

divesting itself of its print and distribution business. What things should it consider?”

I immediately starting mapping out the landscape, pointing to opportunities and impacts from loss of control through disposal of such physical capital to provision of distribution as a public utility to redirecting print capabilities into printed electronics — *“those large scale printers have the potential to be tomorrow’s Intel I declared!”* There was a wealth of opportunity but before making a choice then we needed to understand the landscape more. I started to dig, asking questions about the user, their needs and what did we understand about the landscape. I met a wall of silence followed by the line that *“it’s not relevant”*. The company had already decided to take this action. It was part of its strategy. My role was to give some input into how to achieve this. I asked what was this strategy based upon and an argument ensued. Needless to say, I didn’t make it past round one and was the very first to leave the competition. Mapping had failed on its second outing. So I carried on researching.

It was at this time that I was also becoming quite well known in certain technology circles as a speaker on open source, web 2.0 and cloud computing. I kept being invited to more and more conferences and to present and discuss on technology changes within companies. I was flattered but quickly discovered that I needed to keep things simple. I was told the mapping concepts were just *“too confusing”* and so I restricted myself to talking about the impacts in more general terms. However, here I hit a snag. General concepts such as the world