

couldn't see the environment they were operating in then how could they prepare for predictable forms of change? By the time such changes would become obvious, their pace and any inherent inertia would make them unsurmountable and even fatal. However, in discussion with others I was often told that this didn't matter, that strategy was fairly meaningless compared to the real key which was execution. I also had doubts about this because firing a gun rapidly doesn't help you if you don't know where to fire it.

In 2010, Professor Roger L. Martin challenged this notion head on in the Execution Trap. If you haven't read it, go do so. Martin's argument was there was no distinction between execution and strategy, they were part of the same thing. By pure chance, in 2012 under an LEF research project then I had the opportunity to test this.

Every company told me they had strategy but I was acutely aware that there existed different levels of situational awareness. I had been interviewing 160+ Silicon Valley companies looking for examples of open gameplay whether open source, open data or open standards. I plotted these companies against their level of strategic play based upon situational awareness (i.e. using their understanding of own and competitors value chains and how they were evolving) versus their propensity to take action (in this case to use an open approach to change a market). The result is shown in figure 150.

**Figure 150 — Awareness vs Action**