

Communication	Be transparent (a bias towards open)	Focus on high situational awareness (understand what is being considered)	Use a common language (necessary for collaboration)	Challenge assumptions (speak up and question)
Development	Know your users (e.g. customers, shareholders, regulators, staff)	Focus on user needs	Think fast, inexpensive, restrained and elegant (FIRE, formerly FIST)	Remove bias and duplication
	Use appropriate methods (e.g. agile vs lean vs six sigma)	Focus on the outcome not a contract (e.g. worth based development)	Be pragmatic (it doesn't matter if the cat is black or white as long as it catches mice)	Use standards where appropriate
	Use appropriate tools (e.g. mapping, financial models)			
Operation	Manage inertia (e.g. existing practice, political capital, previous investment)	Optimise flow (remove bottlenecks)	Think small (as in know the details)	Effectiveness over efficiency
	Do better with less (continual improvement)	Set exceptional standards (great is just not good enough)	Manage failure	
Structure	Provide purpose, mastery & autonomy	Think small (as in teams)	Distribute power and decision making	Think aptitude and attitude
	Design for constant evolution	There is no one culture (e.g. pioneers, settlers and town planners)	Seek the best	
Learning	Use a systematic mechanism of learning (a bias towards data)	A bias towards action (learn by playing the game)	A bias towards the new (be curious, take appropriate risks)	Listen to your ecosystems (acts as future sensing engines)
Leading	Be the owner (take responsibility)	Move fast (an imperfect plan executed today is better than a perfect plan executed tomorrow)	Think big (inspire others, provide direction)	Strategy is iterative not linear (fast reactive cycles)
	Strategy is complex (there will be uncertainty)	Commit to the direction, be adaptive along the path (crossing the river by feeling the stones)	There is no core (everything is transient)	Be humble (listen, be selfless, have fortitude)
	Exploit the landscape			

Amber warning

My areas of concern are :-

Design for constant evolution

When someone talks about how the “organisation was recently restructured” then this is a signal to me that the organisation didn’t cope with constant evolution. They may have reformed to a structure which now does but I see no evidence one way or the other.

Think small (as in teams)

Given the above, the discussion on how the “digital group will expand significantly over the next two years” raises an eyebrow. I’d want to know more, are we talking about a hefty department or some cell based way of operating (e.g. two pizza).