is *"Changes to governance, management and practices"*. Co-evolution is always difficult for people to get to grips with as it means that their existing and perfectly valid best practice for a product world become no longer relevant. We can only overcome this by explaining co-evolution usually by pointing to past examples. Both types of inertia are relatively simple to manage.

Slightly trickier is the systems groups. Along with the two types of inertia mentioned above, we're likely to have two additional types especially since the group builds and controls the underlying infrastructure behind any home-grown platform efforts. These additional types are *"loss of political capital"* and *"change of business relationship (loss of social capital)"*

The *"loss of political capital"* includes fear over becoming irrelevant in the future, loss of status and loss of past empire. Don't underestimate or dismiss this as it's very uncomfortable for those who face it. You counter by giving people are path to the future and relevance in it. Start by acknowledging what has been achieved and move onto modernisation. You need to emphasise the importance of future agility, efficiency, importance to the business and how we must build for the future. You also must include them in this future. At this stage, with utility platforms just in the early stages of industrialisation then such action is relatively trivial. The co-evolved practices haven't been developed and so there's plenty of time for training, re-skilling and the re-application of essential system concepts from configuration management to versioning in a more utility platform world. In all likelihood the biggest danger is that by helping your systems team