Planning Doesn't Have to Be the Enemy of Agile

by Alessandro Di Fiore

SEPTEMBER 13, 2018

JON FEINGERSH/GETTY IMAGES

Planning has long been one of the cornerstones of management. Early in the twentieth century

predictable. The future could be planned. It seemed sensible, therefore, for executives to identify their objectives. They could then focus on managing in such a way that these objectives were achieved.

This was the capitalist equivalent of the Communist system's five-year plans. In fact, one management theorist of the 1960s suggested that the best managed organizations in the world were the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, the Roman Catholic Church and the Communist Party. The belief was that if the future was mapped out, it would happen.

Later, MBO evolved into strategic planning. Corporations developed large corporate units dedicated to it. They were deliberately detached from the day-to-day realities of the business and emphasized formal procedures around numbers. Henry Mintzberg defined strategic planning as "a formalized system for codifying, elaborating and operationalizing the strategies which companies already have." The fundamental belief was still that the future could largely be predicted.

Now, strategic planning has fallen out of favor. In the face of relentless technological change, disruptive forces in industry after industry, global competition, and so on, planning seems like pointless wishful thinking.

And yet, planning is clearly essential for any company of any size. Look around your own organization. The fact that you have a place to work which is equipped for the job, and you and your colleagues are working on a particular project at a particular time and place, requires some sort of planning. The reality is that plans have to be made about the use of a company's resources all of the time. Some are short-term, others stretch into an imagined future.

Universally valuable, but desperately unfashionable, planning waits like a spinster in a Jane Austen novel for someone to recognize her worth.

The frustrations with current planning practices intersect with another fundamental managerial trend: organizational agility. Reorganizing around small self-managing teams — enhanced by agility methods like Scrum and LeSS — is emerging as the route to the organizational agility required to compete in the fast-changing business reality. One of the key principles underpinning team-based agility is that teams autonomously decide their priorities and where to allocate their own resources.

The logic of centralized long-term strategic planning (done once a year at a fixed time) is the antithesis of an organization redesigned around teams who define their own priorities and resources allocation on a weekly basis.

But if planning and agility are both necessary, organizations have to make them work. They have to create a Venn diagram with planning on one side, agility on the other, and a practical and workable sweet-spot in the middle. This is why the quest to rethink strategic planning has never been more urgent and critical. Planning twenty-first century style should be reconceived as *agile planning*.

Agile planning has a number of characteristics:

- frameworks and tools able to deal with a future that will be different;
- the ability to cope with more frequent and dynamic changes;
- the need for quality time to be invested for a true strategic conversation rather than simply being a numbers game;
- resources and funds are available in a flexible way for emerging opportunities.

The intersection of planning with organizational agility generates two other paramount requirements:

A process able to coordinate and align with agile teams

Agile organizations face the challenge of managing the local autonomy of squads (bottom-up input)

Consider the Dutch financial services firm ING Bank. It restructured its operations in the Netherlands by reorganizing 3,500 employees into agile squads. These are autonomous multidisciplinary teams (up to nine people per team) able to define their work and make business decisions quickly and flexibly. Squads are organized into a Tribe (of no more than 150 people), a collection of squads working on related areas.

ING Bank revisited its process and introduced routine meetings and formats to create alignment between and within tribes. Each tribe develops a QBR (Quarterly Business Review), a six-page document outlining tribe-level priorities, objectives and key results. This is then discussed in a large alignment meeting (labelled the QBR Marketplace) attended by tribe leads and other relevant leaders. At this meeting one fundamental question is addressed: when we add up everything, does this contribute to our company's strategic goals?

The alignment within a tribe happens at what is called a Portfolio Marketplace event: representatives of each of the squads which make up the tribe come together to agree on how the set goals are going to be achieved and to address opportunities for synergies.

The ING Bank example shows how the planning process is still necessary and essential to an agile company although in a different fashion with different processes, mechanisms and routines.

As more and more companies transform into agile organizations, agile planning will likely become the new normal replacing the traditional centralized planning approach.

A process that makes use of both limitless hard data and human judgment

Planners have traditionally been obsessed with gathering hard data on their industry, markets, competitors. Soft data — networks of contacts, talking with customers, suppliers and employees, using intuition and using the grapevine — have all but been ignored.

Soft data is also vital. "While hard data may inform the intellect, it is largely soft data that generate wisdom. They may be difficult to 'analyze', but they are indispensable for synthesis — the key to strategy making," says Henry Mintzberg.

Companies need first to imagine possibilities and second, pick the one for which the most compelling argument can be made. In deciding which is backed by the most compelling argument, they should indeed take into account all data that can be crunched. But in addition, they should use qualitative judgment.

In an agile organization, teams use design thinking and other exploratory techniques (plus data) to make rapid decisions and change the course on a weekly basis. Decision making is done by a team of people, offsetting in this way the potential biases of a single person making a decision based on her individual judgement. To some extent, an agile team-based organization enables the possibility to leverage qualitative data and judgement — combined today with infinite hard data — for better decisions.

Relying solely on hard data has unquestionably killed many potential great businesses. Take Nespresso, the coffee pod pioneer developed by Nestle. Nespresso took off when it stopped targeting offices and started marketing itself to households. There was little data on how households would respond to the concept and whatever information was available suggested a perceived consumer value of just 25 Swiss centimes versus a company-wide threshold requirement of 40 centimes. The Nespresso team had to interpret the data skillfully to present a better case to top management. Because it believed strongly in the idea, it forced the company to take a bigger-than-usual risk. If Nestle had been guided solely by quantitative market research the concept would never have gotten off the ground.

The traditional planning approach needs to be revisited to better serve the purposes of the agile enterprise of the twenty-first century. Agile planning is the future of planning. This new approach

Alessandro Di Fiore is the founder and CEO of the European Centre for Strategic Innovation (ECSI) and ECSI Consulting. He is based in Boston and Milan. He can be reached at adifiore@ecsi-consulting.com. Follow him on twitter @alexdifiore.

This article is about STRATEGIC PLANNING

⊕ Follow This Topic

Comments

Leave a Comment

Post Comment

7 COMMENTS

Bart Schlatmann   3 months ago

Strategic planning should be a continuous process in all companies; in agile way of working there is a so called Quarterly Business Review: every quarter priorities were defined/re-stated, based on market data (hard and soft) and progress. The Tribes use this as input for the prioritization and allocation of resources. Based on the outcomes of the QBR, the Tribe will define the quarterly priorities; the squads adjust the backlogs were needed. Each item will have a clear deliverable and deadline! It is a myth that within agile way of working there are no deadlines. Agile way of working will provide the most transparant organization (daily progress updates). The squads work together to deliver something to the clients with impact.

The Daily Alert

A daily newsletter with links to all the digital articles published in the last 24 hours.

Sign up now ›