MapCamp 2021 - Adaptation

Pardon? Okay, and we've begun recording. So hello everybody. Uh, thanks for joining us. Um, we are in the adaption group today and I was just saying, I hope that some of you have had the opportunity to attend the talk to this morning. Um, really, really good start to the day. I'm hoping that this session is just as rich, um, for everybody speaking and also for everybody talking.

So I'm going to be talking about adoption and adaptation today. Did I say adaption? That's not even real English. Um, we're talking about adaptation once you've already, you've got a sense of the terrain. You've got a sense of the things that need to be done. Um, how do you change to a changing terrain? So we've got three talks.

Um, we're going to start with David and let everybody introduce themselves, but David will be talking to us about the value flight flywheel and during something that's seems to be something. Theme for today, which is live mapping. And we had a one live mapping talk last year seems to be flavor of the month and everybody's up for it.

So you're going to get to see David sweat through his attempt to live map. I hope everything works. Okay. Um, David, so if you want to maybe give everybody a quick introduction, maybe give a sense of the background and context behind why you've chosen to talk about this subject today, maybe a little bit about what you do, um, to give us a sense of how you look at the world.

David

I folks. Um, my name's, uh, Dave Anderson. I'm a technical fellow at a bizarre voice. And, uh, also author at the serverless edge. Um, I've been part of the Wardley mapping community for many, many years and been using kinda Wardley map and really to, um, um, help change and companies with lots of companies, large companies, small to kinda drive change and really kind of, I would say tighten up, um, not really closed adoption.

It's how you get the maximum value from cloud. So there's your kinda brief intro. Um, like good, not a fire slide to them. Yeah. As, as he, as you do that, um, what I'll invite everybody here listening and all the panelists to do is to basically, as you go along Bumble on my rules for my session, a number one, there is no stupid question.

If it's asked early enough, um, there are some really, uh, knowledgeable people speaking to us today, and today is our opportunity to learn. So feel free, put it in the chat. Don't be embarrassed. Don't be scared. It helps us in the conversation means that we get the most from the day. Um, I will avoid my tendency or desire to interject.

I'll let you run for the full 15 minutes. What we've done in other talks is just do one or two quick questions at the end of each talk, and then do a large question and answer session at the end. So I will be tracking for any questions that come in. I'll be utterly undemocratic in which ones I pick or which one seems to seem most interesting.

Um, but yeah. Uh, go ahead, David. Thank you. Cool. Good stuff. Okay. Hopefully this is coming through. Okay.

There we go. So I'll just give a quick intro before we get going. I've kind of been using this phrase, the serverless age, because I believe serverless and serverless first gives companies a significant competitive advantage, um, moving forward. Um, and really what I'm going to talk with the adaptation theme is the value flywheel.

So I've observed the model over the years. How can companies get in their point where they can kind of move with the market, either pivot or grow, or can you use technology? Is that enabler and not as a dead wet to kind of slow them down. I've seen quite a lot of companies innovate, but then be held. But very technology innovated.

So really it's hard to you keep that value, getting a flywheel them. Um, so my name's Dave Anderson, uh, techno Phillip is our voice on this work. I've been working with mark McCann and Michael Riley to fellow contributors at the service edge. And some of this content will be featured in a book that is coming at next year.

And, um, with 80 revolution press with gene Kim and others. So I'm looking forward to that. And, uh, I wouldn't say I'm enjoying the process of writing the book, uh, for anyone doesn't know what a flywheel is. It takes even a distributed Pyre. So often we have effort from the business side, the technology side, and they often clash and bought up.

So really the value flavor, texts that and creates steady momentum. But I don't know if a lot and I start making a fool of a shelf. So I'm going to try and do something very stupid here. We'll see how we go. I'm going to just try and kinda build this map. I'll try to illustrate the value flyaway. So the anchor for the map here I've got as a senior executive could be a CEO, could be a VP of product.

It could be a CIO, it's a senior executive in your organization. All right. Um, so usually the high level of concerns of a senior executive day one it's operational efficiency. You're high. Can we go fast? How can we keep costs low the bottom line of the business? And then there's a time to value element.

How can we be sure that effort drive and change into the market? We can do that quickly. Don't necessarily tend to market time to value, right? That's a key component, but I see a lot of companies doing a cloud migration, but they haven't thought about what happens next. You don't know we've migrated to the cloud.

What do we then do? And really tamed the value is a significant candidate metric for that. So another concern then is really business. That once you've got your operational efficiency and time to value, you want to think about where can we grow to? And then there's really a dependency on growth with what I would call secure, rapid experimentation.

How can we try things to learn? What's what's working well and that's connected to customer need or customer obsession as Mr. Bezos would say. And quite often around this point, companies realized that they need some kind of modern digital modernization, simplification, whatever we've got old tech. We need to update that from what I can see, those are some of the immediate concerns of some, somebody relatively high level in the organization.

So then when you drop on it, there's a traditional kind of it slash technology organization. There's other concerns. And these are patterns I've seen through many companies. There's always an ask for. Okay. If we want to rapidly experiment. We've got the cloud yet, but we can treat the CLO look at data center.

We need to have close self service. We can do things really quickly, and that can complicate things because your security needs to be a certain way. I need robust data insights to make sure you're doing the right thing. And there's also a need combined with digital modernization for rapid build our, can we build quickly?

These are the, the, the traditional can have dreams of, of Manny can have 80 departments. So then as we move forward, so I would call them initial kind of concerns. But then there's more long-term concerns. Like how, how well is your architecture, um, positioned to take advantage of this, this new tomorrow, and really that the phrase that myself, some others in the industry are using.

It's a problem prevention mindset. It's you celebrate problem prevention. Let's stop things going wrong. Sell bitten problem creation like the hero program or who, you know, gets a system back open on a Sunday when it crashes, it's less prevent outages and issues happening that requires the right discipline, architectural kinda strategy.

And one of the follow on not the sustainability, if you do that, you can actually, uh, contribute to a low carbon footprint for your compute. And you also can actually create some real standards, but the stuff here on the right let's get kind of put on commodity for a reason, that's not always attainable.

So when we step back and add a lens to this, where we bring in the kin of value flywheel, there's almost like an ILC lands here, innovate, leverage commoditize. So the first phase of the flywheel is clarity. Your senior executive, the big clarity of purpose, like this, your top line vision, things that the see, we'll talk to the company about, you know, that's where go north young man, but this is the things that are, that we innovate on.

Then there's what I call the next best action. What are the things we need to do straight away to actually try and meet that need? But it's really the long-term value is some of the architectural sustainability and standardization things. These are the real valuable things, but I would call it commoditization and wanting that I've noticed a lot three companies is this, this route is okay, this clarity of purpose leverage.

It's very hard to commoditize. That's where it gets kind of difficult. So this, this is what I'm starting to call as the value flywheel, but that as we go on to kind of build it, what I would call a missing component, and this is map kabobs. Challenge a key enabler for all three of these phases of this flywheel just can innovate.

Leverage commoditize is steady of challenge. You need a mechanism to challenge standards, security to really challenge the work that's happening. I don't mean challenge in a way to kind of slow things down. I have successfully used Wardly mapping and all of these phases to help people see where we need to get to.

They can plot the movement on the inertia, which creates the, a healthy, uh, environment among technical leaders and also the environment success. And really what that is. The psychological safety is the having the, the, the, the environment. We can actually speak up and say, hang on. I know that was the policy of yesterday, but it's changed.

It's moved. So I see this as is the, is the missing element of this. You probably did the flywheel effect came from, uh, Jim Collins. Good to, good to great. But the company a few decades ago, I think mapping and that sense of challenge is an obstacle, a critical proponent over that, but, okay, well, let's move on.

As we start to map this site, there are a fee and extra points I mentioned. So let's kind of, uh, let's add those back and again, so we have an extra point here for cloud self service, many companies straight, the cloud, like a data that's out there. Uh, you know, they don't actually use the modern cloud capability.

There's a, for rapid, bold, I believe you need a service. First mindset need to embrace the obstructions that the cloud vendors give you. A lot of companies don't do that. They build too low and create work for themselves. So they don't meet that rapid build, um, well, data. Lots of companies do not have their data squared away.

Their data architecture is not fit for purpose. They have data, but they don't have insights. So there's a, I would call that a traditional database mindset where we're still thinking in tables, no thinking about kind of, um, uh, data points. And then for security, there's quite often a very traditional security stance where people treat like the perimeter detection and you're not really doing kind of, um, secure by design or can I, uh, least privilege, which is part of the modern cloud.

So there are significant and our share points, things that, again, like usually at what actually is it's things that have worked well in the past, but have no chance the climatic patterns have changed. So as we start to move forward here, that's show some movement. So where it gets messy. There's potential to move these next best action components over to the right, which will also bring over a secure, rapid experimentation to the right, which creates space.

So what's the, what's the driver for this? I think if you have a mapping of your environment, when you start to plot this landscape art, that technical strategy tied to the business can, uh, um, expect senior executive expectation. You can actually be very focused on what you have to move. And over commonly is in our share points.

A lot of the times these national posts exist, but they're impossible for the executive to see. We understand things are going slow, but we don't know why quite often the result of the solution is throw more money at things which really don't fix inertia. So I showed some movement there. I just want to, let me just give me a second to clean this up a bit.

This is where I make a fool of myself. So let's drop a few things out and tidy this map up a bit. All right. Just bear with me a second. Uh, okay.

So this technique has been, uh, borrowed from Mr. Agent CarCraft. We did this a lot slicker than I am doing it. Um, so let's take those away and we'll bring back in those components once they've moved. So now we've moved. So we have three, our mapping, we have moved close cell service, rapid build, and, uh, data and security over to the right here.

We've, we've taken them all to custom build and moving them more towards, I wouldn't say a commodity yet, probably more like product and not end doing that. That's dragged secure, rapid experimentation, slightly over to the right away from custom build. So as you can see, having a really focused technical strategy at this level, create space up above here.

So then as we continue. So, so what the take, so what, right. You've we've clarified wizard need like any of these maps, certainly the more I map out technology and it, I'm starting to see lots of ships and different things that are almost repeatable patterns. One the same and talks about a lot is this idea of when you move things to the right, the commoditized capability creates an enabling capability, which creates new value, open the top left here.

So this enabling capability, whatever it is, this creates a what next for the executive. This is huge because you've, you've taken some of the concerns to the right, improve them and created space for new innovation. And that's really, the commoditization has driven new innovation. This is something that's very few companies actually make.

Take a pause there. Can I maybe put some annotations on this map as I start to close art? Hopefully everyone's following us. I've stuck a couple of quick annotations here. Number one, the clarity purpose should be fairly constant. Uh, if you're seeing your executive team say we have three top goals, they'll probably remain high-level goals, operational phase and say time to value business growth, whatever way they're phrased.

They're always there. They're thereabouts at the high level of kind of innovation. So these don't change too much in a single company. So they're, I wouldn't say they're evergreens, but it's not like they change every month. Number two, once the technology organization hears about these goals, it's very easy to say we need X, Y, and Z, but that's like the next best action.

But actually connecting those, the technical moves is difficult. The real technical strategy over here, which is your good architecture practices, sustainability standardization. That often seems on a tangible, because you're stuck here because the inertia is kind of holding you back this idea of a value flywheel, where we take this top level clarity of purpose, and we spend in the next best action, move things to the right uncle, back up to the innovation that, that kind of flywheel turn on effect where you're doing next best action changes to drive against the long-term value.

This this on my experience, this can spin pretty quickly. And really the enabler for this is the mapping component though. And below that area of challenge, I like architects, product leaders, exactly this to challenge the thinking and make sure we move with pace. Um, and that's really what opens up new innovation.

Um, one of the things I say is that we rarely link the top level. What the executive sees with this mid-level, which is, and what a lot of the technology there. See, there's often a brick here where we don't make that. And again, in the Wardley map, you see the visibility has dropped. So these things are lowered on a couple of key mindsets here.

A code is a liability. Um, you can't code your way out of this. You need to use higher order services to move quickly to get that mindset in is really first. So I called serverless first, this isn't just a technical system. It's a socio-technical system. So there, although there is technology here, there's also people, which is where the mopping helps.

I believe engineering excellence, problem prevention, having a good discipline in your technical organization actually creates space for innovation here in the left. And then I'm quite simple. ABM always be mopping. Um, I have found in my experience over the last 10 years, constantly drawing these maps and helping people see what is the next best action and the whole.

Maps towards the long-term value is incredibly, um, beneficial. Um, hopefully that makes sense. I I'm there in the open time though, but, um, this idea of the, kind of the value flywheel is something myself. Uh, Mike and mark will be exploring, uh, in our, in our book. That is again, can I draw on slightly differently, uh, this idea of purpose, clarity of purpose, time to value a map, the market competition, thrive challenge environment for success, the socio-technical view and mapping your capability next best action.

What can we do right now? Uh, serverless first, you know, don't build your way out of it. Uh, speed up the engineers on then that long-term value problem prevention, sustainability. And this isn't an iteration. The text like, you know, two years to do, you can do this very quickly weeks. Um, it's really about Hardy kinda plot.

That kinda move. So it lets me Damien, um, uh, somewhere information is on this, on the service days.com. We'll put some studies out about this kind of thinking, but, um, I think for me, he served as first as a key enabler here and the, how you can move this along and, and tie business goals with technology goals.

So how many tech questions, but, um, maybe we can, we can open that up later on. Yeah, really good. Really good. And as I said at the beginning, we'll have a moment just for one or two hot questions. I think with this talk, the majority are going to be tell us about the platform. And I think you can see in the chat, a lot of people are wowed by, uh, the actual just presentation.

Um, I love just how clear it was to understand and to follow it. Um, so really appreciate that first thing. Let me pass to the rest of the panel to ask if you have any questions, observations for Danielle Mandy. This is fantastic. I love the way that you've broken this down into a pattern. I would call it a fractal pattern because I'm into that.

But, uh, I'll, I'll save discussion of fractals work or the end. Uh, the, the, the question I have is what, what drove you? What brought you to the flywheel, uh, mentality, uh, in, in terms of why, why choose that metaphor, uh, versus something that's more kind of single iteration? Okay. No, that's a great question.

It's multiple iterations. And again, the big mindset fork against ears, waterfall X, Y, Z, worked on, you know, and the fact that the flywheel turns quickly, uh, the, the pressure coming into it from technology drivers and business drivers, they are inconsistent. So you need a way to keep that turning you can't, as like, as I've been in many architecture teams, you can't stop.

Musselman's planning. There's always things that you can do. So once you visualize that flywheel, you can always kinda, you know, keep out and then things, it gives you room to experiment to fail, to try again, you know, these are it's what flew efficiency and can, uh, you know, get not flywheel turning. I think that is a mindset that definitely architects and technical leaders need to have an effect because aside from everything else, that's a constant concern.

So I've my experience, the idea of the flywheel. It never stops turning, but the two important points are, um, it's constant and it's fast.

No, I really, really liked the point about, um, how you get to visualize how hard or easy something really is to senior executives who are quite far away from the detail. Um, it's a really powerful tool to communicate, um, such really critical information, particularly when they may not have a really good understanding of the technology and what's involved.

So, um, I've really liked to bring that out in the presentation was really good. Yeah. There's one great question here. And I'm going to add an addendum to it. So the question is what counts as serverless for you? Um, but flip it and also say, what do people think is serverless that you don't think. Well, it's not Lambda put it that way.

Um, you know, it's, it's put this way. We, we pay the cloud providers, the very good cloud providers, an awful lot of money, and then we treat them like they had a center from 20 years ago. Um, there are higher order services from all the five providers that can save you an awful lot of time and effort. Um, offload the work to the cloud provider, right as little code as possible from a programmer and you build capability quickly.

I hate the serverless phrase. It's done more damage than good, but the concept behind it, of using a capability from a cloud provider, that's fairly high level. That's the concept it's really, the modern concept is to use a service, to, to use a capability like a venting or data or compute. The legacy approach is to code everything.

Is. Sometimes you have to code things, you need that capability, but it's not the answer. Every single time, a really good service strategy service. First strategy doesn't include functions or Lambda. You can go higher again. I could do a whole talk on that. My view is very similar it's to do with the it's to do with allocation versus event driven, um, the billing and what that has for the overall cost economics.

Yeah. And then the standard surplus things about, you know, reduced operational burden, uh, pay for what you use, um, event driven, uh, like kind of pure focus on business outcome. Uh, no on differentiated, heavy lifting, again, there's less to get right. We have so much to get through. Um, we're going to have to come back to that in the larger question and answer.

And the second bit, I think you might need to go through your tech stack for the presentation, specifically questions around vs. Code integration. Um, for now I'd love to introduce Danielle, Danielle, why don't you go ahead and just tell us a little bit about yourself, uh, background, um, what you'll be talking about today?

Yeah, sure. Uh, so I'm Danielle and I work at the co-op and have done for the past 20 years and I've worked in and out. Technology, um, architecture, business architecture, enterprise architecture, digital through my, through my time with the co-op, um, I'm currently head of engineering and also head of the office of the CTO in our new combined technology function, uh, which we launched at the beginning of this year.

Um, so today what I'm going to be talking about. So there was talk about last year, but I wasn't able to the time he just wasn't right. And it was around how we adapted while maps to help, um, design on the operating model. So that's the topic of my talk today. Fantastic. Um, if you want to go ahead, you're using slides today, so no live coding, we're all a bit tired of that by now, you know, it's I enjoy hiking, um, really, really, uh, really good.

So you're going to be showing some slides. Okay, great. Yeah, I am. So, uh, I'll, I'll make a start. So, um, so I'm just gonna to talk you through our design story. So I'm not going to go too much into the actual content of, of the actual design itself will melt more and the tools and techniques that we use.

Well, they must be one of them to get to that on why it was important, um, and why it was new as well to us. So, uh, we had a brand new strategy that we, uh, we worked through in the 20, 20, 19 at the co-op. Um, well, there's some question marks around whether we have the right operating model across the whole of the co-op to, to deliver it.

And they're not forgetting that the co-op is I can do in 75 years old, it's got lots of heritage. Everybody knows what it is, but also we carry a lot of legacy as well. Um, and that's in terms of many things or ways of working through to technology. So, um, we, we decided not to use a consultancy to do this, um, the, uh, army CFO wanting.

People who were at the co-op, who knew the co-op to work through this. So, um, a team of people were assembled from, um, sort of organizational design specialists to lean six Sigma specialists. And I was recalled for my role of head of technology to, um, dust off my enterprise architecture skills, um, to support with this.

And because I've been at the co-op for a long time. So we did a big piece of discovery where we gathered an enormous amount of data. So it was interviews with colleagues of what's the data around our cost states around our capabilities. And just to really uncover what we had and how much of it we had and how well, how well it performed and what came out of that, discovery that from looking at the strategy.

Technology and digital were identified as a key area of focus, which is no surprise. And given, uh, given the way the world is changing. And so this is our timeline that we had someone totally through some of the steps that we went through. And so we starting August, 2019 and going right through to sort of launching officially the new, the new structures in 2021.

And we have very helpfully COVID right in the middle of all of that, which is not. And so, um, to, um, one of the things we discovered during discovery was in previous attempts to do the operating model. There was an issue around the positional power of some of our functions. So there was a model that we used and called and we call them turn the combo model, which helps you understand some of the, the accountabilities, the positional power of various functions.

And some of these things weren't clear. So functions that believe that they were policy. But actually there were not consequences for not following their instruction. Um, there wasn't a clearly defined way of identifying what operating weren't also what was critical to deliver the value chain. We have many different businesses and we also have a corporate center that supports all of them.

So there's a few handoffs here and there there's things that would bring together for, uh, to, to standardize and reduce costs. But again, we have still had some pockets of duplication. So we use this model to really help us understand how, how different parts of our organization needed to operate to be successful.

Um, And this, this, this led to quite a lot of soul searching. I'm being really honest about, you know, I think I'm policy, but am I really being treated like policy things like digital, uh, clearly like core resource, what, in some instances will be treated like a shared service, which just wouldn't just wouldn't have worked.

Um, so this guy identifies clearly how, how, um, how your function needs to operate, uh, adopted throughout the business and types of people and resources then. Um, well, this model needed a currency and what's light. You see with wildly mapping, it's a topic that people have. quite a lot by what currency do we use on, on, on the wall, the map.

Um, so, but for looking at digital and our it functions, we needed to be common, a common currency that we all understood because there's awful. Lot of terminology that we use there is essentially trying to talk about the same thing, but we use different language and that has led to some misunderstandings in the past, and it was not working together as effectively as it possibly could do.

So we settled on capabilities and as luck would have it. And the year before we'd done a big piece of work between the technology functions, the it functions as well and digital, and coming up with a common capability model that lifted up and the understanding of capabilities to an extent that no matter whether you worked.

It in a more traditional ways of working through to really agile lean teams, they could recognize what capability is trying to be delivered. So this is what it kind of looks like a very quite traditional model there with the leading capabilities, the top, the supporting capitals at the bottom, and then right through the spine is the value chains of the purpose for which technology and digital rights they exist to, to provide.

And that went down to a low level of detail. And this was the currency used to really kind of unpack and understand what was happening in the functions, on what capabilities there are. Um, so when we designed a workshop around this, and so we created a grid, which is a bit similar to what the map and we mapped on there and the different capabilities and the number of times they, they exist and really where they sat, how were they really treated?

And we saw that there were lots of duplication and you have to be really brutally honest with ourselves about how, how we really operated. And then we moved them to a place where we could really understand, like where things need to be, what type of function that needed to be. Um, and we also put some missing items on there that we just didn't have to.

So we could really understand that now, typically from this point onwards, what that would lead to is start to look up, um, structures and who reports to who and how many of them and what roles people might play. Um, but that wasn't enough for the, for the transformation. Um, so yeah, I got this leads into structures.

So what, it can help us answer the questions, where do we buy stuff or build stuff. And do we work in our jail or do we work in waterfall? And through the discover, these were things that were identified as key tension points that we had between what was digital on what was our it functions. As typically as, as, as new changes being delivered, it will be delivered in the way that that function knew how to do or what had seen success in the past.

And as we start to see more digital, um, this tool initiatives coming through, being done in a waterfall way, um, it doesn't, it doesn't work as well. Um, and, and also on the flip side and the digital catching work that really should have been handled in a different way. Uh, so we decided to look at a tool that might help us.

So the question was, but the way Dr. Walden up tells him stamp that landscape and the ways in which we can organize, because if you go straight to structures and you go straight to roles, then you miss the bit about, um, aptitude and attitude. So the, the, the pain is the Sacklers, the time planners and the different roles that, that, that are needed for those things.

If you miss this part out, you can design in a structure that can handle the different types of work we need, or not enough of the, the types of, um, uh, types of roles that we need to, to facilitate the types of work that are going to be coming down and track to spot the strategy. So the answer is absolutely.

Yes, we could definitely do it. So. That's right. I'm moving on. So we, uh, designed, um, a two day workshop and we had a mix of at eight it and digital colleagues, and we decided on applications as a currency because that was the best common denominator we had across the piece. Um, there are three roles of block, but pepper, chopped pens by 600 pre-written cards, Sharpies, coffee, and biscuits to make this.

Um, but we prepared the attendees with some wildly rapping stimulus, as well as they could start to understand what was going to happen in the session and how they worked and, and, um, and give them some examples. So this is an example of something that we shared. So the evolution code, we, we flipped it the right way for mapping because it appears the other way.

And a lot of this stuff online, um, just so people get a feel of why there is a difference between something that sits in Genesis and something that sits in commodity. Like not all is the same. You don't deliver it in the same way. You don't have the same people wrapped around every single thing that, that, that you look after in, in a function that is trying to be both digital and look after more enterprise type of applications.

So this stuff was quite helpful. Um, but Congress that it does take a lot of practice to really get your head around while they're in. So we had to create a bridge and in using applications as a currency that really helped us. So, um, so focused on that current landscape. And then we started to move things to where we thought they needed to be.

Well, this also helped to do is identify some duplication cause we had, um, whilst we had one, it function, it actually contained probably about five different functions who had very different ways of working and it obviously adopted and grown over time. This is what it looked like. A lot of people in a room, um, lots of cards, lots of discussion.

I will say that probably for the first 20 minutes, this session was really hard. Um, I was doing a lot of pushing, a lot of in open from the board, putting things on there, but actually after about 20 minutes, it kind of started when itself people sides talk to each other and start to collaborate. They start to understand each other's worlds a little bit more.

Um, and actually, uh, myself and Elliot who was supporting me production to just sit back, eat some biscuits and just watch them, watch them work, which was really good to see. Um, so it was big. It took all day. And that was our fun on that when we, we came at the end of it. So we could very clearly see the sort of things that needed to operate in one way versus another on what type of, uh, of roles that we needed around.

Um, so we had a second workshop where we focused on some more logical clustering and stress testing, these clusters of things. And so we just took another bit of paper and started to just chalk this out on the board. And again, um, the facilitation was, had to be quite light. Actually it didn't didn't need to push too hard and just needs to guide in the direction.

And they seem to really understand where, where things need to go.

So we come to our more logical operating technology design, and so we refined it for the, um, to sort of condense them a little bit more so we could see where things need to be. And what kind of, um, what kind of team structure needs to be put around stuff.

And then we went through more of a typical phases then of looking at physical structures and roles and people, and all the really hard part around designing a new operating model, the way you were literally, um, of, um, disassembling everything and reassembling them it again. So that was quite tough. And we're still doing all this around, around COVID time.

And then we went live in January. So what was the outcomes? Our clutch are two pictures that kind of, we use to illustrate to our executive the difference between what we have designed versus what they had. Um, it's something that doesn't come through very well. Looking at structure charts, or does it come through very well?

Looking at, um, uh, presentation slides, we came up with an image to kind of outline that. So this is what we looked like. They had lots of towers and lots of horizontals and some that were both. Overlapping each other, doing similar things, quite hard to navigate. Um, also, um, but within those areas, things work fairly well, but as a collective, not as well as we'd like it to which then took us into something that was much more simplified, where you have very clear place where that town planning needs to sit, um, things that we might outsource and the things that need to move more and more quicker pace and operate in a more lean way.

Um, so these are products that we might have bought or products that we built that are now in a phase of just continuous improvement to a place where things that are brand new that are more, um, in discovery and, um, proof of concept. As well, and also better facilitation of the things that support everything.

So this is the biggest change that the co-op had ever done and in technology, and we're not done, um, as in the still lot of work to embed what we've designed and support people through the change. Um, this in comparison was the easy part that the hard part is when we are where we are right now. So what did we learn from this?

Um, I really enjoy using wildly maps because they're really good at creating a shared understanding. They're really good at bringing people together and Evelyn. Psychological safety is as, as, uh, as David talked to earlier, um, so that they can help those conversations, particularly when you're talking about an organizational design that can be fraught with, um, tensions and politics and people genuinely feeling frightened of change and for very good reason as well.

Um, so being able to do this, um, and to do it in this way, um, took us on a lot further forward. It also helps understand a little bit more about, um, ways of working and having the right aptitude and attitude in the right places. Um, and it's something that we're going to use on a regular basis to review our shape of our organ function and how we configure ourselves around work and what types of skills that we going to need in the future.

Um, and aligning that with, with what the strategy's demanding of us for from the co-op. Um, also including purposeful design and about how we work was critical, uh, because that's something that's often overlooked in pursuit of getting to structure jobs, uh, because there's, there's usually a tension to get to that.

Um, having this included really helped us outline the, the range of different ways of working that would need to be adopted, not just what we have before and no more. Um, there was definitely a blend, um, and also maps are really adaptable. Um, you know, the evolution of services can apply at different levels of the organization from the smallest component to the most cost grant component of the organization.

And, um, and it was really, it was, it was really useful to, um, to deal with this who wasn't traditional, I'd say, is there a such thing as traditional while the mapping wasn't traditional wildly mapping, but it enabled us to have those conversations. So I think that is the end of my talk. So thank you a lot less technical than, uh, than the Phoebe's talk lots about Walden up in, on that.

Okay, thank you. Um, so again, loads of clarity, um, those slides, I want all of them and I want the spiel concepts ways. You're visualized things that I've tried to describe to people. And I realize my gosh, there's a whole journey and it's quite to my sales team at work. Quite frankly, when we're talking of, um, bringing rheumatic chain.

To a mature organization. Um, this is like an amazing playbook for doing so. And we've got so many questions around. How did you get a whole team of people to map festival? Um, how resistant were they, uh, is this something you did piecemeal and sneaked in, or did you do sort of a big bang session when you said, right, this really matters?

Um, there is so much in this chap I'm feeling I might need to make an executive decision and say, actually, we're going to deal with. Stabled topic for a little bit. There's so many questions in the chat, and I think we've got enough time. Um, I've seen some that I'm talk and I feel that needs its own special space as well.

So why don't we start with that? That was brilliant. Thank you. And can I have your slides? Um, I just want to look through, in fact, I'll, I'll let you do this. You can see the Q and a, um, do you want to start by taking them? There's one that, well, actually this is a question for me as well. Any advice on how to run Kickstarter Wardley mapping workshop, and this is internally with stakeholders, you know, um, and where you have social career capital in there as well.

What fallback plan did you have in case any attendees did not contribute much in the beginning? That's a huge part of that question because sometimes the people who need to contribute most don't and therefore you don't have a clear picture. So I would say. The way to kick, to kick, start it and get this move is to find some common ground and not.

B to purist about, um, the maps themselves and how they work. So in choosing, um, applications as currency, it was something that everybody understood. Um, and I find giving them examples of why things are a certain way up the X axis versus the Y axis. Um, find particularly architects want some quite precision, like exactly which point do I put things on and, um, that can detract them from the conversation.

So just. Getting them to think more around what relative positions things need to be in. Um, so that common currency and finding an in instead of, of overwhelming them with the whole concept of what they're mapping can be quite scary, because it does look very different. The UN architecture maps that we've seen before, um, and can be quite hard to kind of get their heads around, particularly if you need to do it quite quickly.

So that's how we approached it. Um, also providing them some stimulus ahead of time and examples of why things sit in certain places and using examples of things they already knew and understood was really helpful. Um, in terms of getting people to contribute who may not be contributing. Um, that's just really good facilitation.

Um, as I said, the first one Spanish was super hard, really hard as people were trying to digest the information. Understand what we were doing. And maybe not everybody read everything before they came in the room, but they just takes one or two people to start putting things on the map that actually better peer pressure starts to provide some emphasis and also putting something in the wrong place on purpose.

So that someone feels like, oh, and I need to correct that. That's not right. That also helped too. But also just encouraging people who were just sitting back and not taking part to do. So in that particular instance, we didn't, that didn't really happen. Everybody kind of got involved at some point,

um, follow on from Dave, I'm curious about what made the executive reject, avoid the usual external consultant companies being brought in. We've done it a few times before. Um, They haven't stuck and haven't funded. And some of their feedback that, and executive hub walls, we bring in people, you don't know the business.

We've got people who know this business very well. Who've got skills to be able to facilitate this, this type of work and also partner size to reduce our cost backs, but also to make sure that we have the right capabilities in place to support strategy. So, you know, feel a bit weird to spend X, thousands of pounds on a consultant long we're trying to save money and that hadn't worked in the past.

So, um, it was something they wanted to try. I think our new CFO Shireen coming in, um, was very pragmatic individual and, and good see some of the talent that we already had and knowledge. So she found that more valuable than, than, than bringing an external. Really good. Uh, last one from Bruno and I know I'm rushing through, but I want everyone as many questions to be honest.

Um, we'll then go into Andy's talk and then we'll have an opportunity at the end to talk about all of the, uh, all of the discussions. So if there are any sort of trailing questions, I'll try and bring them in there. Um, from Bruno, did you need to use any metrics, town, do tangibles or contributors to grasp the value of the exercise?

This is the mapping exercise. Now the overall not metrics around the business exercise. So let me just read that second part again, tangible for contributors to grasp the value of the exercise. And I'm seeing that as the mapping exercise, the exercise of people coming in, let me know Bruno, if I've misunderstood or misinterpreted that

I think the best way. I think most of the people who were attending the session have been in a place where the buy versus build and our job versus waterfall had been a source of pain and contention, and they often struggle to answer it. Um, so, and I say, you know, there's a tool that can help you answer that question quite easily and could use it and adapt it to this.

There was a lot of interest in doing that. And also the CIO at the time, um, gave me quite a lot of leeway to design and run a session that would help us get over some of those tension points. Gotcha. So there was a bit of exec buy-in in the process. And I suppose that would have, that would have, um, given people the right message and that you need to contribute to this.

And I had a little bit more, more scrutiny, I suppose, than just the activist or the enthusiast who decides to sort of bring it in real quick. Last one from me, what was the biggest? And by this, I mean the oldest learning or change, so 175 year old organization, wasn't there a theme that you thought, gosh, we've been doing that wrong for 70 years, you know, not as opposed to it's Toronto for now.

No, we didn't find anything we asked. We've analyzed. I mean, that has been in the past, um, because we had a lot, a lot more businesses. Um, and the things that we've discovered that we didn't know it was still happening. Um, but not in this most recent one though. Fantastic. Well, look, there are more questions for you.

I hope we'll have time at the end to cover some of those and take advantage just to look through in the Q and a and the chat in case you can prep for that. Um, I'm now delighted to introduce Andy smaller. Um, and I've deliberately been just kind of like delaying and delaying because I know you get super passionate and energetic.

Um, and by delaying, I thought I could actually just pee off a little bit, um, in such a way that it would make it even more entertaining. I've seen some of this talk and I'll openly admit to having read three books on. Alien life approaches to it, right? As a direct result of this conversation, that is not the subject matter.

It's not the subject of the talk. However, he does bring aliens into it. And it is just absolutely thought provoking. And it made me question a couple of assumptions, I suppose, that I'd made about how I think about problems. So I really hope you're enjoying this. We're going to talk about fractal game play.

Please introduce yourself the context in your life and work that caused you to be sort of thinking about this. Um, and yeah, pecan and tell us, oh, you're on mute. Uh, this one's really easy. The context was I got made redundant by Google.

The, the fun thing was, um, I spent, uh, over a decade building ecosystems. Right. And, um, I've, uh, you, you can kind of think of the last two years is a bit of an entrepreneurial sabbatical, uh, after the, you know, decades in tech, uh, building these ecosystems. And, uh, I suppose this a good place for me to, to plug that, Hey, I am on the lookout for a new, proper, uh, role.

So I will, uh, leave that out there and not come back to it. But, uh, I'm based in London, uh, uh, coming to from Canada town right now. And I'm sharing with you, basically the output from two years of trying to distill all the things I've learned about building ecosystems into fractal patterns, and why are they fractal?

I'll get into that. But the short answer is their scale and variant patterns. You can see them at any slice of a timescale. You can see the pattern repeating itself. Right. And so we'll, we'll, we can go into fractals in infinite detail. What I really want to do though, is get into, you know, what, what, what are we talking about with respect to, uh, gameplay and Wardley mapping I'm using the term gameplay a little bit different than Simon does.

And, and I can explain exactly how I'm overloading and abstracting that term, but let's start with the common anchor that we all understand. We all understand this loop, right? Whether you call it the ODA loop or sun Sue's strategy cycle, you know, we're talking about the game overall, and then the game play.

How do we dimension out and map the game play or around. And in order to get into the right frame of mind, what I'm going to do is kind of take you into a frame of reference that's, uh, th that, that you always assume is there, but you don't really think about it much. So, you know, how did you form an awareness of the present moment and your place within the context of that, right.

When you arrived in this game that we call life, right? How much of the game play had already been programmed with it? And how did you make sense of the game along the way, right there, clearly you you've, you've picked up a bunch of cultural frames of reference of models, all kinds of stuff. Right. And as you got good at understanding and making sense of each level of gameplay, right?

What was it that you did to, to, to master that? And how did that, those experiences form your identity? And I'm going to use a term. Called identity loop, because I think it's just as important for us to understand as individuals, as organizations. Uh, I like to think of companies, for example, as artificial lifeforms.

Right? And so when I ask this question, it's not only about me or you as individuals, it's also about the organizations that we represent. Right? How does that identity loop enable me, you, our company, our nation's right. To choose where to direct attention to engagement, because that's ultimately the primary degree of freedom that we have.

Where are we directing our attention and engagement. And what tools do you employ to make sense of the game play, uh, at, at each of these dimensions? Right. And I'm going to be a little provocative here and say, I can a robot grasp the context of who you are and what you've learned about the game and how you approach the game, how you frame the game and, uh, and then pull back a little bit and say, okay, what about the artificial life form known as a corporation, right?

How does it master and adapt to human game play? Right. And the reason why I call it a corporation and artificial life form is that you can take every single individual in that corporation and replace them. And it still exists. You know, even, even if it's dead, it still exists as a concept in the minds of everyone who's been exposed to it.

Right. And so there's this question of how does this happen

and how do we guide it's gameplay? Right. Can we map human gameplay for something that's not fundamentally. And what are the fundamental game loops that we play as humans right now, there are an infinite number of ways to partition this human gameplay loop. Right? We can spend lots and lots of time arguing about which particular method of dividing this circle.

Uh, there is now of course, we always have the ability of just splitting that circle in half and picking our favorite dichotomy, good evil, uh, you know, pick your, you know, alive, dead, whatnot. But the really interesting stuff happens when you identify more than two points along that loop. And you begin to understand the way that each segment, uh, interacts and that's why the strategy cycle or the OTA loop, or, uh, any other loop that you identify as a, as a valid.

Fractal loop fractal in the sense that you can identify this loop functioning at any given point in time, take a slice of time, a small slice, a big slice. You're going to see this loop and action. And out of that loop, you're going to see some emergencies and that's what we're going to go into here. And so when we use the term gameplay here, I'm using it as slightly different sense that Simon is it's compatible, but it's overloaded.

Right? And so what I want to ask here is how might we frame the nature of gameplay patterns, right? If you're going to build a map of gameplay, and if you're going to identify points on that map, what are the different dimensions? How many different dimensions do you need? Uh, what is, uh, uh, parallel? What, what sort of thug and all right, w you, you've got to get some basic dimensioning out of the way.

In order to make sense of, of gameplay in order for particular gameplay, to make sense. Right. And so the first question, and really what started me on this journey as an individual was how do I frame the nature of these gameplay patterns? And more specifically, you know, how do I tie each of these dimensions to a primary emergent experience that all of us feel like we can understand and communicate with each other.

Right. And so I'm not going to go through this list right now because I've got a slide on each one of these, but the point here is. For each dimension of game play, right? There is a primary emergent experience and there's something driving the loop that creates that. Right? And so that is what we're going to go through.

We're going to go through these, you know, five or six, because this is a loop, right? A zero and five are essentially the same place. It's just going from an individual to an organization. I'll explain more of that as we get into it. But each time you've got to create that loop, you've got a programming and a viral currency.

Now you can argue, you know, there's a thought program, an emotion or design, an emotion program, a thought the point is. It's a loop, right? And one of them tends to be more viral than the other in certain conditions. Now, sometimes they'll flip, uh, there's a lot of, uh, cultural, uh, dynamics that they get involved here.

I'm not so worried about which one is the programming, which one is the viral currency so much as is this adequately explaining the loop and is that loop distributing resources, right? One of which is limited like time, right? One of which is limitless like energy. Now of course there are limits to energy, but limitless in the sense that, uh, w w we can control the amount of energy that we're putting into a system, we can't control the, uh, the, the amount of time that exists to, to, to execute that.

Right. And so I'm going to also introduce with each of these gameplay loops, something that I call a derivative. I'm gonna start with that because it's a little bit more obvious, uh, obvious it's, you know, how, how do things. How does this gameplay loop play out over time, right? And, and, and I call this an external coherence that you see.

And then if you look at the viral currency and you try to get to the smallest possible unit, that currency, that that's where you get to this concept, I call the integral, right? You play that out over time. You get the derivative of that, right. Same with the programming, right? And then there's an emergent coherence that comes out of each one.

I know, I don't expect you right now at this stage. This is, I'm getting really, really abstract. What I'm doing is giving you the legend for each of these six slides where we're going to be going over. The different kinds of gameplay loops that we deal with as humans. Right? So as I frame each of these gameplay, I'm also going to try to hit on some key questions that fall within a particular gameplay loop.

Now, there are some questions that fall within all game play loops, which is essentially when the game enjoy the game, play follow the rules, pick two, right? What's your priority right? In every game, play. It's possible to pick two it's it's, it's essentially impossible to, uh, equally prioritize all three.

Now, if you have an infinite amount of energy and time, you can write, but, but we can't. So you've got to prioritize now, then there are some ancillary questions, right? Does everybody have to play the same game? Right. This is an interesting question in terms of diversity and how do we produce more winners?

If we allow for more games, how do we produce more winners? This is where diversity and inclusion comes in, right? Uh, but that applies to every game play here. So let me apply this legend to internal gameplay. That seems like the logical place to start. How do our thoughts and our emotions distribute the time and energy that, that.

Right. Uh, by the way, I'm going to ignore this, this bottom thing. If you chase through the slides afterwards, you'll see that there's this opening and closing, uh, dynamic. Uh, I'll leave that for your own, um, uh, chasing. But what I do want to do is come into and dive deeper into, okay. When I say emotions, how do I get down to the smallest possible emotion?

Well, let's call that a feeling. Uh, when, when we talk about thoughts, what's the smallest possible thought, you know, let, let's call that an idea, right? The interplay of that is, is essentially what forms your identity loop, right? This is the narrative that is constantly playing in your head. And it's the interplay between those thoughts and emotions that allows that to happen over time.

That leads to your temporary. And your inner narrative and what people experience as your character right now, all of these things, I'm picking words that are overloaded. You might not like some of these words, you might find a better word. Uh, I am not wedded to these words, except to the extent that they allow conversation to happen around this loop, right?

And at this internal loop, this is where consciousness emerges. And these are the questions that we as individuals, or when you're dealing with identity as a group, right? This is where these questions play out. Now, once you've got some internal gameplay, right, we start out where we don't actually have, uh, an ability of externalizing our internal gameplay.

Right? We, we start out where, uh, in, in psychologist described as the big other, right. We, we don't even recognize that we're selling. At first until we get to the point where we've mastered enough of that internal gameplay. And then we begin social gameplay, which the emergence of that is cohesion, where you can get multiple people that are each have their own internal gameplay going on and you can get a cohesive results.

Right. And we, if you think about, okay, what is the most viral part of that loop? Right? It's the action. That that, that we take and have their C and we program it with the journeys. Right. We, we talk a lot about customer journeys, right? It's because you need to have a coherent journey in order to take someone somewhere.

We already know that it, it requires emotions, uh, and thoughts, right. For anyone to go do anything, that's marketing 1 0 1, but what are the journeys that will allow us to do something coherently outside of ourselves? Right. And what gets distributed? Well, it's, it's security. When we talk about psychological safety, that's essentially what we're talking about here.

I'm going to condense that down to security and then sustenance in the sense that as all of us have social needs, right. And how do we, as a, as social groups distribute that, right? If we. Go a little bit deeper and look at the emergencies here. What's the smallest possible action. It's a step. What's the smallest possible journey.

It's a state. The interplay of that leads to development. Play that out over time. You get movement. Now that could be political move. That could be physical movement, uh, the journeys, uh, over time, right. They lead to progression that interplay is where evolution comes from. Right. So if you start with that as your kind of, you know, first dimension, uh, th this is the loop that happens after we get outside of ourselves and begin interacting socially, right?

We're we're asking this question ourselves, you know, where am I going? What am I doing? Where are we going? What are the journeys that we're choosing who's with us, who's against us, right? That's all happening in this loop, right? And then you get to a certain point where you realize, oh, there's lots of journeys.

There's lots of, uh, social groups that I can be part of and the need for multiple groups to form a loop of their own. A community of their own becomes a parent. And what we begin to do is we program. With the, the principles that emerge from these groups, right? And the viral bit are our values. And of course these are the, these are abstracted, but I think it's, it's well understood that communities form around values and principles, right.

And what's being distributed well, authority is being distributed, right? That there's only so much of it and influence, right? Just like energy. You, you can, you can have a lot of influence being distributed. You can have just a little bit, but that that's what gets distributed at this, at this loop. Right?

What, what's the smallest possible value? Let's call it a belief. What's the smallest possible principles to reason this loop leads to ideology. Right? You play that out over time. You you get doctrine. And th this is a little bit more general than the specific way that that Simon uses the term. Uh, but I can't find a better word right now and theory, and the interplay between that doctor and in theory is what leads to a system.

This is where we answer the questions. What do I value? What do I trust? Why do I believe what's good? What's bad. What's important. Right? And it naturally leads to structural gameplay because once we've got communities, right, communities form around different nucleation points and in order for a larger structures to form like nations, for example, right.

We had to move beyond. The, the simplistic structures that, that kind of naturally form in communities and program forms and conventions with regulations. And this is where we begin to distribute capital there only so much and ranked right. There's as much to, to give out as, as we want. Now we could, we could flip that around as well.

This is where we start to see that you could, you could flip this the other way and still be right. The point here is you, you get to the smallest possible units. You've got a practice, you've got a rule that leads to, uh, order that plays out over time as norms and laws and government emerges. And at this structural level of game play, right?

This is where we start looking at. Power. Right. Where do I belong? How do I fit in? Where do we belong? Who's in control, what's allowed, what's legal. What's not right. And, uh, I kept some of these emergent patterns out of the earlier versions, just because I find that it's distracting. But at this level you can start to see, this is where societies, you know, science can emerge at this level diplomacy, right?

Political systems, nations, right. Corporations, you know, artificial life forms have been with us for thousands of years. Right. I find this whole AI, uh, the discussion of amusing because we we've let these artificial life forms loose on the world. Uh, often with really, really disastrous effects, you know, for, for many, many centuries, Right.

And, uh, th th the fact is that, that these things already exist and they're, they're already loose. And, and in fact that what makes the strongest ones strong are the networks that they formed. Right. And we programmed these networks that, again, which one's more viral, the objectives or the metrics you could argue either way.

The point is there's a loop, right. And this is where, and what's interesting is we're in the point of time where we're at. What's known as peak attention, right? There is so many things vying for our attention and engagement, right? There's there's only so much attention we can give. Right. I'm really glad that you're giving some of your attention to me now.

Right. But the level of engagement that we have is variable. Right. And when we talk about multitasking, what we generally mean is we're dividing up our attention among many, many different engagements, right. At, at a given time. And the hope is that we have tools that allow us to do that in an efficient, highly leverageable way.

Well, let's, let's go down. You know, we, we talk about data, right? What's the smallest possible, um, uh, uh, Right. It's it's, it's a datum, right? Uh, and I I've kind of flipped this just to demonstrate that you, you could, you could go either way. I keep flipping metrics and objectives, and I keep forgetting to do this on the bottom.

But the point is, this is where you get production, right? And production can go out of control. If we're not careful. Now, what, what we're in. And this is one of Simon's specialization is understanding the derivative of this, which is industrialization, right? We're creating intelligence from all this. We we've got lots of ambition that is coming out of it.

And you know, here we have all these systems right there that are creating you right now. You can think of the internet as the ultimate network, right? This is the big emergence from this. Where do we go next? What, what is everybody worshiping? Right. It's fractal gameplay. It's where we're taking purposes.

And we're using purposes at programming purpose with orchestrations. And what are we distributing unity, right? It either exists or it doesn't right. But the amount of resonance that exists there is variable. How much resonance can we create? Right. And how do we take the smallest possible unit of purpose, the intention and the smallest possible orchestration, the arrangement and weave together effective interdependency.

And how do we derive? Over time, meaning and alignment. Now I hate the new agey form of, uh, of the word here. I can't find a better one though. Transcendence, right? How do we transcend, how do we operate, uh, an organization as effectively as we operate as individuals? And we forget that individual is closer to indivisible, right?

We are a whole series of networks and systems and, uh, uh, you know, we're, we're not always unified inside. Right? We get, we get sick. We, we, we have conflict, right. But yet we are visible in a coherent way as an individual. How do you do that with an artificial life one as a group? Well, you do that with fractals cause their scale and variant patterns and that that's the.

Notion of fractal gameplay that allows an ecosystem before, right? That's the emergence from it is an ecosystem, right? Why am I here? How do I align with my ecosystem? Right. And, and these are the basic patterns right now. How does this help us? Well, what this allows me to do is understand, let's see, I'm trying to teach a robot, how to understand the difference between a moral discussion and a functional discussion, right?

Th this is something that when you ask Google assistant, uh, you know, she cannot understand the difference, right? How do we, how do we do this for our organizations? Often we can't, right? This is where, you know, Mackenzie gets lots of blame. For going and enabling functional capabilities that are, uh, morally questionable, right?

It's because we don't have good ways of separating out these different dimensions and understanding when are we having a functional conversation from a structural conversation, from a moral conversation, right? And so we need standards for gameplay mapping. That'll allow us to understand why are we choosing the game that we're playing and w which dimensions are we trying to act on?

Right. We need experiments in gameplay mapping. Uh, this, this is one that I'm, uh, that's near and dear to me, I, I direct this for the sun Ophelia foundation. The short version of this is can we create fractal maps of our problems that allow us to be able to. Those who are working on similar problems, connected with those who have solutions, right?

A problem is indistinguishable from a solution until you've got context, right? You need that mapping. So a small plug for the stone Ophelia foundation and matters.global. Uh, some of my friends there, if you, if you recently saw the announcement about, uh, AI finishing Beethoven's fifth symphony, uh, those are, uh, are, are my friends that formed this on Ophelia foundation, uh, really cool stuff.

Uh, but with that, uh, it's, it's time for discussion. This is, you know, think of this as a provocation and let's get through the discussion. Wow. Um, I mean, I take it personally as a personal provocation right throughout the whole week. It's great. It really is. I enjoy it even better. The second time I was going to ask you to share all of the links and ideas that you shared, because I did so much sort of background reading after we first spoke, um, for me, this talk hit right at the right time, I was thinking about animals, veganism, how we punched down, you know, how we consider the people who are lower than us in the food chain, certainly in the way that we've built our world.

And that's the bit that Ben had made completely flipping the argument and thinking, how about if someone else was pushing down this alien life form, the comes in is smarter is better than us of these things. How is our own morphology, the way we live our lives, forcing us to basically mismanage up and down the chain.

And so this gave me a framework. I love the idea of taking the two extremes, the smallest, um, sort of representation of something to its largest, really useful in the early parts of mapping. And you're trying to determine what the thing is, um, to really think of its maximum minimal scope. So it really, really good.

I'm going to shut up and ask for questions. Um, first of all, from the panel, what did you think of that? Um, where do you think you can apply it and sort of what, what questions do you have?

Uh, I can't see you all on screen, so I'll just pick. That was awesome and really enjoyed that. Um, kinda relate to the question. I see many connections with Kennesaw systems thinking. Um, how well do you think people understand systems and then interactions? You have heart? I think that's the fundamental issue, right?

Is that when, when you say system, right, everyone paints a different picture, right. And you've got everything from people feel oppressed by systems and want to tear down any system when it appears. And those who feel like our only hope is that systematic, scientific progress. And, and the reason why I focus on gameplay is it, it allows us to change the conversation from one of our systems, good or bad to, uh, what are the systems that, that we're embracing and rejecting and which ones do we think, uh, need changing as opposed to it is, is, uh, is a system itself, uh, good or evil?

Yeah. No, very good. Yeah. I mean, you're, you're in a system whether you like it or not, and if you destroy the system and human will appear, so are already could use the phrase ecosystem, but yeah, absolutely.

Oh, sorry. Did I nail, what did you think I was on mute? Uh, just listening to the presentation. It speaks very much to. Ethics of the co-op and what we want to look at making better decisions around particularly technology and the choices that we make. So this is just fascinating, this fascinating. If I feel like it's the stuff you just spend a long time on discussing before you start a map.

And then actually it's the fact that it's so big that forces you to start mapping. Um, but it really, there are some fundamental things that you need to do and think about before you even get down to the okay let's map. And I think this really gives you a great framework to do so. We have some questions in the chat.

Um, Fabian, uh, asks, have you tried to map the concepts? You have analyzed with an arc in it. Um, and he's is described that as enterprise architecture, meta model, I'm hoping that means something. Um, th that that's a new thing for me, but I'll definitely take a look. I, I think that, uh, the, the essence of this, right, what I'm talking about is, uh, Mehta modeling, right?

And so anything that is capable of metal modeling, uh, ought to be capable of modeling gameplay, right. Uh, and, and if it's not capable of doing that, then you know, there's a problem. If it can't handle a loop, for example, right. This is the big problem we've got. We've got tools. You know, if you think of Excel, Excel is really, really struggles with loops, but it can handle hierarchies really, really ridiculously, easily, right.

We need essentially tools that will allow us to do this. So, uh, I'm always on the lookout for tools that can handle. Uh, the kind of real time exploration of dynamic loops. And if, if that's a tool that lets you do that, you know, I'm anxious to try it. Um, if we can pick two, why can't we pick three and all game then for gameplay loops that's from our map.

So we can, it's just that, um, it it's a question of how much fidelity or effectiveness are you willing to sacrifice, right? You, you can do a kind of mediocre job of all three. And then the question is, are you having an impact, uh, by doing that? Right? So it's, it's not so much that you can't do all three.

It's a question of. How much priority and emphasis are you giving to each, for every move you make, you're going to sacrifice one of those dimensions or you're going to need capital or energy, or, you know, any number of the things that are, um, uh, th that cost, right. And another way of looking at, uh, the, the, the viral side of the loop is it's a currency, right?

And so if you've got lots of that currency to put in, uh, then you can get closer to the center of, uh, that, that balance, but it, as you get closer to the center, uh, you can think of that as, as an exponential curve and that exponential curve, the cost to, to make further improvement, uh, just like going from five nines to six nines, right.

Uh, it gets exponentially more expensive. Gotcha. Um, so one last one, this is from a catcher. Um, the hardest thing to formulate is a proper question for the map. Um, so this is really the question about how do you constrain, um, uh, an idea or, or a subject that is very, very low. So in my case that I've done a lot of mapping with a lot of different groups, as diverse as, uh, Christie's the auction house and, uh, you know, tiny, uh, uh, startups that are just trying to figure out where they play.

And in many cases, what, what I like to use the, the, the gameplay dimensions for is, is picking a starting point. What, at what level am I, um, likely to provoke? We can, we get essentially operate the way I look at this is we're essentially operating at, um, one and a half of these dimensions at any time, right.

We can be anchored in and structural or anchored in functional and, uh, reaching down or reaching up towards, uh, another dimension and trying to bridge the, those students. So for me, it's always been helpful to be able to say, all right, Where are we playing? Where, where do we think we're playing? Right. And where do we want to play?

And then pick that as an anchor point, either the aspirational side or the, the, the, the practical side, and then start extrapolating from there, uh, you using the game play. So that's a very abstract answer. I don't know if it's a concrete enough without a specific, uh, example to tie to it, but, uh, that's how I approach.

I'd really encourage everybody to see this as the beginning of a learning journey. Um, so Andy, I think you've posted your slides, um, sort of links to some of the foundational material. I want to come back to both you and David on platforms. So you both used a platform to present. Um, if you could just tell us what you're using, um, what's in the stack, how you put it together because there's a lot of interest around that.

And David, if we have enough time, um, I'd love you to just expand a little bit on some of your provocative statements around serverless. So I'm using something called OVSP. And so I can switch between presentation, view, camera, view, presenter view, and I can compose these and move myself around. Right. Uh, at, at any time, in fact, I was supposed to be paying attention to hopefully not overlap anything important on the slides, but, uh, hopefully I didn't skip anything that OVSP.

Oh, uh, the, uh, sorry. Oh, B S uh, O B as in boy, S as in server and, uh, it's, it's on both the major platforms, uh, and it works great. Creates a virtual camera, which is what I'm using.

Cool. And just using a it's, um, visual studio. There is a fantastic plugin. Um, it's an open source project. I think it's, um, a dam in a scale of horn rotors. It's kind of, um, maps as cold. It's been referred to. It's the same engine that used on, um, online Wardley maps.com under the hood. There's kinda like a matter of language.

So if for, I mean, it's nice using that in a web page, the webpage is fantastic, but if we're doing something a little more detailed, I find getting the plugin for vs code visual studio code is kinda nice. So you just go and search for the plugin and the extension to search for Wardley and it brings it in which means you can save your map as text in, uh, it's like a dot WM format, which is nice for putting them in source control, et cetera, and you up a bit more, or the completion, et cetera.

Yeah, it's it's, it's, it's great for collaborating on maps and storing them. And as they evolve over time, you can kind keep, uh, your own repository of them. Probably expecting that next year. We'll find every using one of those two platforms. If we're following what happened last year, John Porter had a question.

Last thing before we close up, um, it does lead us back into that serverless, uh, chat, David, thanks for the great walkthrough. Interested in your comment of higher order serverless constructs. I know you shared links, but you got a couple of minutes. Yeah. I mean, the thing is. Is it like, I'll talk about AWS, cause I know that platform best, but it's the same on other cloud providers as well, you know, completely.

But if you think of, um, a lower order of compute, like easy to like, just get in a box as you start to layer on obstructions. On top of those, what the cloud providers do is they keep all those layers open, but they're constantly going up the stack. Um, and it depends on what your goal is. If your goal is to have fun, building a system, you know, go lower down.

If you need to deliver a business capability quickly, go higher up, let the cloud provider, um, do the operations for you, put in the abstractions tie thing together, let them provide the, you know, Multiple nine availability. A good example is something like step functions. You can use step functions, event bridge to tie together events and integrations with things you can, you can create a full integration flow, right?

Then he code low code platforms in the past have been problematic, but that the scale we're starting to see now with the cloud providers is really creating a whole new level of capability. Um, and again, you know, um, a lot of people think when they hear surplus, will, I know I have to rewrite my entire system in Lambda.

You know, I think of Lambda is glue. You're using it to integrate different parts of the system together, but what really requires you think of your solution as a system, a collection of components that were together, not as, you know, half a million last year, Because, as I said earlier, code is a liability.

The last cause you have, you don't have to maintain it, secure it, support it, have teams, you know, it's, it's less risk for your business. So again, that's, and you can see what, what, what AWS are doing on the other providers. They're starting to add more higher level obstruction. So I would definitely look at that.

There's a nice, I've posted a link there, but, um, the terminology is, is, is, um, is difficult. Amazon have started using the term, um, modern application development, which is another, and have a lot of great content on, um, AWS and Amazon, uh, on the site, aws.com. We talk about serverless and applicate, modern application development.

Um, but you know, again, one thing that I find very beneficial is then you say, what do you need an engineer. Yes you do. But one thing I find is if you take a team first mentality, give the team a goal as opposed to a set of instructions and then train that team and well architected cloud capability, then they will find the most advantageous solutions.

So it's, it's, it's, it's a new area that's in common, but it's, I don't think it's well, understood. Not really interesting in one, one, I that's new to me, so suddenly. I do some work on that. We've got less than a minute left. So I'll wrap up. Before we close up the room, we have heard, um, all about serverless, uh, an actual, real implementation.

We have seen a playbook for how to enact change in a big mature organization, um, and actually how to sell maps and get people to get involved. And we've had a mind blowing mind, expanding talk from Andy, um, really dealing with. Fractals dealing with different levels of obstruction and how you can, this is in pretty mapping, um, how you can basically start building a framework to understand.

So the more abstract, abstract con concepts that affect a system or a group of systems. So I think that's been a brilliant session. Thank you so much for your questions for your engagement. Um, it's been really great and I hope that you enjoy the rest of the day and the other sessions later on. Um, please take a moment before you leave, just to pick up all the links and things that are in the chat because they will disappear otherwise.

Um, thanks to the speakers and to everybody who's taking the time to join.