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A Marshall Islander’s Sea-Chart

- The shells represent islands.
- Bent sticks represent the direction of the ocean swell and the currents. The adult navigator gauged the refracted wave patterns represented in the Stick Charts entirely by sense of touch when crouching in the bow of a canoe.
- Long crossing lines told something about the destination.
Practice Special Interest Group

- 32 innovation practitioners from 28 companies within FT100 funding PSIG as commercial practitioner learning-club
- Membership “stuck” in “red ocean” thinking: cyclical 6-sigma presentations, “lean” cost-reduction
- Absence of awareness of QFD front-end triage for innovation approach
- Internally-generated contributions insufficiently challenging
- Participation-level degrading (from SVP to Director)
- Introduced SME-TL model developed for one member
Local – Global Continuum

**SME**
- Local organisational perspective
- Knows what works and is going on in specialist subject area, what form it takes, what is emerging and being learnt

**Thought-Leader**
- Local & global perspective
- Develops and leads thinking in specialist subject area
- Understands what is missing in current practice and what is coming next
TLSME-Conceptual Model: 4 x TL Dimensions

Innovation

Visibility & Energy

Perspective

Recognition
## TLSME: **Perspective** Dimension Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambition</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SME (Local to organisation) Knows what works in subject area locally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SME has practical knowledge about a topic through it being part of their title or everyday work in their function.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong tactical sense about how to deploy their knowledge (can break it down into key, sequenced steps); has identified where to modify and improve generic approaches to best-practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THOUGHT-LEADER (Local &amp; Global) Leads thinking in subject area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sees strategic trends within specialist area and how other specialisms connect to influence the shape of the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invited to contribute to/ comment upon policies by external organisations or peer specialists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Member of specialist Editorial Boards for publications and/ or conference organisers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sees generic approaches to implementation or interpretation as a given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From TLSME to Baton Passing Technique

Impact of TLSME-CM
• Only 2 members had significant developed elements of TL capability
• Led to hunger to build TL capability through acquiring new knowledge
• PSIG moved from Q3 to Q2: interest in knowledge capture and fast JIT Baton Passing technique for identifying valuable lessons for future deployment, in a usable form, transferred from team to team, or each other in a specific context.
  • UEFA, British Council, Solvay AG, Lockheed, HMRC
• How to harvest Emergent Knowledge from the group (Q1 & Q4)
Baton-Passing Virtuous Learning Cycle [4 & 6 Synchronised]

1. Diagnostic Instrument Interview (15/18 months) out/ before PGR
2. Foundation Process Orientation
3. Preliminary Team Deliverables Review
4. Recipient: Donor Teams @ 1st Baton-Passing Lesson [Needs] Meeting
5. Project Deliverables Milestone Review
6. Donor: Recipient: Teams @ 2nd Baton-Passing Learnings Meeting (max +3 months following PGR)
7. Active review of Lifesavers and Action Learnings to engineer learning into deliverables and build key education packages

5.1 Documented, generic Time to Market Process with defined key-stage decision gates, each supported by...

5.2 Defined deliverables and success-criteria around ROI, viability and process capability
Successful Baton=Passing Criteria

Personal
- Documented commitment in real-time to specific outcomes that can be tracked.

Fast
- 3 hours together for teams with relevant knowledge and good questions.
- Can be as fast as 45 minutes for a defined topic.

Social and Dramatic
- Brings together the people who have answers and the people who have questions.

Visual, Colourful and Intuitive
- Exploits the way the mind organises information best.
Baton=Passing Variations

1.0 Team to Team

1.1 Process Based

1.2 Content Based

1.3 Practice Mapping (Practitioners)

2.0 Role Succession

3.0 Thematic

3.1 Directed: Established Themes

3.2 Exploratory: Emergent Themes

SMART FAILING - 1
[Identifying Great Success Criteria]

SMART FAILING – 2
[Anticipative Lessons Learnt]
Deployment Maturity Model

- Where is your business in relation to the 4 stages?
- What high-value lessons can you share in which stage? 3 x (How-2s)
- Bundle your high-value lessons into natural families and give them a name
- On what issues (in which stage) would you like an answer? (How-2s)

Stage 1: Deployment
- Engaging stakeholders
- Establishing quick wins
- Rolling out resource and training

Stage 2: Growth
- Build infrastructure
- Adjusting approach as needed
- Aligning to local requirements

Stage 3: Maturity
- Beginning the transition into Line Management
- Establish a steady state program of activities

Stage 4: BAU
- Revolving program of QUALITY activities
- Regular calibration to ensure that the program is on course

The way we work

Net Business Benefit
- Do improvements FOR the business
- Do improvements WITH the business

Build capability AND capacity
1st Wave Outcomes

1. **The DMM prototype was incomplete.** It became clear that it required a prequel or pre-deployment stage, and that the original Deployment Stage needed refocusing to identify and populate a Pre-Deployment Stage 0.

2. **If 69% of projects were within the DMM prototype stages 1 & 2, and 31% of projects were at stages 3 & 4,** did this suggest a level of attrition or merely reflect participating organisations' response to the economic situation (by having lots of early-stage innovation projects)? Could it be the case that participants had very little experience of getting projects to higher maturity levels?

3. **Did the language of the emerging lesson themes and of the prioritised, named lessons themselves suggest a more authentic, context-based reality of what needed to be paid attention to, or worked upon at each stage by practitioners than the rather bland language of the DMM prototype?**

4. **It would be necessary to meet again and rework the DMM prototype to reflect the outcomes (1-3, above), and construct a layered, practice map for participants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMM Stage</th>
<th>Organizations at this Stage</th>
<th>Number of projects at this stage</th>
<th>Individual Lesson Offers</th>
<th>Lesson Themes Identified</th>
<th>Drafted most-important, populated thematic Lesson in each DMM stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39 (40%)</td>
<td>30 (47%)</td>
<td>People capability, organisational buy-in, planning for deployment, way of working, quick-wins, engagement (8; 37%)</td>
<td>1 – “Senior Leader &amp; Organizational Buy-In”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>People development &amp; capability, project selection, linkage to quality, engagement (4; 25%)</td>
<td>3 - “Grow your Own”, “Establish &amp; Protect”, “Cultural Engagement”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>Line management accountability, performance management, keeping things running (3; 19%)</td>
<td>1 - “Keep the Ball in Play”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Usual</td>
<td>as 8</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>Build into the organisational fabric, keep it relevant to business goals, visible metrics (3; 19%)</td>
<td>1 - “Everybody’s Job to Improve Process”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Min 8, Max 22</td>
<td>97 projects</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16 themes</td>
<td>6 x fully-populated, useable lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 1st Wave - Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMM Stage</th>
<th>Organizations at this Stage</th>
<th>Number of projects at this stage</th>
<th>Individual Lesson Offers</th>
<th>Lesson Themes Identified</th>
<th>Drafted most-important, populated thematic Lesson in each DMM stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39 (40%)</td>
<td>30 (47%)</td>
<td>People capability, organisational buy-in, planning for deployment, way of working, quick-wins, engagement (6; 37%)</td>
<td>1 – “Senior Leader &amp; Organizational Buy-In”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>People development &amp; capability, project selection, linkage to quality, engagement (4; 25%)</td>
<td>3 – “Grow your Own”, “Establish &amp; Protect”, “Cultural Engagement”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>Line management accountability, performance management, keeping things running (3; 19%)</td>
<td>1 – “Keep the Ball in Play”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as Usual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>Build into the organisational fabric, keep it relevant to business goals, visible metrics (3; 19%)</td>
<td>1 – “Everybody’s Job to Improve Process”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Min 8, Max 22</td>
<td>97 projects</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16 themes</td>
<td>6 x fully-populated, useable lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repopulated Stage 0

- PSIG Website Content/Aide-Memoire DMM-2
  - Where am I, now?
  - What do I need to consider/pay attention to?
  - Which principles or lessons apply in this theme?
  - Who can I talk to?
2nd Wave Outcomes

- In first 3 out of 5 DMM phases
- 20/27 Principles
- 9/12 lessons
- Low survival-rate of projects into maturity, low adaption by organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMM-2 Stage</th>
<th>New Lesson Themes</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Fully-Populated High-Value Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: Pre-Deployment</td>
<td>0.1 Align the vision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1.5 “Parliamo Business”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 Identifying demand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 Sustainability strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 Deployment plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Deployment</td>
<td>1.1 People capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Organizational buy-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Planning for deployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Way of working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Quick-wins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Growth</td>
<td>2.1 Continued buy-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 People development &amp; capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Link to quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Project selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Maturity</td>
<td>3.1 Maintaining momentum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Performance management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Line management accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Business as Usual</td>
<td>4.1 Build into organizational fabric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Everybody's job to improve process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Keep it relevant to business goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Visible metrics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20 Lesson Themes</td>
<td>27 Principles</td>
<td>12 High-Value Lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intimations of Practitioner Marginality

• Contradiction between innovation role and political reality
• Political vulnerability
  • Low-Hanging Fruit (improvement projects) vs. High-Hanging Fruit (innovation projects)
  • Distance from real political conversation between CEO and functional/ BU heads
• Innovation Titles didn’t reflect political reality
  • Sense of being funneled into LHF/ Quick Wins
  • Tactical (closed system) not Strategic (open system) innovation
  • Bigging-up to deliver led to political in-fighting (why should I deliver your results/ my battle: your victory?)
Longer-Term Political Lessons

1. Innovation Practitioner (IP) recruited to lead innovation.

2. IP forms own function to populate IP portfolio, assumes functional role.

3. Leaders see IP as a threat and limit their access to functional departments.

4. IP compromises and focuses on low-hanging fruits, or quick-wins (LHF).

5. IP senses that LHF have marginal effect on profitability, but need to look busy to justify salary.

6. Political leadership points out limited impact of IP. Cuts role to save money.

Recommended IP Approach!

1. Find the customer

2. Don't compete with the Business Functions

3. Give it away
Lessons

• IPs need to
  • Negotiate a more balanced portfolio of LHF/QWs: HHF, early.
  • Identify characteristics of survivable projects for LT impact: start doing less, more effectively.

• Mapping and aggregating individuals’ knowledge within a maturity model
  • Can identify and integrate fractured, isolated experience
  • Build personal knowledge into useful capability that can be used more widely.
  • Gaps in maps can be a useful form or provocation!
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