Digital Podcast Show Notes

Episode 18 with guest Troy du Moulin

**Hosts: Barclay Rae, Ian Aitchison,**

**Guest:** Troy Du Moulin

BR: Welcome. Hello Ian. <idle chitchat>... what new fine fellow?

IA: Today’s trivia. Apparently a recent survey has proven that people report the best healthcare as coming from the hospital that gives them the most attention, not the best actual healing outcomes. That’s another example of perception and how we value service over actual delivery.

BR: Hello Troy!

TDM:Greetings. It’s been an interesting year in Canada. Looking forward to Summer.

BR: You are a Director of Pink Elephant, tell us about that.

TDM: At Pink Elephant our mission is to research, document, and promote best practices. I’ve done this for 24 years. We don’t only help with service management, also agile and devops, we get in the room where it happens, and translate these ideas into something practical. I’m a teacher by nature.

BR: Welcome!

**<mainbit>**

IA: Welcome back, you are from Pink Elephant so… the topic of ESM, when someone says **ESM, do you think it is a thing?**

TDM: Start with the definition. Do we mean enterprise IT software, we the brand? we take the brand and organise a service orchestration and one flow of beauty and solution value. That requires a significant quantity of org capability and a drop of the ‘us and them’ mindset.

One book I teach is High velocity IT. It talks about 3 levels: Transformation level1 ‘We the people of IT, a department are going to work agile’. Model 2 ‘we the people of enterprise IT with an enterprise value chain are going to work together. Model 3 ‘ we the people of the brand’. I teach this and most orgs are not even at level 2. The premise of ESM as We The Brand is beyond most organisations

IA: So level1, level2 are making IT stronger, and **level3 goes horizontal?**

TDM: There’s always a silo. The question is ‘How Wide is Your Sense of Us?’ We talk about relationships as transactional cooperative and collaborative.

Collaborative : We value shared truth over individual rights and freedoms. Us can be Me, our our Team. Where there is an Us there is a will and a desire to share. The problem comes when Us is too narrow.

IA: You need a wide us! <obvious a joke about a wide ass>

The big difference then is that what we call as ESM is horizontal, flowing across. They all become us. **But do you think it is impossible to get to level3 without being successful at level2?**

TDM: leadership creates systems thinking and constancy of purpose. If our leaders are talking in a sense of us then we can jump to the brand-us. Do your leaders create a sense of system thinking of us as the brand, or do they have a sense of tribalism?

BR: Interesting. **Can you define an organisation or a brand from the outside?** We’ve had 30 to 40 years of selling to IT and technology. Do we now look to sell across the whole organisation. Who do you market to, who do you sell to? Vendors that have tried this have struggled because they can only sell to the IT organisation. They don’t know where to go.

TDM: Conways Law : structure dictates architecture. If we are structured in silos then that is the architecture to how we approach life, and how we procure. As organisations evolve so do structures, and you might see buying tools for ‘we the IT people’ but that is just a stepping stone to enterprise shared services where we the people of enterprise brand have things and capabilities. If now my tool acquisition goes to brand level and can blend commonality and diversity. That's federated governance. I would need structure and function that operates and dictates at an enterprise level to buy tools at an enterprise level.

I spoke to a vendor about their ESM strategy, but did you sell that same tool to one group or to multiple groups? Sometimes you see orgs buy the same tools multiple times.

BR: I've seen multiple vendors come in and they are all showing the same client list because they have sold to multiple parts of the same organisations. You need to be able to sell to a target that understands.

IA: Challenges that a bit… multiple tools are not the fault of the vendors, often it is also acquisitions and they are often trying to fix it. I’ve been in meetings where there are reps from multiple business functions. In the same way the employees are involved in IT tech acquisitions.

TDM: Yes. ESM isn’t selling the same product separately 3 times to 3 departments, it is about selling one product that is used by 3 departments.

IA: **Is this only coming from IT and IT vendors**? Do other depts have this coming out from them?

TDM: There are more people in IT that get the sense of us than elsewhere. You don’t see that from finance and HR.

IA: Back to the wide us… in some places, if you need to get something done, you need a small team. **How does that fit?**

TDM: Throughout history, sometimes you do need a tiger team - multifunctional - against specific outcomes. How can you get this project sense of team around an outcome or a product? We did that with ERP, or SAP or Oracle teams where embedding mini-IT closest to the business function where it is going to be used. We’re all one family. We’ll bear the brunt of variability. It’s worth it. The strategic value of speed is more important than cost.

IA: You see that with outcome focussed Product Teams

TDM: you see that with DevOps teams. It all came from Toyota. In the 1980s there was a ‘new product development team’ which was about cross functional teams int outcome based teams. What we talk about in product management has its genesis in the 80s in the Lean movement.

BR: you saw that in the 90s with subsets of large orgs, like First Direct or Direct Line. Created to get something up and running quickly and it takes too long in the existing organisation. They have been very successful.

TDM: Gartner talk about ModeA and ModeB

IA: Spinning off a team… Mark Temple talked about their ESM model and he talked about the idea of a showcase department that can demonstrate to the business why and how this works. Others say they want to be like that. Is that the same thing?

BR: The concept of pure org-wide, tier3 is unobtainable at the moment. The Glasgow Uni model was a good one. Do you have stories of where this has worked?

TDM: First, ESM is not across ‘everything’. Just a focus into selected areas that need consistency. Universities often have a shared services, shared approach model. Can be held together by just 2 or 3 core outcomes.

BR: Universities are really interesting…

TDM: The Oil Industry is also really diverse.

BR: What do you think, from the future health of an organisation, is it a good direction to head to try to work in more integrated collaborative ways? Is that our business?

TDM: There is value in variability and there is value in consistency. It depends on the context. There is a concept of two ways of looking at a decision over consistent or independent. Is it Core to Mission or is it Differentiating (Secret Sauce). When we have a capability that is both, that is where you promote variability with a focus on speed to market. But you don’t get a long time, over time it loses differentiation and is only core to the mission. When it becomes a system of parity you have to be as good as your competitor. Being better than your competitor becomes a form of waste. If you have a system of parity you only need one. If I have differentiation, dedicate a team to it.

IA: this is bimodal IT again, right? Move fast with a spin-out.

TDM: only for a short time. What was initially spun-off, you may now want to bring into a system of parity.

BR: <his head is spinning a bit>... what do you think the future holds? How many organizations can consider all this in their decision making?

TDM : The human being responds to a crisis by rallying the troops as a shared brand, or the other approach is to revert back to taking care of my own. The first requires a Churchill leader type. If we don’t have that, we double down on our sense of isolation. I think we;re seeing that happen at the moment (with pandemic and vaccines). Altruism is on the back burner right now.

BR: I see many organisations looking at this though.

IA: And in summary… in the past we;ve talked about needing good broad total leadership. Today we’ve also said there is time for innovation teams to do things, go be creative.

We might know the outcome but we don't know how to get there. Just need some creative leadership.

TDM : and you need agreement and standards. Leadership and governance. It’s not a lack of tools or knowledge. All that is left is organisational will, culture and leadership.

**Endbit**

Troy’s recommended drink.

**Nut brown ale.** A craft beer. A pint... and a pie.

**Key Lessons from Troy du Moulin**

1 - You need a Wide Sense of Us

2 - Conways Law : structure dictates architecture

3 - ModeA and ModeB

4 - It’s not a lack of tools or knowledge. All that is left is organisational will, culture and leadership.

**Useful Links**

Troy on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/troydumoulin>

Troy on linked in: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/troy-dumoulin-148235>

Pink Elephant: <https://www.pinkelephant.com/en-US>