MapCamp 2021 - Challenging Orthodoxy

Oh, hello people already talking to me in the trap. Well, for those who are here welcome, um, I'll give a minute or so just for everybody to come in, but really delighted to welcome you all to this track of challenging orthodoxy, um, which is, uh, can be a really interesting topic because of all of the, um, areas that it can inflame.

What does, what does challenging orthodoxy mean to me? Um, quite a lot of things I'm seeing beyond the superficial, um, allowing yourself to ultimately. Envision or see things that have sometimes very little evidence, maybe just an idea or, or a little bit of something that alludes to it and having the confidence to sort of go with that.

Um, getting into trouble, uh, opposing the status quo, um, quite a few things. So I'm really interested to see what this set of torts generates and Julius coming all the way from Germany. Um, docile, dove in Germany, we'll be starting a soft today. Um, and on that theme of, yeah, getting into trouble, Julius is going to talk to us about some of the social aspects of challenging orthodoxy, which can be, um, the, the barrier, I suppose, to people trying to do so, because it does cause upset, you can create conflict.

Julius, Jonah, give us a quick introduction. Um, a little bit about yourself, perhaps the world that you come from that leads you to talk about what you want to tell us today, and then fly on into your talking to your slides. Yeah. So, yeah, my name is Julius Kemani. I've been, um, at Accenture for the last 10 years as, um, software developer and architect.

And, um, so I've been working on different projects, different teams, and then when it comes to challenging, I interpret that as I'm disagreeing with people, but in a certain way. So some disagreements are useful and productive. Some are just useless as in, we have the Tom trolling these days. So knowing when to make that.

That's really good. I will also mention one thing. So we've got a general format that you'll find across the other talks where you're going to be saying 15 minutes, all the talk with 15 minutes of discussion, we decided to challenge the orthodoxy of that wife at the beginning. We're going to do 15 minutes back to back with just a couple of burning questions.

So I'm going to put in a request for everybody as we're going along, throw in your questions in the chat. I'm going to randomly pick what that burning question is right at the end we're going to have, because it's quite a cut of sort of interesting topic. We're going to have a one long session of question and answer where we can dip into one talk, sort of make connections between each one of them.

So feel free, I'll hand over to you Julianne JS now for your slides. All right. So I'll be using the, uh, Yes. Yeah. I know what the mapping tool, well, let's see how that goes. Um, hopefully it's still there. So I have some maps pre-prepared and my starting point was, um, to, to consider the, just the words, um, what is challenge?

What is orthodoxy to set up the scene for these, um, users and user needs question? Can you see my screen? Okay, good. So then I'll start, uh, with this component of challenge. And like I said, I take that to mean, uh, to disagree with someone on the orthodoxy is unaccepted opinion or a belief. So then the next part is, okay, who am I disagreeing with that?

That's where the users come in. So I have here an individual, so I can disagree with myself. So. Looking at my environment, something's changed my habitual beliefs that I had before I no longer valid. So then I have to disagree with those on how to change those. I can disagree with you Damien or whoever, but then other people can disagree with me as well.

And then there is also a group here or a collective. We are groups are against other groups. Well, disagreeing. Um, so the next part is, okay, how do I link these two together? So what are the user needs for these two? And one that I do have is to always improve our, um, the way we observe and the way we orient.

So this is Boyd's OODA loop. So our decisions and actions depend on how we see the world and what we, uh, what we observed for that. Um, so I left it generic. Um, and then the next part is to preserve our positive and negative feedback loops. So this is in the sense of, um, some SU I know it's a bit, uh, theoretical, but the positive feedback loops tell us that we are going in the right direction, that our actions are having the right effects in environment.

And so we can continue doing that with the negative feedback loops, uh, that's information we get that tells us the actions we've done do not produce the desired effects. And so we can adjust and fill up this gap. So if, um, for those who already know, uh, the game plays in worldly mapping, or you can do an exercise to see which game plays target, the positive feedback loops that we can target the negative ones.

One of them is like, um, this reinforcing the international of someone else of your opponents that messes up their positive feedback loops, and they just continue to do. And then they cannot readjust to reality unless it's too late then on the negative feedback loops, uh, there is this, um, the ILC gameplay innovate, leverage commoditized.

Um, it's one of the things that's recommended, but to guard against that, you just, uh, one way is to cut off the data, uh, for this, um, for this vendor, then they don't get anything. They don't learn anything from the encounters and, uh, they cannot predict how you're going to react. So all these, um, I think the two most important things, if you don't get anything from my top, just take away those two things and you'll be fine.

Um, the other one is we want the ideas to be able to stand by themselves. So it could be an idea or it could be something that you're doing. Um, and then for that day you need some disagreements, um, detect. So I'll go over there and to the, to this sub map that I have right here. And, um, so we have these two things, the challenger and the initiator, so I can initiate something.

Oh, the state of school, uh, found it like that. And then I need to challenge that tiny to disagree with that. So in order to do that, communication has to take place. So if I'm the challenger, I need to challenge. And then if I'm the one who initiated this idea, I need to have the idea rejected or accepted or adjusted in some kind of way.

But communication has to take place. Um, question, is that big enough? Should I make it bigger? Okay. I'll try that. Okay. So then, um, So when we talk about something, um, so now we talking about, uh, challenging and disagreements. So that is the topic of the discussion. So we need to have that and we need to, um, understand this thing.

So like someone said, the map is not the territory. So the map of France, um, is useful, but it is not actually France. So there's two things we do need, and we need a willingness to challenge on our side and also a willingness to be challenged if I was the initiator. So how do I react when someone challenges me?

Um, we just get upset. So if we have time, we can go into that a little bit. Um, so we also need to know how to challenge, like I said, what makes a good challenge and what makes a bad one. Um, and then we need to also present. To challenge. I mean, if you disagree with me and you don't see anything okay.

Forever hold your peace, but you need to also present that so that I have time to also react to that. Then if we look at, um, this willingness to be challenged, um, the interesting part for me was to, um, to realize that there is, there are also these two parts and the interesting thing was, um, that yeah, there are these two parties, but they use the, the same value chain, so to speak, but just from different sides, different angles.

Um, so one part is why does challenging matter to us? Or why does it matter to me and for that? Cause I could just go through the world, oblivious, why do I need to challenge anything? Um, and so far for that one, we have this, I know how you, how they call it these days, but. Feeling of moral responsibility and to realize that the benefits are more than my Philippine trust.

Um, so if I only care about my self interests, who cares about challenging something? Um, so the second part is the environment that we're in, I'm used to teams. And so there are many more environments, but this is where I spent most of my time. And so they could be safe or unsafe, uh, which is why I think this question of why does it matter to me seems so important, the safe and unsafe.

Yup. I'll just leave those as the, um, five dysfunctions. So if it's, uh, in a safe place, we have these at least these five elements, there's trust, there's productive conflict. Uh, we are committed to our goals are accountable to one another and we care about the team's results rather than our own individual results.

Sometimes there's conflict between the. So, what do you choose? Um, yeah, the teams or predicts I've been on have been diverse in that safety and unsafety, and it's always, um, a spectrum, but regardless of where you are, or I've been a founder, uh, answering this question has always been the top most part. And for that one, what does it mean?

Uh, these are the values, so I'm using virtue. It's an old fashioned wide, but, um, let's say being, um, open, uh, being willing to be challenged. Do I want the ideas to be challenged or do I just get frustrated that I cannot get you to agree with me? Um, and also this sense that yeah, I could be wrong. I'm going forwards.

If anything comes up, you'll let me know. Um, then we have. Okay. These batches need the human batches and vices to compare and contrast. And then we have, um, I'll just not say much. Then we have examples and role models. So if I see how you challenge or how you're willing to be challenged, then I can take that.

As my example, we've seen in the past also from histories and biographies, that that also inspires us. And then let's not forget, literature is also important. If I cannot find any role models, then I'm going to go to my fiction and find some rebels there. Who've inspired me to disagree with you. For example, regardless of how safe or unsafe the environment is.

So if I have something like this, then I'm able to influence it in a certain way, if it's just for myself or for the team that I'm part of. Um, yeah, that was what. Key things. I think then for these other parts, I don't know if we still have time, but, uh, but one part is, um, there are these, um, I need to understand the thing that's being talked about before I can challenge it.

And for that, there is the classical and how I call it classical tools, where you have arguments. Um, you have propositions, you have terms and this make it easier to understand something and also to challenge. So if you say some, uh, the, what we talking about challenge now, as a, as a term, I'm using it to just mean I'm disagreeing with you, but I can also go to the gym this week, lift 10 kilos the next week as someone to challenge myself to lift 50 kilos.

Um, but that's not the way I'm using challenge. So that has to come in here for you to understand. And then you can disagree with me if you want. So one quote from Samuel Johnson, someone told him, I don't understand what you're saying. Yeah. I gave you an argument. I'm not applied to give you an standing.

So, um, so I found that quite funny. Um, so once we understand, then we can disagree. So we also use the same, uh, the same tools. And then when we come to disagreeing, well, how does the analysis look like? Is it complete? Um, is it illogical as in the propositions, don't follow to the conclusions and then, uh, we have to look at the premises themselves.

Are they effective? Are they valid? Um, being uninformed and also being misinformed. So misinformed is, uh, this is not true. You're saying something that's, uh, that doesn't match reality. And uninformed is you're missing a piece of information that's relevant to the problem you're solving. So my work has always been on backend systems.

Um, if someone gives me, it tells me I'm uninformed on user interfaces, I'll say, yeah, thank you. But that's not relevant to my problem. So this is where also these, um, disagreeing with maps comes in. So you can tell me, oh, I'm missing a component. That's this misinformed part, but it doesn't steal as much. Um, if you say this component is in the wrong place, uh, compared to when you're saying, oh, Julia said misinformed about this thing.

So it doesn't stink so much personally speaking then uninformed is also maybe the component, uh, is in the wrong place or it's more evolved as you think. So that is interesting. Um, then, you know, again, one example and one quote from a history Edmund back was arguing against. Uh, one of the pamphlets instead of the nations.

And then he, um, he just had this little sentence said, okay, to assume you have to convince us, you have to assume your facts, but if you follow in his thoughts, then they don't lead to the conclusion. So that is a good, um, I think it's a good challenge. The others are just, um, I cannot do anything about it.

So, um, the other important component is to be able to see multiple views on this is way, um, Wardley maps and other tools like, um, gold dress thinking process, where they help so much. Um, cause then they allow us to see the different sides at the same time. So that, um, that's before we finish, I don't know if anyone knows about Goldratt's.

I know Simon doesn't like the, uh, the matrices. I love these matrices and I think it loved them too. Um, so they look like this. Uh, so on the one axis, there is the, uh, countrymen into that. So,

but I'll just, um, present the matrix on top payer run out of time. Um, at the bottom we have the problem, which is, do we change here? What do we not change? There are positive consequences for not changing, but there are also negative consequences. Um, up here, there are positive things. If we do change and also the solution can bring about negative consequences.

So there's, um, I would summarize the things we have and once the things we do have in don't. And then here it's the solution. It gives us everything that we do want, but don't have, but it can come with its own problems. So, um, yeah, the status quo and orthodoxy, there are there already some benefits to it, but when we are, but it's not a hundred percent beneficial, there are some problems with it.

And this helps us to map out on what we can do with these things. Um, so I'll end there. Um, and then take questions. Injurious quite, excuse me, quite a few things. Going through my mind there on the, on my interface to this whole area is trying to map, um, negotiations specifically, you know, what, uh, factors should I be able to, um, use as leavers?

You know, which things should I offer as part of the negotiation next? Um, and the difficulty is the mapping of human intent, right? It's great. When we're doing things that are. Tangible fixed, um, and where we can measure when we decide that a thing has this particular, uh, quality. Um, usually we can agree on what that quality is, whereas when it comes through a human it's a little bit subjective.

So I find that interesting couple of comments, quite a few people asking, um, they really want to see the text. And I think when we go through and this sort of larger question answering session, maybe we can zoom in. Um, my question people seem to be asking is around, uh, the placement on the X axis. So how you determine where something said somehow on, on Vieques and what that really means from a, um, I think on this one, you've got universally accepted theory.

Um, earlier on it wasn't quite clear whether that was Genesis sort of, or not. As far as, um, a burning question. I wonder through this to Andy and Jackie, um, just in the interest of time, I want us to get one. Do you have anything burning? Um, I mean, sites, thoughts just around what you've seen. So.

I think this is the same question for me, as we see in the chat, which is how, how you reason around what to place, where on the evolution access. We'd love to hear, hear more about that, especially about this team sort of feeling safe or not safe. For example, was a good example that I was also wondering about.

Yep. So I placed them here because, um, at least what I've seen so far teams that have, um, unsafe environments, that's the psychological safety are more common than the ones that are quite safe for maybe that's the world I've been in. So that's why I've placed them on this side. So that's the only reason more common, not as common.

Does that help?

Yes, that's a yes for manly. So I think this is like a whole one hour workshop. I think you're going to have to offer people a workshop on this. We'll dive back into this in the more general sort of question and answer. I think people, some people have some reasonably technical questions that we can get into.

Um, for now I want to introduce Andy, how are you? I'm good. Thank you. And where are you speaking to us from today? I'm in the small town of London corner in Sweden, south of Sweden. Excellent. Thank you so much for joining us. Do you want to give yourself, uh, give a quick sort of intro, a little bit of context and domain for us?

So I'm on an order grim and I've been working in the technology and games field for a really long time. Now I'm currently at unity technologies. Unity makes a game engine and support things, services to create and operate games. If you play games, some of them are definitely made with unity. And, um, I've been thinking about participation and agency and how both customers interact with, with products and also how teams and direct internally in companies, uh, for a very long time.

And so today I want to show how I used mapping. To solve a, an internal problem that was, uh, present a few years ago when I joined unity. But I think this could have been a story from more or less, any fast growing, uh, company in the technology field. So I can, I can share my screen here. See if I, I can, yes, I can.

Here we go. So today is about how we decided to build an API platform after a Wardley mapping integrations of, um, between different services as a trust value chain problem. And of course, this comes with a map and I'm gonna take you through it. Uh, live any questions before I dive into that,

nothing here. I love all this live mapping that we sent that, and we have a one session across the 36. Um, yeah, crack on it looks good. All right. So basically the environment, uh, That I came into was a really, you know, fast-growing pretty small at the time, very network then distributed organization where most teams were, you know, due to the nature of where the company was up.

They were really optimizing for fast results. And that by definition meant working within the sphere of control that you and your team had yourselves. And there was actually a kind of unorthodox yet the time with the, at the company, at least in some parts of the company, which was, don't try to build things that have too many dependencies right on this starts to become a problem when the user needs some application feature, which we have here, uh, And we assume for the purposes of this mapping exercise, that it's a useful feature and is useful.

We have some proof that it's useful, right? For the purpose of this exercise, say, we want to display assets that the user owns a list of assets. And we also want to show the user, which one of these, the user already owns, for example, and this, uh, data is in two different systems. There's no integration yet.

There's no way to easily sort of pull this data together. So if we want to, uh, do that, we, if we want to display this date, this will the user, we need some type of integration to happen. And then I looked at the internal environment. And, and realize that these were very, very expensive to do. And I've, I've placed it here in custom-built because these integrations were basically custom built.

Every time I saw this pattern that we have teams who to create these integrations, they have to collaborate and custom sort of structure these integrations all the time. And so for this integration to actually happen in a common, a common example, we would need some feature work by TMA. Um, we would also need some feature work by team B.

And for that to actually happen in this type of networked organization where all of these teams were never going to be in the same org, right. There were some different, you know, capabilities sitting in different backend systems managed by different teams in different parts of the company. So for this integration to even happen, you know, team B needs to actually have some trust in team a, because you're going to, if you're going to invest time in the collaboration and build something that's needed for this high level feature, then you need that trust.

Um, this is where I started looking at, okay, why is this, why are these integrations not happening? And realizing that trust was actually a kind of part of the value chain here. Um, so these teams need to trust each other. So teammate to do the feature work, they need to trust the team B and for team B to trust team a, they actually need, you know, a time commitment from team a to develop.

To do the feature work like to actually schedule, you know, like on somebody's sprints, somewhere, the work needs to be scheduled and it needs to be committed on some type of roadmap. The resources needs to be sort of allowed to be allocated. And for that to happen, to even get to the place where you understand what it is that you needed to build each team first has to dedicate time for collaboration to even understand what we're building together.

This is the type of collaboration that in the team topologies, a book they talk about as kind of intense, like full collaboration that you want to do for short amounts of time. To establish what you're doing together, and then hopefully sort of disengage because if you keep collaborating this heavily, it's very expensive, right.

But we do need to dedicate some time to actually having this collaboration happen. And for that to even happen, the team has to actually have cognitive capacity to even understand what is the integration needed for what application feature and what are the consequences for our system and so on and so forth.

Uh, and along with the commitment to develop, um, we also have this, you know, commitment to support because you don't just need the feature work to be done. Now you also need to be supported to be supported in the future. And of course we have the same need for across, you know, for the other team and every time.

These integrations had to be constructed like this in a custom way. And it's kind of course, we debated how exactly to map this. What exactly depends on what, but this is how I broke down the problem to see, like, why are these integrations not happening? Because in this environment, what would happen was that teams evaluating application features here, they would see that an integration would be needed to have the feature happen.

They would pretty quickly parse that all of these things would have to happen for the integration to even be possible. And they would actually just say no to the feature in the first place. So this feature would become a, you know, if you t-shirt size things, this would be an X, X, X, L feature because of all of this extremely.

Fragile kind of value like dependency chain. And it's not that it could be tiny, tiny feature work that was actually needed to bring these, uh, this data from two different systems together. But because it was so expensive to custom build the collaboration needed to actually make this happen. People would just say no.

And it meant the consequence was that users would not get the features that were actually good for users. Users would get, you know, a classic problem. You ship your org chart. Users would get features that were possible for individual teams to build an isolation. And as the company was growing, this was clearly not what was, what was needed.

So by viewing the problem in this way, we could start talking about, okay, how can we evolve these things to make them change? How can we reduce the cognitive capacity needed? We started at the bottom of the value chain, right? Right. Now teams need to kind of custom-made cognitive capacity, if you will, or they need at least need, you know, it's, it's the different, it's a different problem every time.

So you need a lot of cognitive capacity. So first question number one is like, okay, how can we reduce that? And by reducing the special kind of custom capacity that needs to be dedicated to this problem, how can we reduce the time needed for this intense collaboration where teams needed to engage? And, um, how can we reduce the time for that?

Now of course, the time commitment to develop and to support will never really go away because these are prioritizations that any company has to make, like improving the, uh, the value chain here will not remove the need for company. So make prioritization. Um, but if we could make this, uh, cheaper, our hypothesis was that we could then make these integrations as a whole cheaper turn them from something that was like custom built every time to something that would basically be more of an off the shelf or behave more us an off the shelf thing that was easier and cheaper to do because more efficiency here, we thought we hypothesized would, you know, have new patterns evolve where if these integrations were much cheaper to do, we would see way more of them thus benefiting users, getting more features.

They're actually better for them and not so much maps to our, uh, particular ecosystem. So we were basically trying to start here at the bottom to see how can we reduce cognitive capacity here? Um, How can we sort of shift these arrows are not behaving like a one two, but I think you get the point of basically, how can we make these integrations, uh, way cheaper?

How can we evolve them? And when we saw the problem in this way, we basically gave ourselves a compass in a way, we got a why of purpose, which was, make these integrations cheaper so that we get more of them because it's better for users. And then a why of movement, which was about, we need specifically to make these, uh, we need to go down the value chain here and make this cheaper.

And in this context, we saw that if we could, you know, Uh, introduce, you know, classic tactic here, of course, which is not going to be new to anyone who works in technology. That's the benefit of building, you know, API platforms, but this solution had a proper why with this map, right? And we also could optimize features on this API platform.

So we ended up building a graph, QL based API platform because it helped us, you know, by defining strong contracts between the teams. It helped them collaborate quickly for a short amount of time and then disengaged to build, you know, client side and back in integrations, uh, or a sort of feature separately.

But we, we did. So when the features we chose for this platform, we were specifically optimizing for reducing cognitive capacity needed for teams to understand how to work together on reducing the time needed for this intense collaboration, so that we could get much quicker to having the work sort of agreed and prioritized and having the integration as a whole, be cheap enough for teams to start saying yes to this type of feature.

So that's how we decided to build the API platform and prioritize this feature after, uh, thinking of trust as a value chain problem.

Um, There was a festival. There is a question in the chat, uh, which I think is pretty good. I think this is a chaos engineer in disguise. Have you considered being deliberately challenging as a strategy? Uh, specifically says like punk music, music was deliberately not like seventies, rock scaled, musicianship.

I dunno if punk musicians were unskilled and I think that's a controversial topic in itself, but I think, I think I understand what you mean. Let me felt some that festival in the general, January of being deliberately challenging.

I mean, I think that the challenge or the orthodoxy in this system that had to be overcome was actually to justify to the organization to build, to, to invest the time in building the platform and framework for these, uh, That would help people collaborate in this way, because in this environment, like I said, we're kind of, you know, optimizing for fast results within the sphere of control of individual teams.

And in this environment, we're also pretty small, fast growing company, but still resource constrained, basically justifying a team dedicated to. Making it an API platform, uh, you know, many, many leaders have seen, unfortunately, technologists be very excited about technology for its own sake. Many, an engineer being very excited to build an API platform because of course, engineers have a view where they see these inefficiencies, right.

And they want to solve them, but it's not always clear to leaders like why, right? What am I getting for this investment really? Right. Why am, why am I putting three, four engineers on making some platform thing? And this was a way to kind of frame this investment and saying, we have this backlog of things that would be obviously useful to users that we are not building today.

Here's why, and this is why this investment world basically. This type of feature. And so there was kind of, you know, two orthodoxies that this helped me challenge one was don't invest in things that don't have sort of immediate value, immediate and direct value. And B don't do things with dependencies, right.

And saying like, yes, we will do things with dependencies, but we will do it with support. We will do it with this framework to support so that those dependencies become easy, cheap, easy, and sort of manageable because before this type of framework, The team that wanted to create the application feature.

They somehow became responsible for all of this custom stuff because they cared, right. They were closest to the user. So they cared about the quality and they also recognize the reason they t-shirt size. These as XXL was not just that they were hard to build in the first place is because they couldn't necessarily control or trust the longterm commitment to support the integration.

Then they couldn't guarantee quality to their end user. And that was another reason that they would say no. And, and so these were kind of two combined orthodoxies that, that. I not challenged in a confrontational way, but basically by digging into the void, treating this as a trust, as a value chain problem, we were able to dig into this and come up with solutions and show like, why would they improve the problem?

Why is this not a sort of adjust the tech thing in a corner? Because engineers like API APIs, how is this going to provide like tangible value to the business?

Damian, can I jump in here?

And do that was brilliant. I love that. Um, and I think that, um, um, I've definitely would want to show this too, um, jointly to our product and engineering teams, because I think this is, uh, a barrier that literally, um, exists in so many teams and making. This process more effective and creating that trust basis on locks.

So many things, but I was wondering whether as a result of implementing this, did you get a multiplier effect? I, as you've unlocked how the technology, uh, approaches here and the collaboration approaches, um, enabled you to see the product engineering, uh, tensions I'd call them. Did you find that, that you found other things as a result of that?

So, so did you end up with a different way in which the culture around the whole product engineering, uh, dynamic changed? Was this just the beginning of an understanding? Cause it looks like it could be to me. I mean, so at this point we built the platform it is in use and it is creating, I would say it's, it's still, you know, obviously not sort of fully concluded, but we, we are definitely seeing.

Both the value of it and some new evolving patterns in the organization where people are using it to collaborate in new ways, or we're seeing collaborations that wouldn't have happened before. Um, we're seeing collaborations go faster and easier as more teams adopt this way of, uh, this way of working together because they can see, um, they can see the benefits.

And I think that we've also seen some of the other things I, I wanted. And the reason we chose a graph QL was from thinking of a different kind of value chain, which was, uh, you know, reusable, uh, features like if you do the work of integration, one. How can you make sure that you don't have to do it again because you just have a slightly different use case.

And this is what we've seen, where this word graph QL works really well as a kind of self-serve back and forth front end. So patterns. I was hoping to see that, okay. Once we have an API, you know, graph QL exposure for, uh, our courses that we have on our learn website, for example, that we would see teams just grabbing those and displaying them in different contexts.

Because now this was free. Now you didn't even need an integration. Cause somebody already did it for one purpose to display them in our like launcher installer called the hub. Uh, now, you know, as part of a hackathon, they were also pulled into a mobile app for. And this was so now, so free, cheap and easy.

Nobody had to ask. It had basically become the integration had become completely self-serve in that way. And then we start to see these new types of patterns of all. And I'm not sure that's exactly what you were asking, but it is because what sin sits underneath this, for me, there's an ROI, a genuine ROI, but the initial use case could be tested against what you've just described.

And I think that that's a great way of making, you know, a positive peer Nell, uh, type intervention from an engineering point of view to say, look, the reason we did this is the ROI is, and that would open up all the possibilities about how you might apply this trust-based thinking. So that's really the reason I was asking, because I know every CFO would want that number and you would have from an engineering point of view, a much easier time to get things agreed and a tighter cop.

Between the product and the engineering, um, components, the teams within the company. So, yeah. Brilliant. Thanks Sunday, Andy, of course there's a whole load of commentary in the chat. A couple of questions on Q and a. Um, I'm wondering, do you want to pick a question? I think you're probably better qualified to decide.

What's an interesting question. Um, and perhaps come back to some of the other ones in the larger, um, in the logic here in IBM. I think we've answered a few questions now. Why don't we hear a Jackie's talk and then we can all have a, have a big, uh, panel Parthi afterwards with all the questions that people have.

And I'll also hang around afterwards. I'm happy to chat about this any day of the week. Brilliant, Jackie, over to you. I'm not going to introduce you. I'm going to let you do that yourself. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. I'm I'm the thing I need to say. Um, let me just try and share my screen. Um, yeah, I need to tell you first off these I am visually disabled.

Can you see my screen? Right. So I've got four screens here to do what I'm doing today. So the introduction for me, I'm, I'm, I've put in my, in my slides, so I'm not like my paint. So if you will really disappointed, I'm very sorry. Um, uh, it probably become evident as to why I, when I say it, um, mainly because I want to share my slides.

And so anybody that. Also has some sort of accessibility issue gets to see everything. Um, so I just want to say good morning to everybody already fascinated by the discussion. Can't wait to, to, to, um, pull this all together. So I'm the co-founder of flying binary, where websites company, we're focused on inclusion.

And by that, I mean leave no one behind and we're changing the world to leverage the industrial internet of things with deep tech. So last year at Mac campaign spoke about mapping a government research I've been involved in with Simon and this year I've been expanding my work to challenge the orthodoxy, my general way of doing things across 180 nations.

And I've based the approach that I'm doing this year, um, to leverage the, uh, the way in which as the co-founder the data journalism industry. Um, I do. I challenge orthodoxy. So basically what that means is I've been following the money, um, that each government spends on procurement. Just to tell you a little bit about, um, the company though, um, as international scientists that have, um, pioneered this approach to.

To, to, um, orthodoxy, we have 34 million citizens in Flint binary that inform our websites research. And, um, I would say colder feet to the fire. Um, the industrial internet of things is an engineering challenge, but the key thing for me is, has a societal impact. And that's where I inclusion mission comes from since we were formed in 2009, we, we focused all of our attention in building the deep tech for generations that Jen said are 28 to 18 today.

And since 2020 have been influenced in that 40% economic power. So it's cha it was time to challenge 180 nations. And in my double speech in January, 2019, I said, we're no longer building deep tech to that agenda. We're building for general. 17 to seven, although we do have some gem Bita as youngest fives that are involved in what we're doing, because they have very different requirements for the industrial internet of things, outrage from gen Z.

What do you mean you're leaving us behind, but the reality of it is they're quite capable of pushing the agenda. They need to push. Um, one of the things I want to say is, um, we're a gov tech 100 company credited with the transformation, um, uh, are using technology for the, for the UK government. And that's where the collection.

Of interoperable, uh, cloud services. And I'm one of the original G cloud, uh, zero team that challenged the orthodoxy to get us to that. Um, and we've, we've literally built everything until Brexit. To meet the European procurement rules. So what we built for the UK was automatically available to the EU 27, but the reality of it is, is we don't use the U S privacy shield we do when we're required to, but we don't recommend it.

And as expert advisers you see on the list, there that's one that's to talk about today. I do need to clear this up though, because I've got lots of questions last time. Um, a number of discussions, um, in the post, uh, presentation, deep check, um, comes from strategy. Shatavari here's the. CEO of, of the investment, uh, organization propel and deep tech companies are based on substantial scientific advances in our case, the websites that we've pioneered since working with Tim Berners-Lee in 2009 and the high-tech engineering innovation, both co-founders of fly-by-night engineers.

I'm an aerospace engineer and Ian is an electrical engineer. And the key, the key thing about D tech companies is, uh, what we produce and what we, um, what we deliver requires lengthy R and D usually a long time to get to commercial application, a large investments to get that commercial success. But the key thing is for us as companies dictate comedies, the underlying IP of what we build is well-protected hard to reproduce and gives us a strong, competitive advantage from what we call the 800 pound gorillas with the cash flow miners.

The exception of both of those counts, from what shotty said, um, we've never taken investment in 12 years since we founded and we were profitable in month one and pioneering the fundamental websites that underpins that an architect in the sustainable cloud service. It's why. So what I'm going to talk to you about today is my view of challenging orthodoxy.

Um, I think, uh, this is what, supposedly there isn't a definition. So I've made one up based on some research, but challenging the orthodoxies, that technology, um, utilizes is what I've been about. Always I've made a career out of it. Uh, initially as an aerospace engineer, that challenged the way in which, um, computing was done and, and part of the team that brought software engineering to our industry.

Um, and from my own personal point of view, the business plan I created from that to address the societal impact of noise pollution by the aircraft, we built solved by the creation of the BA 1, 4, 6 whisper jet. I still get to fly in her regularly. So I love that through to the founding of the empathy economy in 2016, which was my response to the Brexit.

Argument discourse, narrow argument, I think. And of course they today, uh, showing you how I've done that in both the, uh, European union work and the UN work that I do. So if anybody that's listening was here last year, I thought about put this slide in because I left new last year saying, okay, I've delivered the G 20 plan.

Um, we've, you know, we've got a three-year plan that pushed me for five. I pushed them back for three to generate a growth. The growth agenda also realize the brace agenda, but industrial internet things with the core proposition being deep tech. And that was based on the services we delivered. Wells for smart cities are, um, in public and private sector in the smart city domain.

But one particular thing that came out of, of last year's presidency for the GTMC was the UK. It turned out when I did the assessments for each, each G 20 member was the only one who recognized the critical national infrastructure component of the future digital economies. And so part of the client I delivered was to address that gap for the other G 20 members.

And if you sort of keep an eye on that, that whole. Critical national infrastructure piece across the world. You'll see G 20 members have been addressing that. And in terms of that change and the, the GCNT plan, um, as we started the delivery of that, that three year process, uh, the pandemic hit. And so the 4.4% growth plan that had on average across the G 20 members, it turned out it was a COVID plan.

Um, and we began implementing the changes that we said we would gear up across a tricker of G three G tread to presidencies, um, in three months. So completely changed my world as well as our world. Um, Uh, area, uh, that I particularly focused on and I've put a lot of material out there is that the G 20 team from Europe immediately adopted that G 20 plan.

And I, um, I've been appointed as a European expert advisor to shape the policy agenda over the next seven years. That meant I got to swap my Azure on provocateur role in the EU, which have quite farmed off. Generally. I took that to mean troublemaker, although it's not a straight trip translation to be one of the 40 you fast afters, that's actually a promotion.

Don't like the title, but I hold the pen for changing the outcomes for 450 million EU citizens by the challenge to the orthodoxy that is set in that. And we've transitioned how we implement the industrial internet of things or user needs agenda to inclusion agenda. And that's the next steps policy that we've already outlined.

And I've gotten to roll out there. And, uh, also as lead on to. It was abandoned in the idea of delivery models based around smart cities, but I'm directing everything to sustainable communities. And one of the things, the real core of that plan is that we will deliver a hundred different, uh, climate neutral cities.

We've got 99 signed already and delivering, um, which gives us a hundred different strategic approaches and, uh, climate neutral models to plan the next steps for your 95,000, uh, sustainable communities. So, so that challenge in orthodoxy and that picking up what I'd done, energy 20 was ratified by European council in October and cause Simon to say, you are such a troublemaker.

And I did have to remind him I wasn't Azure provocateur anymore. I was a Firestarter, so I'm not officially a troublemaker anymore in the ICU. Um, but he was, he was pushing back on me saying, but that's the you 27. There's nobody from the UK in council. It's like, well, yeah, because you guys got a different plan.

So this was the Wardley map that effectively on depend the reboot, you know, the evidence about what was wrong and the ongoing plan for each G 20 member. And it was also the start of the next steps agenda. So when you pull your mapping collateral together, moving it between nation states, as I'm doing it or sectors, it doesn't mean to say that you necessarily have to have a different start point if you're actually looking at, um, challenging the norm and the norm I'm, I've challenged is the sharing economy.

Um, but I'll talk about that bit later. Um, so what next was completely unexpected. I was doing what I was doing and having quite a good time and all the rest of it. And then I got a call from euphoria SSC, which is the, um, hundred and 18 members of the United nations that are looking to smart cities, delivery models saying not inclusion, Jackie, leaving all of us behind.

And that's fair. That's fair. But they, they, their, their initial piece was we can demonstrate that war, they map for the rest of us too. So you need to give us a G 20 plan. It doesn't actually work like that. Um, and so it was a much more complex problem for the fir. So jeez, 20 years, 60% of the world's GDP, it's a much more complex problem, um, to, to solve that for the rest of the nations.

So what we first had to do was. Decide on a focus. So I was appointed an expert advisor to the four habits you for SSE, and then every other logo on here, we had to effectively challenge all the assumptions, all the thinking about how we would solve this and what we actually agreed was we needed a focus.

One thing let's pick one thing. And as I explained at the beginning, I'm a data journalist and I've had real success with follow the money approaches. So you'll see in the Panama papers, paradise papers. And of course the Pandora papers are not the ones that we're still working on. So that's what we did.

We said, that's our focus. Let's look at where the money is in all of this. And let's challenge that orthodoxy. So we focused on 13 trillion, annual growth global procurement spend, and we changed the paradigm of what we do with that. I w I obviously, from a UN point of view, we'll talk about the UN sustainable development goals.

You may not have seen this diagram before. Usually what gets presented with UN SDGs is a flat piece of 17 boxes, all bright colored with all the numbers and everything you see here, but not this piece. And this was one of the first thing that I want to challenge, because I knew that that was we had, we're not driving adoption and the climate, um, challenge is our biggest challenge in my view.

And so this is the new approach that we came up with. I must credit my colleagues, um, um, in, uh, in Sweden who we we've done a lot of work on resilience, um, because of climate, uh, um, The climate change that that Sweden's experiencing. And essentially this tech, this turns on its head, what we normally do with the UN SDGs, because this depicts the way in which economists and societies, I ran bedded Como components of the bias fair.

So it takes an approach that views those economies or those sense societies embedded in the bias. They're not separate and what is actually happening, competing pillars. So it implies that the transition towards sustainability and the change we need to make from a climate action point of view is that the economy serves society.

So it evolves within the Planetree binder boundaries and this, and the work that underpins all. This is a reason I've got my hands on 13 trillion. Uh, dollars. So what did we do? It's hard and I've only got a few minutes. So what I wanted to do is to say we've effectively got sets and maps on depen all these 10 things.

Um, because we had to say, when you're buying technology, what is it you think could do in and Mac, all of that, what is it we should be doing? What are the principles under which we. We should be changing the way we commission ICT in any shape or form, uh, in the UN ICT is the sort of name, not, not tech. Um, but, but essentially that actually gave us a huge conversation around values.

And, um, this essentially is the end of the sharing economy where technology has been the outcome, um, to what we, what I call the empathy economy, where technology is the enabler. And so in order to reposition the money, we had to take these views. There's this is a whole half a day thing, but, um, In summary, the future digital economies have had a reboot from the user need to an inclusion agenda because this is what this enables.

So the work's on going. We're currently creating, uh, the next steps for the next year. Um, because each time we unpack this a little bit more, we, um, we're able to create a consensus. We don't have agreement across, underneath two nations. Um, the whole thing about challenging orthodoxy from my point of view is it's a progressive journey.

And, uh, whilst we have no dissenters on the values or the principles that we use in we, the, the way in which we implement is still up for debate and then the pandemic hit. So, um, we had to say, well, stop, stop the world. Because what we have now is we have, um, on the ground changes. Of that spend of $13 trillion it's been spent in a completely different way than anybody spending it before.

And we created a new procurement practice, which we call emergency buying. And these are the governments that we saw that, that new practice from. Um, we ended up having to develop the workflow in order to understand how to leverage both the traditional and the next gen approaches to procurement products.

Basically, I'm telling you, it all got more complicated just because it did. So this is where we started to create a series of maps because you can't do 180 countries change all at once and somebody has to step forward to say, Do it to me then. So this is the landscape of UK, uh, her Majesty's government procurement, which is currently a traditional, uh, next gen model.

Um, I need to say right now, every maps in. Perfect. And, um, essentially I want to show you also how messy is in order to create the initial, um, the initial, um, communication about what we need to do, but it's, it's how, how complex it is, is how a maps gives me the context and helps me understand, communicate the opportunities, because this is a very strategic way of, um, the question that was in the chat earlier, strategic way of unlocking, uh, challenging orthodoxy and, um, We had to effectively create a new approach to government procurement in UK, even though we'd reinvented it back in 2010, this was now time to change.

Now I can only really unpack a couple of aspects of this because, um, it's hugely complex. So I wanted to focus on, um, on this, the key changes and I call this my net zero map because that's the focus we chosen, um, uh, as part of follow the money. So the next tax for procurement, um, which has been led by the UK is to translate those new practices into procurement products, make the change.

Every penny of 290 billion UK government spending will underpin this to drive the net zero agenda. And it started, we started it a week. We closed the doors at the end of August and from the first September, 2021, we are on a, um, uh, a set of interventions to make sure that every penny of 290 billion UK government spending drives net zero, um, So it's complex conscious of time.

Um, so I wanted to just bring two pieces out of this to say, how does it link back to the UN piece? How do we get this, um, this, uh, 13 trillion spend re uh, set, um, one of them's workflow, we had to agree across all hundred and 18 nations, given the commissioning principles that we created, how we did it. And so essentially there's four components of that workflow, which I'm just pulling out, like as a highlight from that map to enable the commissioning of government services.

And we've agreed on planning, informing the market evaluation and award and manage endure delivery. And that approach takes the permissioning principles and works for all traditional and next gen practices for all UN members. And the second piece is back specifically to the UK. We have to, we've had to create a new marketplace, uh, which looks at, um, these are the highlighting, the net zero assessment criteria here.

How do we do that? What does it look like? Um, for all contract delivery and it's across the supply chain for every penny of that 290 billion become it spend in the UK, but it's, it's done in three, in three stages. We've created three different scopes. So from the 1st of September, all contracts that are awarded that have been awarded for 5 million, um, uh, to any you, any supplier to a magister's government, um, are in scope one.

The key thing that I want to do a bit of myth-busting here, there's been no adverse impact on SMEs. And in fact, the reverse, um, because the UK government has, uh, um, as a principle of, of enabling nursing SMV market, 95% of our, um, GDP is generated in that market. So really key. And the two things that everybody has to do.

The qualifications for contract, you don't get it awarded and get to do it. You don't get the contract without doing it. Publish a carbon reduction plan in public on your website saying how you going to achieve carbon neutral net zero by 2050, and measure the carbon emissions and declare them scope two, we'll go live in 2022 and I've accepted a two year appointment back in the UK cabinet artists.

For those of you who know me, you know, that I left, um, uh, in 2015 to go on and do my, my, um, global work where we're going to create the open standards that are needed to underpin these new procurement practices. And as ever, when I'm doing something. Like this at this sort of level, I've got million questions.

I know some of you have got answers to those million questions. So if you think you can help with this, get in touch. If you'd like to know more, um, then equally getting top touch and then just three tips I wanted to in listening to people, um, during the mapping exercises, um, I want to say number one, nevermind alone.

Huge. Thanks to Steve Perkins, who I know you here today, Steve. Fantastic to see you for his help to take, to create these maps from the, all the landscape material I had. Um, He knows far more about global procurement than he ever wanted to, but he's been a fantastic challenge to how I could present this material in a short amount of time.

Um, number two, what I've learned with working with the 118 nations is always map worldly mechanism only way I've ever found to capture situational awareness, but communicate it with your audience, always important, but bring them along with you is to bring them along with you. That is really hard, uh, to understand.

And the other thing, which is. Based on, you know, the oversight I have across the way the world's changing and the, the, um, the next steps I'm already doing is start mapping now. And the reason for that is the industrial internet things. Isn't just a technology change, as I said before, it's societal, but it's enabled by technology and, and the empty economy approach, which I've talked through you today.

This is the, the, um, some of the core principles around that. It replaces the sharing economy, where technology wasn't the enabler, it was an outcome. And, and you'll need to map this change for your organizations. If you're, you know, that situational awareness is needed by every, um, organization. And thanks very much for listening and looking forward to questions.

Brilliant. Thank you so much, Jackie. Um, exactly what I expected. One of the comments. Um, there is so much in what Jackie does. It often takes one or two passes to really be able to get the scale of what Jackie is trying to do in many of her programs, but then also to really understand where the impact is going to be.

And just thinking about all of the talks that we've had. So we're talking about the general sort of circumspective journey through a couple of viewpoints on the general area of challenging orthodoxy. And one of the things that came up to me, it was just articulation in every one of these cases, there is somebody to be influenced and the map has been a way of articulating what needs to happen in Andy's particular case.

I was looking at this and thinking, well, yeah, this is really about articulating what you need to do to build the trust and create a program. Built in people's understanding and knowledge. So, so you basically creating trust to extract the value that people's knowledge and understanding around these integrations and motors to enable them to happy happen with Jackie, you're dealing with massive supranational projects with, and goals that sometimes may seem so removed from the day-to-day actions or the people who you might actually need to influence.

And, um, same again, when you get into the, uh, Julius area of human, um, interaction, uh, It's an absolutely huge area, super complex, and is now starting to make me really think so in aspects, because I've always been mapping the static, the things that I've always been drawn to because they're easy to measure it, computers, physical things that can, you know, that have, have, have discrete value or at least, um, as changeable as humans, um, human intent, et cetera.

So some were really great questions. I'm sorry, Jackie, during that, I got this warning telling us that the whole thing was shutting down at 10 o'clock what was entire mistake? Well, that's why I heard you're a log in a little bit and then reload. We've got loads of time for the question and answer like we plan.

So I'm going to allow any of the speakers to dive back into their slides to sort of revisit anything that we need to, we have loads and loads of questions, and I feel that I'd be a bottleneck if I was the one to try and pick these. So we have some in the chat. Uh, we also have two other panelists I'm going to let you just, um, feel free.

So first of all, Everything. Jackie's just talked about Julius and the, if you could start any burning questions, ideas, thoughts, and then we'll open it up out to the general floor and take through some of the questions in QA as well. Um, I'm really curious when listening to you, Jackie, I guess there's no baby, no brief version of it, but I'm really curious how more precisely or arrived at procurement as such a key.

Cause it seems super obvious when you talk through it that unless you, but that's where it happens. It's kind of where rubber meets the road about how these investments happen. Uh, but how did you arrive at identifying procurement as such a crucial component? It's a really good question, because I think when the UN contacted me saying, right, okay, we need you over here.

And you know, you're, you're you say on every stage we've ever heard inclusion leave? No one behind you just left 40% of the world's GDP behind. Fair question. Fair challenge. Um, I think what they had in mind was I take that G 20 plan and then translate it, that actually isn't possible, um, because of the, there's a whole maturity curve that sits alongside it.

And so we had. Uh, a really in depth debate about how do you even begin to ask the question to get the answer to what you've just said? And, you know, obviously I'm a science diplomat. I haven't said that in any, anything. So I work around the world in order to create consensus. Um, but when you're challenging orthodoxy, that doesn't help you and, um, being very respectful to the cultures and all the rest of it.

I got to a point where I, I, um, I laid down some of the principles that underpinned the G 20 plan and said, quite frankly, I think we should put those in the bin because what we're talking about here is we have. Find something that unlocks this agenda for you all. And when I look at the non G 20 members of this whole piece, there isn't anything that aligns you.

And we can't federate you on smart cities because we've proven that with the G 20 plan that doesn't deliver net zero, and it's only thing anybody's focused on. And so having had that debate, they said, if you've got any ideas, I said, well, I co-founded the data journalism industry on the basis of the let's follow the money.

So let's do that. And so then it was a question of, do we even know across the nations, how that is done and we didn't. And so there was a whole exercise, I think, took about six months to actually understand that. And five nations were who, who, um, who represented that spectrum of change, um, were, were fantastic in supporting.

Uh, unlocking that for their five nations so that we can see effectively five different strategies that all had nothing in common. And then from that the 10 principles were developed and, you know, the asset test is actually getting the nations to say, and this would work for you or this would not. And, and so we're about to, we just finalizing all of that at the moment.

And then we will in December put the roadmap together for all 180. So it's, it's, um, you, you can't solve all of that with mapping, um, because you have to it's, um, it is a consensus making activity, um, and there's a huge about of diplomacy involved in that. Um, and, but it's, it's the leave, no one behind piece that mattered the most.

How did we find something that did that? And we had many candidates on the table, um, but repositioning, um, uh, 13 trillion. Dollars every year to deliver climate change was something everybody agreed on. So we that's, that's essentially how we drew it together, but obviously the interventions for each nation is different.

And so I wanted to show you the UK one, which has been built within the G seven negotiations with Tom, because obviously the maturity curve is how, how ready are you that the UK has already junked is on top of Carmen once before on a set of principles. These are the new principles. And then, uh, the. The, um, the forcing function is delivering net zero.

So effectively, we said, this is how we did it. And then for those countries that can just pick that up and lift it. They will do that. And for others we'll need to do some at some dig. So deeper work to understand. Yes. Now I know, um, the sorts of numbers that I deal with at this level, I've only given you one aspect of it.

It's actually a much bigger number, but it's where we're starting because. Climate action is the key thing that links us all. Um, but you have to know what to do about it. And the SDGs have been round a long time and they haven't created the impact we needed. So we've taken a new approach to, um, the, the, how we deliver and implement the UN SDGs for 2030, and then each nation's done its own intervention.

And we will end up with a series of things that not, can only be rippled across each individual nation, but that can be shared across more. So will, it'll be a co production co-learning environment for all the nations long explanation. Cause it's complicated on me, but it's a really good question, uh, in, in outline.

That's how I did it. Yeah, it's really interesting to me because of my day job. I'm interesting in what specifically provoked Danny to ask that in my day job, what I see is procurement, which sometimes involves legal, lots of people who are effectively in an organization to police, um, people's ability to deliver value.

And to me, that falls right into what Andy was talking about. It's about trust. So I deal because what I do, I deal a lot with organizations in enabling sustainability. And one of the challenges I find is I'm always in a company, in a room with one company, not with a whole consortium like Jackie's, um, and most of the time we'll have a conversation.

We'll come for. Clear idea as to what we should be doing. And then we'd go through the procurement challenge, which is often the deal breaker. Um, it's very often the least, uh, valuable part of the process and that sometimes it's 60, 70% of the sales cycle. Um, really interesting stuff, 13 trillion, if you need any help spending that for a small commission, um, you can always come to me.

When did the pub, you know, they, they rules, I operate under as a member of the cabin office. I think that that's not likely to happen. So we'll go through the process and that it's all done in a transparent way. So, um, having come back into, uh, to, um, cabinet office, I'm very familiar with that, but I'm sure that we will have conversations and either your last questions, uh, or I will, um, will help again.

So, and I think the reality of it is we unlock it, um, at this level so that the conversations you're having daily. Automatically get unlocked the way the UK is moved now on this, um, to deliver the net zero agenda means that if you have any part of the work you're doing, that's involved in any part of the value chain for government it's been changed for you.

Now it's already changed since the 1st of September. So it may well be we've unlocked some of it already.

I have a question, uh, for, um, that was, um, so now you're starting with, um, user needs as, um, as the first step in this procurement cycle. Uh, what was the starting point before, uh, before you work and how did you get the, everyone to just agree with this? What principles start with. No, no, we didn't, we're not starting, we're using needs, we're delivering it on the inclusion agenda.

Um, so I can give you a European answer to that because some of that sender in the public domain, the UN piece isn't because we're still navigating some of this, but in Europe I hold the pen for changing the outcomes of 450 million citizens in the EU 27. Um, and we have 80 million of those citizens that have some, um, some accessibility needs by challenge or by choice.

Um, that means that if we didn't consider that inclusion as a driver, as a forcing function, we would, we would, um, leave 80 million citizens behind. So we've moved the way in which we approach this strategically from a user needs agenda to an inclusion agenda. And essentially that's true. Most of the ways and approaches, we do things on its head.

It's actually been quite a dramatic change from a policy-making point of view. And, um, the way in which we'll deliver that 1.8 trillion your budget, um, it has been a severe challenge to everybody. We reorganized the European commission parliaments have to be involved. Councils have to be involved. All the EU institutions have had to be reformed.

Um, because inclusion drives you in a very, as a forcing function drives you to very different outcomes. Um, and, and of course that's is that is flying by and his mission. So that's something I care about passionately. Um, a couple of questions for Julius. What I'm going to try and do is to wrap them up into one question.

Cause I was kind of thinking of this. So you gave us a way of visualizing, thinking about a specific interactions or conflict, um, that we're anticipating with somebody that's a singular conflict. There was an earlier question around punk rock and, um, basically doing this just almost a constantly a sort of chaos monkey type, just constantly, always pushing the barrier.

And there's a question here, which is related to that. Um, mapping can be. Uh, further up, so asking, because I'm a real live examples on how you use the map to initiate change. So I was wondering about two things. One is the S if you do make yourself this agent of change is always pushing the boundary and always finding that conflict.

What does that do for your relationship with people? Is there sort of a diminishing value the first time you look to change something? Hey, that's great. But once you've got a reputation for being this person, perhaps if it changes that map, it makes it harder to do so. And, uh,

yeah, so I was, yeah, to the first two, the first one I mentioned, which was just that you, this was a visualization. Do you have some just practical examples of little stories of where you actually had a conflict or maybe what we could draw from that in the conflicts or disagreements we might have.

Yeah, one thing I forgot to mention was all these things. Okay. What I've mapped is making some of these, uh, processes explicit, but in our teams, we disagree with people every single day, every single time. So from, from, for me, when it's, um, when it's a delicate situation, when it's, um, I don't know how to phrase that other than making it very daily delicate.

That's when I get into these maps and map these kind of things. So in our teams is, um, sometimes you have someone who just complains a lot about every single thing and that just tanks the morale of the whole team. And so, uh, okay. It's not here on the map, but I'm building up this harmony within the team allows us to move faster.

So I didn't have the conversation with his, um, with his kinds of people. And so I do the map and especially use this, um, change matrix from Goldratt because now. If we are changing or not changing, he brings in also things like, um, there are these layers of resistance. So every quadrant has a, has a resistance either.

We don't agree that there is a problem. If we do agree, there's a problem. Uh, the solution might not give us the outcome that we want. And then if we do implement the solution, then it comes with its own problems. So every one of these layers, um, it's something to overcome. So me personally dealing with, um, interpersonal things, that's the most, the hardest thing for me.

So then I mapped this. I'd make sure. Okay. Um, if I say, um, you do X and it irritates me, do I have the X? Right. And do you agree? Um, so those are the, on the interpersonal level when it comes to being a change change agent, um, I always fall back to Goldratt's change matrix and the layers of resistance.

Because I can take, um, I check this and ask someone, okay, look, you don't want to change. That's fine. I, myself also sometimes don't want to change, but these are the problems that we are having. Do you agree because what I'm going for is yes, I do agree then at least we have a great as a problem. Um, so that's all I can say on that side.

So it's making explicit what we already do every day. Um, that's really good. I think that answered the question. Well, um, so that's something I need to, I need to look more into gold rep personally, um, and just really understand that. So once you've mapped the disagreement, how do you now map the interchange, the exchange you have with the person and also correctly interpret the things they come from.

They got a big part of my doubt comes in terms of two people with. Uh, opinion or objection may express it very differently. And so am I measuring the strength of their feeling on their expression or adding in their personality, et cetera. So I think that will probably help Jackie, I wonder in the last few minutes, if you don't mind expanding on your answer to Chris in the chat, um, so to the, I'll read it out, um, and read out your initial answer.

Maybe you can just add to that. Uh,

and I've lost my ability to read up. So Chris says this whole speech had a lot of assumed knowledge about the UK and the UN it's hard to pinpoint a single question. Um, the word inclusion is used here in a way that I'm not familiar with. Um, and you've come back and answered. And when read and read, your honor, so I'll just let you sort of riff on that.

You want to just explain or talk through that. Yeah. I mean, I think Christoph, you make a really good point. Um, we've we've since 2010 and particularly in the environment where, uh, I was working for this first focus of procurement, we've put a lot of emphasis on user needs. I'm not saying we don't do that anymore.

But as the example I gave from a European point of view, if that was what we were using as a forcing function for the change for the , we would have disinherited 18 million of our citizens. So, so we've, we've really. Um, we've, we've reset that to be user needs are important, but inclusion and actually understanding the value chain.

Um, cause I answered another question to stew on that, um, is key because do you know where technology is disinherited in it? And from a UN point of view, do you know the adverse SDGs that are, are happening as a result of your intervention? There's one of the things that we've struggled with too, to see the impact and the outcomes from the SDGs is we haven't looked at it from a point of view of what the unintended consequences might be to climb that.

And so the combination of a net zero focus, but a forcing function of inclusion. Um, I mean I have the evidence-based. Uh, 34 million citizens to challenge lots of the stories that go around around that. And also we have technology to reach out if we needed to into, I don't know, Ghana or Malaysia to ask the population of those nations to say, uh, we, we want some wicked questions answered.

Can you give us some, some of your thoughts? So, so I think it's a combination of things, but I wanted it to come across that. One of the key points we've learned as a result of this exercise is just focusing on user needs. Um, hasn't been enough because of the unintended consequences of that. And so therefore, an inclusion agenda, um, specifically understanding who you leave behind, who you might disinherit, what the unintended consequences of what you.

Is has been a really key learning point for all of us in this exercise. So as we plan the rollout next year for 2022, at the end of this year, that's going to drive, um, the way we prioritize that roll out. Well, we've got quite a bit to get through. Thanks again, Jackie, but I'm going to rattle through, cause I want as many people to have a question answered, Andy, I really want to hear the answer to this because I've experienced that show.

People are map people, see work. I need to understand that. I need somebody to explain that that's already some inertia. So you went and he basically didn't use the map in the negotiation, took us through that. I mean, I've, I've found that that's very often the case that you want. Mack. I mean, there are different, different ways to collaborate using mapping.

I think there are cases where leaders need to map a space together to build a strategy. But I think that very often you actually need to map, you need to map the landscape with like, it's a kind of, you know, the doctrine of like understanding the details is that you have to have like real expertise in the room to map the actual details of a subspace right.

What, what matters for that space? And this is where we bring like this. My favorite quote from Gregory Bateson is like information is, you know, it's a difference that makes a difference. And I find that this is often, the challenge in, in, in mapping is to map the things that actually matter because very often people will try to map everything or they will try to make, you know, a very accurate technical representation of some, some system on the most cases to understand.

How to move you, hold your, really need to map the moving parts. And this you can do in detail with kind of a small group. And from doing that, you will learn some things and you will have some outcomes. And usually you don't have to show the map to communicate those. You, you can just bring the key insights, like the key insights for me, it was like, okay, you know, I dug in and understood trust as a value chain problem.

But coming out of that, like I was saying in chat, all I really needed to say, to communicate to the bigger picture in the organization and convince people of was that these things that are clearly beneficial for users that we want to have, we are not doing them today because they are too expensive.

I've thought about why they're too expensive. And it's because of the heavy collaboration that's needed to, to make them happen. And that means teams are saying no before they even build them. And here's a solution to. Basically. And again, I didn't have to show the map to anyone and really a lot of this knowledge where I've built knowledge and mapping and understanding some principles doctrine and the climactic patterns around evolution.

And if you can create the efficiency, you'll see new patterns emerge. All of this I built into. You know, I put into how I told this story, but I didn't need to show it to anyone. So I think that this is where very often our own excitement for mapping can actually get into the, in the way of using it effectively and organizations, because this is a cognitive load problem.

So this problem is if you first have to explain mapping for it, to then be valuable and all the cognitive capacity, or people will always almost bounce off before you get to the valuable parts, because you're so excited for the value of it, that you're just, I just have to explain to you how cool this is and what happens and like how much insights we have and how this is totally different from everything else.

And, you know, you're so kind of excited for the format and you've actually. You've spent the cognitive capacity that person had and social capital as well. And you've spent your social capital to, right. Um, and I think that cognitive capacity or cognitive load is a really, that has been transformational concept for me in relation to mapping, uh, from, from the team topologies, a book is to really think about people and teams, cognitive capacity, and also think about how it changes depending on, well, you're choosing to invest it.

If I come to someone in an organization they're choosing how, if they're going to invest their cognitive capacity on whatever it is that I'm bringing to them based on the perceived value of it. Right? So if I lose them in the first, you know, 15 minutes of explaining something extremely conceptual, that has no clear value yet they are probably going to withdraw.

The investment that they had initially granted me because of some basic trust in the organization or openness to collaboration, but it can be withdrawn. So that's why I really think about how to, how to get immediately to some of the value without needing to explain. And again, it's also power dynamic, because if you first need to explain mapping, you put, focus on the person with the mapping expertise and everybody else feels stupid because they feel like they don't get it.

Cause it's a lot and you're not going to contribute when you feel stupid. So the challenge here is to make people feel smart because they have the expertise, they have the knowledge, and often I will just map with people. And if I have a map since before I will do what I did in this talk, which is to map it out live.

Cause I find that it it's extremely difficult to understand the map. That's all there. And it's super enlightening. When you talk through the actual flow that you have or value chain that you have mapped, then everybody's with you. Everybody gets. But you have to take the time to do that. And you have to have the tool that supports it, which is why this kind of map us code is super powerful because you can so easily who those Adrian did this.

I saw this the first time Adrian doing it the last year here at map camp. Um, it's super, super powerful. I've done it in the past, like PowerPoint presentations, where you just use the animations to, you know, bring it into the components, but this is way easier. Yeah. I agree with Andy on that point about not, um, explaining them up, um, at the beginning.

So 60 to 70% of my work is just, uh, give the summary, uh, show the findings and then they're like, wow, where did you get that? Then, then you can follow up later. But usually it's a. That's the way it starts. Uh, and then you just see this light bulb moment in their eyes. Oh, you in a stomach problem. Oh, very often.

Yeah. Very often people have enough contextual understanding that when you, when you explain the findings of the mapping session or the outcome of the mapping session, people know enough about the area to kind of reality, check what you're telling them. Like, you know, if you're basically saying, well, we're doing this custom today and we really shouldn't be, then people can go like, oh yeah, that makes sense.

Because they have enough contextual knowledge. They don't actually need to see the whole map. If they're in a field, if they're in a domain, they will just intuitively kind of, you know, agree with a sense-making finding. They wouldn't necessarily have arrived there themselves without mapping. But now that you tell them they can not alone.

Right. And they didn't need it spelled out in detail. That's at least my experience. Quick note to everybody just taken that, take a moment. There's so much valuable stuff, links, definitions that everybody's been putting in. And thanks everyone for just mocking in like that. There'll be really useful, especially anyone new to mapping.

Um, totally agree. And I love that conversation that jumped out to me because a map is really useful in my sense-making. Why should customer do X or Y it's toxic to take into the meeting for all the reasons that you mentioned? I do have a little trick where if I, in the days when I did try and show people maps, I used to tell them the specific thing that they told me that made me put a component down.

So I had a map which had quotes on it. And it was, you told me this six months ago and that kind of looks to sort of be.

Sort of works too. I want to say, remove the elevation, make it a little bit more accessible to the person and understand that it relates to them. But I think we're now up in terms of time, that was a fantastic session. And there are loads of questions. I would encourage everybody follow on Twitter, LinkedIn, every, every one of the speakers today is the first part in a journey and understanding some of what you've heard.

It's not that you should understand everything and consume it all in one go everything's recorded. It's going to be on video, um, and would invite you to also let other other people know what you've seen today. If it's of interest to them and share it around. Thanks everyone. And thanks to our panelists.

That was just a brilliant, brilliant.

Um, and I don't know what happens if I shut the shut. Shut this down. Should we just keep doing, keep talking to James asked us if we can go to the networking, working area. Thank you for that last question. Brilliant. So I'll close the room. Thanks everyone for attending and for taking part. That was really good.

Yes. Anyone emailed me about bikes. So I'll talk all day about.