ThoughtKite | [LaunchClearly] Methodology | User's Manual, V1

Why

The major problem that we see with early-stage ventures and projects is the notion of "throwing spaghetti at the wall and seeing what sticks." When done indiscriminately, without direction, this results in a tremendous amount of wasted effort, lacking completely in alignment with the original motivations for initiating the venture. Exploration of market opportunity should have its moments of frustration and waste – that's a given – but that collective struggle should be in the direction of the original motivations. A team will not remain committed to a project long-term – especially ventures where the financial outcome is uncertain – when there is no alignment between the project's outcomes and the team's goals. Embedded in this "firing blind" operational paradigm is the entrepreneur's sin of solution-centric thinking, which fails to fully understand the problem at hand.

Solution-centric thinking is not just the act of creating a product before interacting with the market – the Lean movement has already dealt with this issue, conquering the pitfalls of the waterfall development model. Rather, solution-centric thinking also manifests in the assumption that one must have a product concept to test against the market. This way of thinking loses sight of the fundamental need to truly and genuinely *listen* to the market – to fully understand the problem by immersing oneself in its context. With this in mind, the [LaunchClearly] methodology has been designed to structurally emphasize and organize the process of listening to the market in ways that have not yet been formalized.

Informing Sources

[LaunchCleary] is firmly rooted in the Lean movement fathered by Steve Blank and Eric Ries while, simultaneously, borrowing core insights from Clayton Christensen's theory of Jobs to be Done. To be explicit, Blank's *The Four Steps to the Epiphany* forms the core foundation which is methodologized in Ries's *The Lean Startup*; Ash Maurya further operationalizes these insights in his *Running Lean*. In parallel to these developments, Alexander Osterwalder and his team author *Business Model Generation* which forms a complementary backbone of the Lean movement. Less commonly known, and critical to [LaunchClearly], is Trevor Owens and the Lean Startup Machine's *Javelin Board* circa 2013/2014 – Ian helped launch and run the Toronto installations of this workshop in 2014, after going through it in the Fall of 2013. Naturally, there is a debt owed to Ian's predecessors and contemporaries in #LSMTO who collectively identified some gaps in the 2013 *Javelin Board*. Finally, independent of the Lean movement is Christensen's theory of Jobs to be Done, first given flesh in his 2005 HBR article with Taddy Hall, *Marketing Malpractice*; subsequently, Hall explored the theory through his *Nielsen Breakthrough Innovation Reports*. This all culminated in Christensen's and Hall's *Competing Against Luck*, which fully articulates the Jobs to be Done theory. Taken together, the Lean movement and the Jobs to be Done theory both inform the [LaunchClearly] methodology – it would be a crime to not credit them for their influences.

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

Philosophical Foundations – The 5 Ps of Experiential Learning

Problem-Based | Purpose-Driven | Profile-Guided | Project-Oriented | Portfolio-Measured

The 5 Ps are not just the foundation of this [LaunchClearly] methodology but of ThoughtKite in its entirety and our approach to education in particular. An experiential approach to learning is essentially phenomenological in nature (in the spirit of Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty) whereby there is a groundedness in the phenomena directly perceived by the seeker of knowledge. If we accept that a direct experience of phenomena is an ideal path for understanding reality, diving directly into problems themselves is the first course of action. Purpose is something that emerges after interacting with the context of a given problem – a purpose is the realization of a direction to move forward after experiencing the blocks of the problem. Embedded in purpose is passion – what we'll call the hidden P. Etymologically, *passion* derives from the Latin term for *suffering* and we can thus understand *passion* as "a purpose originating from a problem that one has personally suffered from."

After experiencing a problem context and deriving a purpose from which to proceed, our skill profile largely determines the form that a solution will take. If we have digital skills, we may launch a digital product; if we are gifted writers, our solution may take the form of a book or blog post. Understanding our skill profile is important because it gives us a realistic assessment of how much we can expect to impact a problem on our own; alternatively, it gives us an indicator of what skill profiles we need to incorporate into our team.

Naturally, the solution we create is a project – a focused vehicle for channelling our efforts. A project is capable of interacting with the phenomena of the problem in question as a means of determining the efficacy of its solution – thus, the metrics of success are grounded firmly in the reality of the problem. Iteratively approaching a problem with several projects constitutes a portfolio by which our ultimate success is measured.

Using the [LaunchClearly] Dashboards

This methodology uses four 24in x 36in dashboards that sequentially guide an individual from problem to purpose, from profile to project; collectively, the four boards embody a portfolio-minded approach towards problem solving. The 3in x 3in squares present in all of the boards are for use with Post-It notes to capture the progression of ideas. The main use case is to tape a dashboard onto a large wall space and for the Post-It notes to continue beyond the boundaries of the board – consider the initial grid just there to start us off. There are no numbers listed on the Post-It grid because there is no need to put an arbitrary limitation on how many notes we should be taking during each experiment: use as many Post-It notes as needed for a given experiment before labelling it with an experiment number. Having a large wall space is critical for the [LaunchClearly] methodology so that we can see the progression or evolution of our insights as we move from experiment to experiment.

At the top of each dashboard are one or several items that have a single square option, rather than a progression – this is intentional. These singular restrictions tell us that if we change any one of these items we are changing our core idea – this is tied to the bottom of each board labelled "direction." In terms of the direction, there are three options: (1) iterate, (2) pivot, and

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

(3) kill. To iterate is to progress in the same direction of the chosen single-square options, under the same vision; to pivot is to change one or several of the core items, while remaining true to the vision; to kill is to change visions entirely – scrap the board and start fresh.

Dashboard #[1/4] | Problem-Based Concept Discovery Framework

[1.0] Use Case

The Concept Discovery Framework is primarily about passively listening to the market and, in the process of observation, discovering the blocks that people are facing. As much as possible, we are to reduce our impact and presence upon the problem context in order to witness the blocks as they naturally occur. We must think of ourselves as nature photographers: our singular goal is to capture our subjects in their natural environment, as their regular selves. The moment the photographer is noticed is, truly, when the photographer has failed. With this in mind, we need to immerse ourselves in the problem context and truly experience the blocks.

[1.1] Choose | Problem Area

The problem area can be thought of as a general area of possibility that we're investigating. If we were to think in terms of geography, think of continents rather than cities. Defining a narrow scope too early on will limit our ability to fully explore the interconnections implicit in any problem area – to over-examine a single tree is to miss the entire forest in which that tree is situated. A helpful way to start is to think about industries or markets: broad slices of the economy like *Education* or *Health*.

[1.2] Immerse | Location

Where are we most likely to be able to come into contact with the problem area we've defined? For a given experiment, stick to one location – exhausting all its possibilities in full – before attempting a different location. These locations could be physical or virtual – a hospital would be an easy choice for Health, but Education could be explored through either a classroom or an online forum. An additional layer is to also consider locations of thought. If a particular group of books have been influential to a problem area, get copies and dive into the pages to absorb the context of the thought.

The action word for this section is *immerse* because we literally mean: *go there*. Wherever possible, interact with the phenomena directly – experience it. Wherever possible we should reduce the amount of intermediation between ourselves and the experience.

[1.3] Immerse | Time

When are we most likely to interact with the problem area we've defined? The "time" is to be understood here both in a chronological sense (e.g. 2pm) and in terms of what we'll call a "moment of occurrence." Chronological time is a great way to broadly define a problem area – for instance, the after-midnight time slot at a 24 hour convenience store is largely a different experience from the afternoon time slot. Equally, the moment of occurrence helps us define a

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

problem area through understanding how certain events – both external and internal – interact to produce a problem context at a point in time. To make sense of the two aspects of time: if our problem area is the Food Industry and our location is a fast food restaurant, the time could be understood both as breakfast/lunch/dinner and "when people are hungry." The location of the restaurant becomes deeply embedded in terms of the moment of time since the contextual surroundings inform "when people are hungry." If there is a gym near the restaurant, "when people are hungry" could equally mean "after a workout." We need to adopt this flexible conceptualization of time in order to fully explore the problem area – the location and time jointly form the context in which the problem area occurs.

[1.4] Listen | Roles

Who is involved in the context of the chosen problem area? Map out the types of individuals engaged in the problem, across the entire spectrum, at a given location and time. If we're at an emergency room in a hospital after midnight, there are obviously going to be service provider roles to take note of – nurses, doctors, specialists, receptionists etc. However, you're also there to note the types of patients in the waiting area, looking for patterns in the types of cases. It's extremely important to realize how the situation/context (location + time) defines the roles in question. A doctor in a hospital is a service provider; in a gym, that doctor becomes the service receiver. What this means is that demographic information is completely useless for understanding roles – it's more relevant to understand the operational context of the problem area.

[1.5] Listen | Goals

What is each role striving to achieve in the context of the chosen problem area? Every individual in existence will have numerous goals throughout his or her life – however, in specific contexts of location and time, individuals tend to have a specific set of goals as tied to their role in that context. Each role may have several goals in a given context, but that context nonetheless focuses the set of potential goals. For instance, in a hospital, a doctor is there both to provide health services and to make a living. There is no need to dive too specific in this goals section; rather, strive to understand *why* everyone is in this particular place at this particular time. Ideally, we want to discover that all the goals converge around a single area – our problem area – where the roles are simply different expressions of this area. If we happen to find more than one area of convergence, we divide them into separate Concept Discovery dashboards and explore each area of convergence separately.

[1.6] Listen | Tasks

What is each role doing in the context of the chosen problem area? Each role can have more than one task – this is when we get extremely granular. If we're at an office and encountering a receptionist, pay attention to how many tasks the receptionist has been entrusted with. Interfacing with a client like ourselves counts as one; taking incoming phone calls counts

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

as another; let's not forget about booking future appointments; did we notice the receptionist taking care of our payments and billing? The focus of each task is a target – the target is the entity upon which the task is being performed, which may be either animate or inanimate. The target of a task performed by a construction worker is inanimate; the target of a task performed by a salesperson is animate. We should be striving to map out all the tasks and associated targets involved in this given context as they are related to the roles performing them. The total number of tasks will give us a rough grasp of the degree of complexity involved at this particular location at the specified time; the distribution of the tasks per role will give us a sense of the most important individuals in the operational context, where the most important individual is he or she who is most depended upon. The total number of target categories will tell us how concentrated or distributed the problem is in the chosen context; the ratio between animate targets and inanimate targets is a clear indicator of the social activity in the context.

[1.7] Listen | Methods

How is each task being performed in the context of the chosen problem area? Observe the process by which a role executes a task and make note of three core items: (1) tools, (2) techniques, and (3) channels. A tool is any item used to fulfill the intention of the user, whether animate or inanimate – what we mean to say here is that we can think of our body as a tool. In a face-to-face customer service scenario, our voice is the tool to carry on with the task at hand. When we're talking about techniques we're referring to the individual steps taken in order to complete a task. Think of the tools as ingredients and the techniques as recipes by which the ingredients are used. The number of steps needed to complete a task will give us a sense of the level of efficiency of the given method. Finally, by channels we're referring to the medium in which the tasks are performed – at present, these would be: (1) in person, (2) in print, (3) over the phone, (4) online. The channels are the interfaces through which tasks get performed and the number of channels will increase in lockstep with the advancement of technology. It won't be too long before virtual reality will count as a proper channel. To illustrate, let's take an indoor swimming pool (location) during morning lessons over the summer (time). Therein, the swimming instructor (role) teaches flutter kick (task) to his swimming students (task:targets) by equipping them with flutter boards (method:tools) and demonstrating through his own example (method:techniques) in-person (method:channels).

[1.8] Notice | Blocks

For every role, guided by a goal, engaging in tasks upon targets through various methods, where is the flow of activity stalled? The progression of activity in a given time and place can be thought of as a flowing river; the blocks are dams that inhibit the flow of water (the water here is time – the one true currency of life). To visualize this concept, let's take a popular coffee shop during the morning rush – there will be a build-up of unserviced clients forming longer and longer lines, as during all peak hours. The block in this situation is the long line of unserviced clients – we can't make any assumptions yet. We don't know if the slow service is due to: (1)

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

low staff, (2) equipment failure. (3) a special event in the city that causes a surplus of clients, or (4) some other reason that can't be approached with generic examples. As an observer, taking *note* of the situation, our objective is to be aware of how the blocks are experienced without diagnosing too deeply the root causes in this early stage.

Without trying to bias our perception of blocks, one general heuristic is that blocks will tend to occur in the methods. Taken logically, the task definition is the starting point, the target is the destination, and the method is the process of arriving at the destination. If blocks are what stop the flow, they can only occur during the methods. This is mentioned with reservation because there are edge cases where the roles and goals need to be rethought. A slightly controversial example of this is replacing customer service staff in fast food chains with touchscreen menus – in that case, the very nature of the role needs to be reconceptualized.

[1.9] Compile | Results

Compile all qualitative and quantitative results and post them on the board – the goal is to get *everything* on the wall so we can see it all in scope. Have a bias towards over-posting than under-posting – it's better to double-post the same observation than to leave an observation out. We never know which Post-It note will turn into *the* crucial insight that moves us forward (from experience, it really just takes one note to change our lens on an issue). There's no analyzing or processing at this point – just get all of the data on the wall.

[1.10] Derive | Insights

After reflecting on our notes, we mentally digest the data and capture any *connections* that occur. What we'll end up discovering is that the insights are not some magical forward-leaping surges of genius – rather, they are about seeing the connections in the data. It sounds so simple and yet that is truly where the difficulty lies – seeing bridges where before there were only islands. A recommended strategy is to rearrange the Post-It notes in various orders and structures: to explore how different arrangements can cause us to see the data in new ways. We derive our insights by *playing* with the data and *exploring* all of its possibilities in a spirit of *childlike enthusiasm*. We must think of our data like Lego blocks and the eventual insights as structures that we build out of said blocks. We won't be able to build the best structure unless we try multiple combinations.

[1.11] Decide | Direction

Iterate, Pivot, or Kill.

- Iterate:
    - Same Problem Area
    - Same Location and Same Time
- Pivot:
    - Same Problem Area
    - Different Location and/or Different Time

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

- Kill: Different Problem Area or stop altogether

Bridging Dashboard #1 and Dashboard #2

Decisions made in Dashboard #1 become the foundation for Dashboard #2 – with this in mind, we can say that Dashboard #2 is nested in Dashboard #1. Any iterating, pivoting, or killing of concepts in Dashboard #2 all occurs within scope of Dashboard #1 and so we must see those potential options as truly *nested* iterating, *nested* pivoting, and *nested* killing. Purpose (synonymous with "Vision") emerges after exposure to a given problem area as a point of focus for action and thus we may also refer to it as a Problem Focus. For this reason, the uppermost square in Dashboard #2 is entitled "Problem Focus." The Problem Focus is derived from the Blocks noticed in Dashboard #1.

The most important aspect with regard to transitioning between boards is the notion of a narrowing of scope – if problem-based concept discovery is about exploring a country, purpose-driven concept refinement is about exploring a single city within that country. To extend that geographical metaphor, we may very well have to explore several cities but that exploration is done sequentially such that never more than one city is explored at a given time. In short, numerous Problem Focuses exist in a given Problem Area, where the purpose of Dashboard #2 is to narrow-in on a single Problem Focus.

Dashboard #[2/4] | Purpose-Driven Concept Refinement Framework

[2.0] Use Case

The Concept Refinement Framework is about actively engaging with the market as a participant – not simply as an observer – by asking questions that clarify and dig deeper into the Problem Focus (that is, the Blocks of Dashboard #1). It is crucial to emphasize that no solutions are to be proposed at this point – *do not* ask people if they think [Solution XYZ] will solve all their problems. The goal is to conversationally engage with people facing a general problem area and to ask them more about it. Whether or not Ford actually said this quote, it is relevant here: "[i]f I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses." This is type of response is what we actually want to get with Dashboard #2 – the Block here would clearly have been something to do with transportation speed. Ultimately, the keyword for this entire board is *organic conversation* – the complete antithesis of surveys, focus groups, and other non-natural data collection methods, where *natural* is understood as "spontaneously emerging from original contexts, without outside intervention." When we ask somebody about a problem they are facing in the context (time and place) in which that problem occurs, the conversation we have therein will provide genuine actionable insight.

[2.1] Choose | Problem Focus

The aspect of the Problem Area that we are focusing on – the Problem Area is a pie and the Problem Focus is a slice of that pie. The Problem Focus is synonymous with both the corporate notion of Vision and a specific notion of Purpose, when understood as "intention" or

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

"objective." The Vision Statement of a company often emerges from experience with a market or industry, both of which are essentially problem contexts; Purpose emerges from exposure to a problem context; the Problem Focus emerges through interaction with a Problem Area.

Examine the Blocks from Dashboard #1 and select one to use as our Problem Focus. We may keep the phrasing as it was (e.g. "the lines were long at the coffee shop") or we may choose to rephrase the Block into a guiding statement (e.g. "Exploring customer service delays in coffee shops").

[2.2] Choose | Customer Profile

The individual or group of individuals experiencing the chosen Problem Focus – will coincide with one of the Roles identified in Dashboard #1. In this second dashboard, our goal is depth over breadth and, as such, we will be examining a given Customer Profile as much as we can until we change focus to another Customer Profile. Changing a Customer Profile is so drastic for our purposes here that it constitutes a pivot. Why? Who the customer is changes absolutely everything about how we will structure our eventual solution (especially a product and its business model). Selling to teachers, and the institutions that employ them, is a far different scenario from selling to students; selling to nurses is a different scenario from selling to patients; selling to game developers is a different scenario from selling to game users. It's important to remember that demographics are largely dead – we're defining customer here as "the role that an individual has in a problem context, where said role in said problem context is willing to pay for a solution." Age is not (necessarily) our primary focus; race is not (necessarily) our primary focus; gender is not (necessarily) our primary focus, etc. What is central to our examination is the role that an individual plays in a given problem context. Demographic elements only become a primary focus when there is a clear case to be made that they form a core part of a role, in a given problem context.

[2.3] Choose | Customer Struggle

The element of a Block that an individual or group of individuals experience in the chosen Problem Focus – a Customer Struggle is the individual aspect of a Block that a Customer Profile experiences. In other words, if a Block is a pie, the Customer Struggle is a slice of that pie; the Customer Struggle is the Block experienced from the *viewpoint* of a single Role. The notion of *viewpoint* is essential here because the concept of Customer Struggle implicitly acknowledges that multiple perspectives exist at any given time, in a given place, where the Block occurs. To elaborate, let's go back to our coffee shop example with long lines manifesting. The coffee buyers are experiencing wasted time; the baristas are experiencing increased stress; the managers and/or owners of the coffee shop are experiencing both missed revenue opportunities and increased service dissatisfaction, which may result in both poor reviews and a smaller future client volume. Just as with the Customer Profile, any change in choice of Customer Struggle constitutes a pivot –our future solution is critically impacted by the type of Customer Struggle that we choose to address.

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

[2.4] Immerse | Location of Struggle

The explicit Location where a chosen Customer Profile experiences a chosen Customer Struggle in the chosen Problem Focus. This is roughly identical with the Location of Dashboard #1, except that we will be *explicitly* exploring *specific* locations and naming them as such. Thus, it's no longer just "coffee shop" that we will be listing on our Post-It note – go as deep as saying "Starbucks on King & Yonge in Toronto." Remember, our focus in Dashboard #2 is depth – if a coffee shop truly is the location in which our Problem Focus occurs, we need to explore as many examples of a coffee shop as possible to truly understand how our Problem Focus manifests. In doing so, we may eventually stumble upon a coffee shop in which our Problem Focus never occurs, which helps us narrow our scope even further while giving us hints at what a solution may look like. To extend this coffee shop example even further, let's say we stumble upon a coffee shop in a rich neighbourhood where a small cup of coffee costs $10 and where long lines never occur – we can deduce from this experience that high prices *may* be one way to reduce long lines. Ultimately, be specific when it comes to the Location of Struggle and remember that the location may be online as well.

[2.5] Immerse | Time of Struggle

The time at which a chosen Customer Profile experiences a chosen Customer Struggle in the Location of Struggle of a chosen Problem Focus. Broadly, the Time of Struggle should be identical to the Time of Dashboard #1. With this in mind, we are to understand "time" here both in the chronological sense and in what we earlier defined as a "moment of occurrence." Whatever Time of Struggle we choose is intertwined inseparably with its Location of Struggle. Thus, we may explore "Starbucks on King & Yonge in Toronto" at various times which are nested within that given Location of Struggle; we may explore the same or different times with another Location of Struggle, understanding our observations to be categorically different. In the end, we just need to remember that the spirit of Dashboard #2 is to be as specific as possible and this holds for the Time of Struggle as tied to its Location of Struggle.

[2.6] Assess | Knowledge Gap

What we don't you know yet, given the Problem Focus and its associated: (1) Customer Profile, (2) Customer Struggle, (3) Location of Struggle, and (4) Time of Struggle. The context (or lay of the land) generated by the aforementioned elements presents some common ground from which we can determine what we don't know, constituting the Knowledge Gap. In this section, we want to list out everything we don't know right away – braindumping all of our unknowns and uncertainties onto Post-It notes and spreading them across the dashboard. From this spread, we select the unknown that we most need to know in order to make progress and mark it with our writing instrument to mentally note that we're focusing on it. The Knowledge Gap section is the raw reservoir from which the Knowledge Goals are selected. When a Knowledge Gap item has been satisfactorily addressed through a Knowledge Goal and

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

subsequent Question, we cross it out; however, we leave crossed out Knowledge Gaps on the dashboard in order to prevent potential repetition. In the process of engaging with our Problem Focus through Questions we will likely come across more unknowns which we'll then add to the Knowledge Gap queue. Above all, ensure that the identified Knowledge Gaps are geared towards addressing unknowns in the Problem Focus.

[2.7] Determine | Knowledge Goal

What we want to know. Drawing from Dashboard #2, if the Knowledge Gap is the Problem, the Knowledge Goal is the Purpose: the purpose emerges from the context of the problem, just as the Knowledge Goal emerges from the Knowledge Gap. A further step taken in the Knowledge Goal is converting the core of the Knowledge Gap into a guiding statement – one which will inform how we phrase the Question. If the Knowledge Gap is "how much money does a coffee shop lose when customer lines get too long?" the Knowledge Goal transforms this question into an actionable statement: "Determining how much money is lost at a coffee shop when customer lines get too long." The Knowledge Goal is framed as a guiding statement because it should serve as a guidepost for several iterations of Questions until an answer has been found. Dashboard #2 is intended to be used in such a way that several iterations will tend to happen for a single Knowledge Goal.

[2.8] Ask | Question

The tangible expression of what we want to know, framed as a query and asked in the context of the Problem Focus. Immediately, it is important to note that we should not be committing the startup founder's sin of equating the Question with an elevator pitch. Too often, individuals will think of the Question as an opportunity to ask something along the lines of "Do you think an Uber for Octopus Lovers is a good idea?" which is wrong on two levels. Primarily, this is just solution-centric thinking posed as a question; secondly, the framing of the question asks for imprecise validation that is no different from "Mommy, am I good child? If yes, please pat me on the head."

Rather, our goal with this section is to come up with focused – one topic – questions that can draw an immediate response, whether on an online platform or in person at a venue. As a general rule, the question should be simple enough to be asked in a single breath, as one would ask in a regular conversation. The longer the question is the more assumptions are embedded in it; short questions convey a single idea. With short questions, there is power in their directness and concision which enables, in return, a direct *signal* from the individuals to whom the question is asked. Let's use our earlier Knowledge Goal as a starting point for illustrating how the Question process is done, namely: "Determining how much money is lost at a coffee shop when customer lines get too long."

The first question we want to ask is if indeed these lines are longer than normal and so we ask "Are these lines longer than normal?" If it is validated that the lines are longer than normal, the next thing we want to know is the financial impact of the long lines on the coffee shop;

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

however, we want to be natural and act as a regular customer would. With that in mind, our second question will be "How many cups of coffee do you sell during peak hours?" because we want to use cups of coffee as a proxy for financial data. Based upon personal observations of how many customers get served, how many customers leave before getting served, and the answer to the second question, a rough approximate of the financial impact can be arrived at. For a given Knowledge Goal, it's always best to prepare the necessary chain of questions even if not all of them will be used.

We'll be asking the first question to the first employee we meet under the guise of being a customer, in order to get a natural response. If the employee is not much of a talker, we use the long line as a justification to talk to the manager in order to ask the same question. Finally, it's crucial to note that if the first question is invalidated, the rest of the chain of questions is invalidated as well. For instance, if we get the response "No, these lines are regular for us" there is no need to proceed to the second question in the chain. Above all, it is important to see how key *signals* can be extracted from the Customer Profile in a Problem Focus without being too direct. Very few coffee shop managers will respond positively to a question that essentially says "Show me your financial data" but it is possible to ask about the number of cups of coffee sold without being suspicious, especially when done in a context-appropriate manner under the guise of a disgruntled customer. The right proxies give us the right signals to make the right decisions.

[2.9] Compile | Results

Compile all qualitative and quantitative results and post them on the board – the goal is to get *everything* on the wall so we can see it all in scope. Have a bias towards over-posting than under-posting – it's better to double-post the same observation than to leave an observation out. We never know which Post-It note will turn into *the* crucial insight that moves us forward (from experience, it really just takes one note to change our lens on an issue). There's no analyzing or processing at this point – just get all of the data on the wall.

[2.10] Derive | Insights

After reflecting on our notes, we mentally digest the data and capture any *connections* that occur. What we'll end up discovering is that the insights are not some magical forward-leaping surges of genius – rather, they are about seeing the connections in the data. It sounds so simple and yet that is truly where the difficulty lies – seeing bridges where before there were only islands. A recommended strategy is to rearrange the Post-It notes in various orders and structures: to explore how different arrangements can cause us to see the data in new ways. We derive our insights by *playing* with the data and *exploring* all of its possibilities in a spirit of *childlike enthusiasm*. We must think of our data like Lego blocks and the eventual insights as structures that we build out of said blocks. We won't be able to build the best structure unless we try multiple combinations.

[2.11] Decide | Direction

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

Iterate, Pivot, or Kill.

- Iterate:
  - Same Problem Focus
  - Same Customer Profile and Same Customer Struggle
- Pivot:
  - Same Problem Focus
  - Different Customer Profile and/or Different Customer Struggle
- Kill: Different Problem Focus or stop altogether

Bridging Dashboard #2 and Dashboard #3

Decisions made in Dashboard #2 become the foundation for Dashboard #3 – this, again, is further nesting, meaning that Dashboard #3 is ultimately nested in Dashboard #1. Results and insights from Questions asked in Dashboard #2 inform the Solution Concept and Solution Format of Dashboard #3. Unlike the previous two dashboards, however, Dashboard #3 is largely one of personal reflection; profile-guided concept selection is about internalizing the discoveries derived from listening to and engaging with the market. This internalizing is done by deciding what we want to do about the problem context we've explored – the intersection between the problems we experience and what we want to do about those experiences constitutes an area of potentiality from which a solution can emerge. Specific solutions require specific skill profiles and, as such, the transition to Dashboard #3 is about making sense of what a solution to our chosen problem context means and what skills it will take to generate said solution.

Dashboard #[3/4] | Profile-Guided Concept Selection Framework

[3.0] Use Case

The Concept Selection Framework is about defining a path towards a solution guided by the skill profiles available for the problem context we have experienced. The word *available* is used intentionally here to convey that multiple solution paths exist based upon: (1) the skill profile of the individual or team developing the solution, and (2) the ability of this individual or team to acquire either necessary or desired skill profiles for the development of said solution. With that in mind, the modus operandi of Concept Selection is to *work within our means* and to layer on top of our natural foundation whenever possible. In the process of experiencing a Problem Area and subsequently a Problem Focus it is quite common to realize that we do not have the skills necessary to tackle the problem fully with our current skill profile; alternatively, we may realize that we desire to do more than what the basic requirements of a solution would entail. At this juncture between the parameters of the envisioned solution concept and our skill profile lies room to either *build* skills, *partner* for skills, *buy* skills, or *remain* with our current skills. The dance between these paths will ultimately determine the format (or medium) that our solution takes. Thus, the Concept Selection Framework could very well be a 15 minute solitary exercise that we use to clarify that we'll be running with our existing skill profile to develop a

solution. Or, a realization from this framework can lead to a multistep interactive process between ourselves and the labour market as we vie for the skill profiles necessary to develop our ideal solution. Remember, the founding team of any solution is just as much focused on HR as it is on product development.

[3.1] Choose | Solution Concept

The value we are seeking to provide to customers, informed by the Results and Insights of Questions asked in Dashboard #2. Those familiar with *Business Model Generation* can rightly equate the Solution Concept with *Value Proposition*; in attempting to build a stand-alone conceptual system in [LaunchClearly], we've been trying to avoid overlap with existing terminologies yet it is undeniable that a parallel exists with the concept of Value Proposition. In any case, consider the Solution Concept as the soul of our solution – a soul that does not yet have a manifest body in the form of the Solution Format. Think of the *benefits* that our solution is to provide, independent of any medium. This means that we are largely focusing on what we want our customers to experience as they use our solution, which has three broad dimensions: (1) functional, (2) emotional, and (3) social.

The functional performance of our solution is how it gets the job done; the emotional satisfaction of engaging with our solution is how it enables users to feel internally; the social validation of using our solution is how it enables users to feel by virtue of the external perceptions of others. To illustrate the three dimensions of a Solution Concept let's take the example of water (we're not specifying the medium, e.g. glass of water, because that would under Solution Format) to solve the Problem Focus of thirst during a hot summer afternoon in Toronto. Water functionally satisfies the job of quenching thirst; users feel personally relieved when drinking water; users drinking water are seen as healthy by society. It may not always be possible to specify all three dimensions for a given Solution Concept but it's worth keeping them in mind in order to see the total value that can be rendered.

[3.2] Choose | Solution Format

The medium of the value we are seeking to provide to customers; if the Solution Concept is the soul of the solution, the Solution Format is the skin. The Solution Format is how the value is *packaged* to the customer – if the medium is the message, we may say here that *the packaging is the product*. The nature of how value is packaged determines how customers interact with the value and, thus, how they experience the value. Ultimately, a customer's experience of value constitutes their perception of the product and its benefits.

To elaborate, let's use [LaunchClearly] itself – its Solution Concept is about rigorously listening to and engaging with the market in order to launch meaningful solutions. The Solution Format for [LaunchClearly] could take the form of: (1) a printed book, (2) an ebook, (3) an audiobook, (4) an online course, (5) an app, (6) a first person documentary, or (7) an in-person workshop. How we experience [LaunchClearly] will depend in large part on which Solution Format we chose to engage with. We would have paid $20-$30 for the printed book; we would

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

have paid $10 for the ebook; we would have paid for a $25/month subscription to access the audiobook (among a library of audiobooks); we would have paid $50 for the online course; we would have downloaded the app for free, but would have been paying with our personal data; we would have paid $15 to watch the screening of the documentary; we would have paid $100-$200 for the in-person workshop. Beyond the price of access determining how much attention we'll devote to (and thus extract value from) the solution, the nature of its visual, auditory, and/or tactile presentation will further determine the user experience. There are other layers of value analysis that we could explore but this should suffice to illustrate how the packaging of the Solution Format structures how the Solution Concept is experienced and thus evaluated by users.

Implicit in this ongoing discussion is that there is a tremendous amount of variability in the Solution Format. One Solution Concept can have multiple possible Solution Formats; one value proposition can be expressed as multiple products. Based upon the skill profiles available in our labour market there are likely to be various pivots associated with the Solution Format alone – for instance, if a solution was intended to be an app but lacked access to mobile developers, the solution providers would pivot to a Solution Format conducive to the skill profiles accessible to them. Finally, it should be clear in this discussion that we are never to be attached to any given Solution Format – we must detach as much as possible from the Solution Format while remaining fiercely committed to the Solution Concept. It is because the Solution Concept has many possible expressions that we can adapt with the co-evolution of technologies and markets. Do not repeat the mistakes of our predecessors: if railroad companies had remained true to their Solution Concept, transportation, rather than their Solution Format, railroads, they would have overtaken airline companies.

[3.3] Immerse | Location of Creation

The environment required for the production of the solution, according to the chosen Solution Format – the Solution Format determines the production requirements. The action word here is *immerse* and we really mean it: if we do not have access to the environment necessary for the production of our solution, we cannot progress any further. The Location of Creation could be as simple as a room in an apartment; the Location of Creation could be as complex as a factory. This section should only take a few seconds to conceptualize as we should inherently know if we have the means to produce our desired Solution Format or not.

[3.4] Explore | Materials Required

The materials required for the production of the solution according to the chosen Solution Format. This is another reality check: if we do not possess the materials necessary for the production of our solution, we cannot progress any further. The material required for an information product is subject-matter expertise; writing a book on chemistry requires theoretical and applied experience with chemistry as the raw material from which a narrative can be crafted. The materials required for a physical product are component parts; a car is constructed from

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

windows, doors, seats, and other various components that need to be assembled into a unified whole. Again, this section should be completed relatively quickly.

[3.5] Explore | Tools Required

The tools required for the production of the solution according to the chosen Solution Format. Yet another reality check: if we do not possess the tools necessary for the production of our solution, we cannot progress any further. The tools required for an information product could be as simple as a laptop, headphones, internet access, and several social media accounts; the tools required for a physical product could be as simple as a ruler, a pencil, nails, a hammer, screws, a screwdriver, and a saw. However, if we extrapolate into more complex products, the tools will become more advanced as well. We must ensure that we have access to the tools needed to build our chosen Solution Format.

[3.6] Explore | Skills Required

The skills required to use the tools needed for the production of the solution according to the chosen Solution Format. All of the above has been for this ultimate reality check: if we do not possess the skills necessary for the production of our solution, progress stops altogether. The Skills utilize the Tools to shape the Materials into the Solution Format within the Location of Creation – the skills are the central component in this sequential checklist of necessary items. Section [6] is intimately tied to [7], [8], and [9] in Dashboard #3 as a step-by-step analysis of the skills needed to make the desired product.

[3.7] Assess | Skill Profile Gap

The skills needed for the production of the solution according to the chosen Solution Format that we do not possess – what we need but do not have. The Skill Profile Gap, and how we choose to react to it, determines the Skill Profile Goal. If we learn that we are missing certain core skills that are fundamental to the Solution Format we have chosen to build, there are two paths to pursue:

- Lower the Bar: adapt the Solution Format according to our present skill profile. *Remain*.
    - Ex | Original Solution Format: interactive web article. Skill Profile Gap: advanced frontend development. New Solution Format: Wordpress blog post.
- Rise to the Bar: maintain the Solution Format and acquire skill profiles to match the requirements. *Build*, *Partner*, or *Buy*.
    - Ex | Solution Format: interactive web article. Skill Profile Gap: advanced frontend development. Skill Profile Goal: advanced frontend development.

Alternatively, in a context where there is no Skill Profile Gap, there is no need to use this dashboard any further – progress to Dashboard #4. If we have the skills we need to create our solution, it's time to experiment with a project as soon as possible.

[3.8] Determine | Skill Profile Goal

The skill profile we have decided to acquire in order to produce the solution according to the chosen Solution Format. On the Post-It notes we simply list the skills we have decided to pursue, one skill per note, and lay them across the board. This allows us to visualize exactly how much effort will be required in order for us to be at at level where we are production-ready.

Alternatively, if we have chosen to run with our current skill profile (i.e. Lower the Bar strategy) leave this section empty.

[3.9] Execute | Skills Acquisition Method

The method by which the skills necessary for the production of the solution, according to the chosen Solution Format, will be acquired. Stated simply: (1) build, (2) partner, (3) buy, or (4) remain. Underneath each of the Skill Profile Goals list the corresponding Skill Acquisition Method in a Post-It note. For example, let's say that our Solution Format is an in-person workshop, with three Skill Profile Gaps of curriculum development, teaching, and advertising – we choose to Rise to the Bar, and these three become our Skill Profile Goals. We decide that curriculum development is a core competency so we label it as [build]; we decide that teaching is too important to just buy but not important enough to build, so we label it as [partner] so that our instructor is incentivized by revenue sharing; we decide that advertising is something worth testing on a contract first so we label it as [buy]. If we had chosen to run with our current skill profile we would list [remain] for the Skills Acquisition Method.

It is important to note that the method of iteration and pivoting in Dashboard #3 with regard to the Skills Acquisition Method section is one of *batch experimentation*. Test each listed Skills Acquisition Method, as linked to their respective Skill Profile Goal, before engaging in additional tests on any single Method. Using the above example: we are to explore [build] for curriculum development once, [partner] for teaching once, and [buy] for advertising once before we engage in a *second round* on any of the three. Thus, we are using this dashboard poorly if we're on the second round of experimentation with curriculum development's Skills Acquisition Method when teaching and advertising have not yet had their first round of experimentation.

The mindset here is to think like an HR manager – HR Managers list all (or most) available openings at all times in order to increase the likelihood of filling the needed roles. Moreover, applicants for a given position can be routed to other availabilities according to the proper fit. Likewise, a prospect sought for one Skill Profile Goal can be routed to another during a single batch experiment; after exploring various Skills Acquisition Methods we can determine which methods to use for which Skill Profile Goals. In the end, the process of skill acquisition is all about increasing our exposure to the labour market while simultaneously increasing our degree of competence with the acquisitions methods – a process best engaged with through batch experimentation.

[3.10] Compile | Results

Compile all qualitative and quantitative results and post them on the board – the goal is to get *everything* on the wall so we can see it all in scope. Have a bias towards over-posting than

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

under-posting – it's better to double-post the same observation than to leave an observation out. We never know which Post-It note will turn into *the* crucial insight that moves us forward (from experience, it really just takes one note to change our lens on an issue). There's no analyzing or processing at this point – just get all of the data on the wall.

[3.11] Derive | Insights

After reflecting on our notes, we mentally digest the data and capture any *connections* that occur. What we'll end up discovering is that the insights are not some magical forward-leaping surges of genius – rather, they are about seeing the connections in the data. It sounds so simple and yet that is truly where the difficulty lies – seeing bridges where before there were only islands. A recommended strategy is to rearrange the Post-It notes in various orders and structures: to explore how different arrangements can cause us to see the data in new ways. We derive our insights by *playing* with the data and *exploring* all of its possibilities in a spirit of *childlike enthusiasm*. We must think of our data like Lego blocks and the eventual insights as structures that we build out of said blocks. We won't be able to build the best structure unless we try multiple combinations.

[3.12] Decide | Direction

Iterate, Pivot, or Kill.

- Iterate:
  - Same Solution Concept
  - Same Solution Format
- Pivot:
  - Same Solution Concept
  - Different Solution Format
- Kill: Different Solution Concept or stop altogether

Bridging Dashboard #3 and Dashboard #4

Decisions made in Dashboard #3 become the foundation for Dashboard #4 – this, yet again, is further nesting, meaning that Dashboard #4 is ultimately nested in Dashboard #1. Project-oriented concept testing is about taking all the insights from the previous three dashboards and implementing them into a concrete project that we can use to interact directly with the market. This is no longer about listening or asking – this is about *speaking* with a prototype in hand. This prototype, the Solution Focus, is the result of combining the final Solution Concept with the final Solution Format – it constitutes the bridge between Dashboard #3 and Dashboard #4. The measure of success in this final round is the natural measure of any commercial launch: profitability. In order for a test to be successful, sales must at least pass the break-even point. If a concept fails in its test run, consider this a blessing – better to fail at this early stage than to invest more time and capital into something that would have met the same fate.

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

Dashboard #[4/4] | Project-Oriented Concept Testing Framework

[4.0] Use Case

The Concept Testing Framework is about interacting with the market through a concrete prototype, using *profitability* as the key performance indicator and passing *break-even point* as the threshold between success and failure. Fundamentally, this is a sales dashboard that can be used throughout the lifespan of an organization – the core of sales is unchanging for any business of any stage. However, what makes Dashboard #4 uniquely positioned for concept testing is that it embodies the core structure of all the [LaunchClearly] dashboards: room to document iterations and pivots over time, easily conceptualized linearly across a wall. The ability to capture insights quickly and to visualize performance across time through standardized categories is essential to making sense of market feedback – if we can't respond properly to market feedback, there is no testing. With that in mind, we need to commit to rigorously tracking sales progress and to be radically honest with our results – in doing so, we can guarantee that our solution will be genuinely vetted either as a commercial failure or as something worth pursuing.

[4.1] Choose | Solution Focus

The combination of the final Solution Concept and the final Solution Format into a commercially viable prototype. Whatever form the prototype takes – be it physical, digital, cyber-physical, or whatever form the future may hold – it must satisfy the quality standards necessary to be sold for a price that the creators of said prototype would be happy to pay were they customers themselves (Golden Rule). If we would not pay for a given product nor use it if it were free, we have no chance of being able to sell it to others. When the art of sales is done right, the seller feels a sense of satisfaction in having served a customer a product aligned with his or her needs – a product that said customer would not have known about were it not for the seller's efforts. Alternatively, selling done wrong is coercing individuals into buying products that they don't need. As such, having a commercially viable prototype prepared before testing shows self-respect, respect for sales prospects, and, ultimately, respect for commerce itself.

[4.2] Choose | Customer Profile

The Role that the Solution Focus is targeted for – this should be identical to the Customer Profile that was identified and honed in upon in Dashboard #2. What this means is that there is no pivoting with the Customer Profile at this stage in Dashboard #4 as we should have already thoroughly refined who we are serving and selling to by now. The Customer Profile is merely emphasized at the top of the dashboard to present a clear direction as the iterations of the testing process begin. Ultimately, there should be no changes in the Solution Focus or Customer Profile in this final dashboard – they collectively represent the targets that the previous three dashboards have cumulatively worked to identify.

[4.3] Choose | Revenue Model (Reference: *Business Model Generation*, 30-32)

The mechanism by which the Solution Focus generates cash from the Customer Profile. A Revenue Model has a Pricing Model, but they are not identical: the Revenue Model determines *how* a customer pays, while the Pricing Model determines *what* a customer pays. The two broad categories of Revenue Models are: (1) transaction revenues resulting from one-time customer payments, and (2) recurring revenues resulting from ongoing payments. Any specific type of Revenue Model will fit under either one of these two categories. In terms of the specific types of Revenue Models, there are several to consider: (1) asset sale, (2) usage fee, (3) subscription fees, (4) lending/renting/leasing, (5) licensing, (6) brokerage fees, and (7) advertising. In terms of the Revenue Model, this is truly where a lot of the experimentation should be done in Dashboard #4 – with a prototype in hand targeted for a vetted customer profile, the room for exploration is in how we make money.

[4.4] Choose | Pricing Model (Reference: *Business Model Generation*, 33)

The mechanism for determining the amount of cash to be generated from the Customer Profile in payment for the Solution Focus. As mentioned above, the Pricing Model is nested within the Revenue Model and determines *what* a customer pays. The two broad categories of Pricing Models are: (1) fixed menu pricing that predefines prices based on static variables, and (2) dynamic pricing that allows prices to change based on market conditions. Four specific types of fixed menu pricing include: (1) list prices, (2) product feature dependent prices, (3) customer segment dependent prices, and (4) volume dependent prices. In parallel, four specific types of dynamic pricing include: (1) negotiation/bargaining prices, (2) yield management prices, (3) real-time-market prices, and (4) auction prices. The type of pricing model that we select can have a tremendous impact on the amount of revenue that we do or do not generate. As with the Revenue Model, there is much room for experimentation in the Pricing Model to find what works best for the particular Solution Focus in the context of the chosen Customer Profile. Explore all the possibilities and find the price that's right.

[4.5] Immerse | Location of Purchase

Identical to the Location of Struggle in Dashboard #2 | The explicit Location where our chosen Customer Profile experiences its Customer Struggle such that it is most receptive to purchasing our Solution Focus. Just as in Dashboard #2, by explicit location we mean specifically naming the locations we'll be targeting. Whether that specific location is the physical "Rogers Centre" or the digital "Startup North" on Facebook is immaterial to the act of immersing ourselves in said locations. By definition, the Location of Purchase is where the sale will occur – we must be present as a prerequisite to engaging with our Customer Profile.

[4.6] | Immerse | Time of Purchase

Identical to the Time of Struggle in Dashboard #2 | The time at which a chosen Customer Profile experiences its Customer Struggle in the Location of Purchase such that it is most receptive to purchasing our Solution Focus. Just as in Dashboard #2, we are to understand "time"

here both in the chronological sense and in what we earlier defined as a "moment of occurrence." Ultimately, the Time of Purchase is intertwined inseparably with its Location of Purchase – they jointly constitute the context in which the purchase occurs.

[4.7] Immerse | Trigger of Purchase (Reference: *Hooked*, Nir Eyal)

The signal that causes the Customer Profile to purchase the Solution Focus, which manifests either as an element of the external environment or as an internal state of being. In other words, what emotions or what environmental stimuli is the Customer Profile experiencing at the Location of Purchase, at the Time of Purchase, such that a desire to purchase the Solution Focus manifests? Choose one core Trigger of Purchase to optimize for.

[4.8] Assess | Break-Even Point

The point at which total cost and total revenue are equal, the Break-Even Point is when the Solution Focus stops costing money to produce and sell, and starts to generate a profit. Some models display the Break-Even Point in number of units to be sold and we express this in [LaunchClearly] through the Required Sales Volume below. It is our belief, however, that before conceiving of the number of units to be sold, we must conceptually understand the number of dollars that must be brought in over time – a dollar figure invites immediate comparisons with costs that we are aware of in our immediate environment. This ultimately contextualizes the value we are seeking to monetize in very real terms, normally with our personal cost of living as a standard of comparison.

Conceptualizing the Break-Even Point in dollars begins with understanding the relationship between *costs* and *sales*. Sales will increase or decrease over time; one class of costs will fluctuate according to sales, and a second class of costs will remain unchanged.

- Variable Cost: increases when sales increase and decreases when sales decrease. These will be contextual to our Product Focus. Often, these will be the supplies necessary to produce a product or to deliver a service.
- Fixed Cost: does not increase when sales increase and does not decrease when sales decrease. These are contextually independent of our Product Focus. The most common fixed cost for businesses is rent.

The next step is to understand *contribution margin*, which is attained by subtracting all *variable costs* from *sales*. It represents the amount available from *sales* to cover *fixed costs* and *profit*.

- [Contribution Margin] = [(Sales) – (Variable Costs)]

The last step before we can calculate the Break-Even Point in dollars is to convert the *contribution margin* into a ratio. The *contribution margin ratio* indicates the percentage of each *sales* dollar that is available to cover *fixed costs* and *profit*. The ratio is calculated by dividing the *contribution margin* by *sales*.

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

- [Contribution Margin Ratio] = [(Contribution Margin) ÷ (Sales)]

Finally, we can calculate the *Break-Even Point in Dollars* by dividing *total fixed costs* by the *contribution margin ratio*.

- [Break-Even Point in Dollars] = [(Total Fixed Costs) ÷ (Contribution Margin Ratio)]

[4.9] Determine | Required Sales Volume

The Break-Even Point expressed in number of units of the Solution Focus needed to be sold. After conveying the Break-Even Point in dollars, enabling us to contextualize the value of the Solution Focus against a personal reference point, we switch to conveying in number of units here in order to develop an orientation towards action. Having the Required Sales Volume expressed in a concrete number of units to be sold sets a definite goal to work towards – a clear measure of success and failure. We've already discussed the finer details of the Break-Even Point above, so let's dive into what we need to do in order calculate it in number of units.

To get started, we need to know the *contribution margin per unit*, which tells us how much we will have left per unit sold to contribute to our *fixed costs* after the *variable costs* are covered.

- [Contribution Margin per Unit] = [(Sales per Unit) – (Variable Costs per Unit)]

The *Required Sales Volume*, or *Break-Even Point in Units*, is the number of units needed to be sold in order to cover the *fixed costs* and *variable costs*. We arrive at this number of units by dividing the total amount of *fixed costs* by the *contribution margin per unit*.

- [Required Sales Volume] = [(Total Fixed Costs) ÷ (Contribution Margin per Unit)]

With the number of units needed to be sold over a given period of time definitively calculated, it's time to pound the pavement. Ain't nothin' to it but to do it – *it's execution time*.

[4.10] Execute | Sales Method

The tactic used to get the chosen Customer Profile to purchase the Solution Focus. The Sales Method strives to activate the Trigger of Purchase either by existing as a prompting external stimulus or by aligning with the internal state of the Customer Profile and bringing this state to the fore of his or her consciousness. An external stimulus could be a firm handshake when meeting someone at a conference for the first time; an internal state alignment could be a social media post that draws the user to read it with the right image and header. In other words, the Sales Method can take the form of either a *push* or a *pull*. It would be impossible for us to explore every possible tactic; however, we can confidently say that the Location of Purchase, Time of Purchase, and Trigger of Purchase for any given Solution Focus collectively form a narrowing context in which only specific tactics will work. We cannot shake a person's hands online, nor can we consider social media posts the best way to attract the attention of delegates

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike

that are networking at a conference. Ultimately, we must decide on a Sales Method that works for the threefold context of location, time, and trigger in which our Solution Focus is embedded.

[4.11] Compile | Results

Compile all qualitative and quantitative results and post them on the board – the goal is to get *everything* on the wall so we can see it all in scope. Have a bias towards over-posting than under-posting – it's better to double-post the same observation than to leave an observation out. We never know which Post-It note will turn into *the* crucial insight that moves us forward (from experience, it really just takes one note to change our lens on an issue). There's no analyzing or processing at this point – just get all of the data on the wall.

[4.12] Derive | Insights

After reflecting on our notes, we mentally digest the data and capture any *connections* that occur. What we'll end up discovering is that the insights are not some magical forward-leaping surges of genius – rather, they are about seeing the connections in the data. It sounds so simple and yet that is truly where the difficulty lies – seeing bridges where before there were only islands. A recommended strategy is to rearrange the Post-It notes in various orders and structures: to explore how different arrangements can cause us to see the data in new ways. We derive our insights by *playing* with the data and *exploring* all of its possibilities in a spirit of *childlike enthusiasm*. We must think of our data like Lego blocks and the eventual insights as structures that we build out of said blocks. We won't be able to build the best structure unless we try multiple combinations.

[4.13] Decide | Direction

Iterate, Pivot, or Kill.

- Iterate:
    - Same Solution Focus and Customer Profile
    - Same Revenue Model and Pricing Model
- Pivot:
    - Same Solution Focus and Customer Profile
    - Different Revenue Model and/or Pricing Model
- Kill: Different Solution Focus and Customer Profile or stop altogether

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike