

The second part of my play (the red number two) is to name and shame. I would aim to deliberately undertake a campaign of highlighting waste in global supply chains and the poor understanding that companies have over their actual supply chain. This will involve us working with other countries to understand the supply chain hence another purpose to step one. I'm going to direct this campaign towards shareholders and customers in order to create pressure for change despite the inertia that executives within the company might have. I don't care how the industry solves the problem (they can use blockchain if they wish) but I'd intend to use policy to drive for a more open approach on global supply chains. The two parts are needed because having a global supply being transparent is useful but not as useful if the standards involved throughout the chain are similar or at least the details can be accessed. Now, you might fundamentally disagree with this approach and that's fine. It might surprise you to discover that I'm not a regulator and have little to no idea about the current state of the pharmaceutical industry. Hence, the mythical company. But disagreeing is part of the purpose of a map. It exists to enable precisely these sorts of discussions by exposing the assumptions. However, it's also important to note that action and strategy doesn't have to involve specific technology (e.g. blockchain) but can instead be driven through policy. There is a tendency in today's world to immediately jump for a technological solution when other routes are available e.g. frictionless trade doesn't necessarily require magic smart borders.

**The nature of capital and purchasing it.**