter are:

Cost per outcome. How much does it cost the company to deliver one unit of value? This is the AI-era equivalent of gross margin, and it should be declining continuously.

Outcome velocity. How many outcomes can the system deliver per unit of time? This measures not user growth but *throughput*—the raw productive capacity of the AI engine.

Intelligence compounding. Does the system get better with use? Not through network effects in the traditional sense, but through feedback loops that improve the agent's accuracy, speed, and autonomy over time.

Invest in companies that can demonstrate all three. Avoid companies that are merely adding "AI features" to a SaaS chassis. The chassis is the problem.

5.3 If You Are an Operator

Your skills are not worthless. But they need to be redirected.

The expertise you built in configuring Salesforce, optimising HubSpot campaigns, or managing Jira workflows is *domain knowledge* wearing a tool-shaped disguise. Underneath the tool proficiency is an understanding of sales processes, marketing funnels, project management methodologies. That understanding is valuable. The tool proficiency is not.

Invest aggressively in learning how AI agents work—not at the model layer (you do not need to understand transformer architectures), but at the *orchestration* layer. Learn how to design agent workflows, how to specify outcomes precisely, how to evaluate agent performance, how to handle edge cases and failure modes.

The operator of the future is not a "Salesforce admin" or a "Jira power user." They are an *agent designer*—someone who can translate business intent into agent specifications, monitor agent performance, and continuously refine the system.

This role requires a hybrid skill set that did not exist two years ago: part business analyst, part systems thinker, part prompt engineer, part quality assurance specialist. It is a new profession, and it is desperate for practitioners.

5.4 The Acceleration

I want to be direct about the timeline, because the single greatest risk in the SaaSpocalypse is underestimating the speed.

The SaaS industry was built over twenty years. It will be substantially restructured in five. Not because the technology is immature—it is already astonishingly capable—but because the economic incentives are overwhelming. A company that can replace a $100,000/year SaaS stack with a $10,000/year agent deployment will do so. Not out of ideology, but out of fiduciary duty.

The early movers are already in the market. The fast followers are raising capital. The incumbents are in various stages of denial, bargaining, and reluctant adaptation. By 2028, the landscape will be unrecognisable.

5.5 A Final Observation

The SaaSpocalypse is not a tragedy. It is an evolution.

The SaaS model served its purpose. It democratised access to enterprise-grade software. It enabled startups to operate with the tools of Fortune 500 companies. It created enormous wealth and employed millions of talented people. Its contribution to the technology ecosystem was genuine and substantial.

But models have lifespans. The mainframe gave way to the PC. The PC gave way to the cloud. The cloud gave way to mobile. And now, the SaaS model—which was, at its heart, a *cloud-era* invention—is giving way to something new.

What comes next will be messier, faster, and more consequential than what came before. The agents will not merely automate our software. They will restructure our organisations,

reallocate our capital, and redefine our relationship with the tools we build.

The subscription is over. The service has begun.

References & Further Reading

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Harvard Business Review Press.
The foundational text on why incumbents fail to adapt to disruptive innovation.

Rifkin, J. (2014). *The Zero Marginal Cost Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.
On the economic consequences of driving production costs toward zero.

Bezos, J. (various). Amazon shareholder letters, 1997–2020.

A masterclass in platform economics, customer obsession, and the long game.

a16z (2024–2026). Research on "Service-as-Software" and the AI-native company.
Venture capital perspective on the SaaS-to-agent transition.

Gavet, M. (2020). *Trampled by Unicorns: Big Tech's Empathy Problem*. Wiley.
On the human consequences of rapid technological displacement.

Thompson, B. (ongoing). *Stratechery*.
Essential analysis of the strategic implications of AI for the software industry.

Cowen, T. and Tabarrok, A. (2023). "The Economics of AI." *Marginal Revolution*.
Economic frameworks for understanding AI-driven market restructuring.

About the Author

Nabil El Mahyaoui

https://nabil-el-mahyaoui.com/

https://www.linkedin.com/in/elmahyaoui