something is on the certainty axis of evolution. For things that are uncertain then this should be impossible as the ability to precisely measure something which is uncertain is the stuff of magic folk. My first reaction was Gartner's hype cycle proved evolution was wrong. I was a bit perplexed at that point especially since I had found mapping so useful. Fortunately, I met with a friend who pointed to a great big hole in my argument. I was assuming that Gartner's hype cycle was based upon the measurement of some physical property. If it wasn't, if it was just aggregated opinion (of consultants, analysts or industry) then there's no measurement of the uncertain as it's just opinion. It's an opinion of where something is, not a measurement of where it actually is. As I subsequently found out, the hype cycle is subjective opinion.

Along with being quietly relieved that I hadn't yet disproved what I was finding useful, it also opened up a new opportunity. I have two benefit curves — one for differential value and one for operational value. They both shared a common expectation versus time pattern. If I look at an evolving component then where it appears in the early stages on the expectation curve for differential value can be the same place it appears on the expectation curve for operational value when it's more evolved. See figure 232

Figure 232 — Evolution of an act on differential and operational expectation curves.