Scenario 2

# Objective / Problem statement

This is a situation known as The Knowledge Gap: between Plans and Outcomes

* Outcomes: What the corporation wants to achieve.
* Plans: What the organization would do in order to achieve the Outcomes

The Gap: Organization does not know what is the real outcome, and they planned for the wrong outcome.

# Measurement for transparency

Everything looks fine for the setup of the development organization, they have all the roles, they know who can do what, and how to do their tasks. So basically, they are good on the Operation aspect: Doing the job the right way.

What they lack of is the Strategy aspect: Doing what’s right.

Here I assume that communication was the root cause, specifically between the corporation and the organization. There are several possibilities:

1. It could be that the corporation had communicated what to do instead of what they want, and then the organization just received the tasks and worked on it.
2. Or, the corporation did tell someone in between what they wanted, however this layer misinterpreted it to the wrong actions, then planned for the organization to execute these actions.

The middle layer could be the architects, could be not, since they only oversee the technical implementation for the team.

# Solution to achieve / overcome

The solution for the Knowledge Gaps is to make sure everyone understands correctly what is the purpose of the corporate goals, that is short TTM and low cost.

The specific requirement could be that the organization back briefs to the corporation about the goal, to ensure everyone is aligned. After that, no matter what specific product they are building, they have the biggest goal to stick to: Short TTM and Low Cost, and they can design their solutions (the “How”) using their experience and innovation.

# Take Charge and Accountability

The Architects of the organization can be the one to be in charge of this solution. Since they oversee and design the solution for the team, they will make sure their technical approach aligns with the corporate goal before transitioning it to the technical team for implementation.

# Constraints and risks

1. The corporation may not be used to communicating the purpose. In this case, they should realize that what they consider the solution may not be the right one, and that the development organization had their own experience and innovation to fulfill the corporate goals, as long as it is communicated clearly.
2. On the organization level, the architects could be too strict with the solutions. In this case, they should foster autonomy within the team, of course with accountability.

# Documentation and Learning

The corporate goals should have been communicated clearly to the organization since the very beginning. It must have been in the onboarding document of anyone new to the team, and be the guardrails for the team’s daily works.

If that’s not the case, it would be good to get it done, by training the team with the corporate goals and values, then document it in a centralized and accessible place.

# AI Usage

I could see the gap when reading the situation as described in the book “The Art of Action”. However I did brifed the situation to MS Copilot, and ask:

*What’s the problem? What is the slution? Any constraints to the solutions?*

The response was almost like my solution, basically: Clear vision and Strategy, and Fostering Autonomy.