

RUDYCT ACADEMIC SERIES 2026

Smart Tech, Smarter Business

Navigating the Next Wave

of Digital Transformation

AI • DATA • CLOUD-EDGE • PLATFORMS • RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION

Prof. Ir. Rudy C. Tarumingkeng, PhD

Bogor, Indonesia | 29 July 2026

www.rudymt.com/cv.pdf

RUDYCT ACADEMIC SERIES 2026

SMART TECH, SMARTER BUSINESS

NAVIGATING THE NEXT WAVE OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION

AI • DATA • CLOUD-EDGE • IoT • PLATFORMS

Strategy • Innovation • Resilience • Responsible Growth



AI



DATA



CLOUD-EDGE



IoT



PLATFORMS

By _____

Prof. Ir. Rudy C. Tarumingkeng, PhD



www.rudycr.com/cv.pdf



Abstract

Digital transformation is entering a new wave defined by the convergence of generative and agentic artificial intelligence, cloud-edge computing, connected assets, digital twins, advanced analytics, platforms, and programmable business processes. This article argues that “smart technology” becomes “smarter business” only when firms connect technological possibility to strategic purpose, organizational capability, responsible governance, and measurable stakeholder value. It distinguishes digitization, digitalization, and transformation; explains the economic and architectural logic of digital systems; and examines how firms can redesign customer journeys, operations, products, ecosystems, decision rights, and business models. Particular attention is given to data foundations, human-AI collaboration, cybersecurity, privacy, interoperability, sustainability, talent, legacy modernization, and the challenges of small firms and developing economies. Drawing on research in information systems, strategy, innovation, organizational design, economics, and responsible AI, the article develops an integrated framework and a staged implementation roadmap. Its central conclusion is that the next wave will not be won by technology accumulation. It will be navigated by organizations that learn faster, build trustworthy digital foundations, preserve human accountability, and repeatedly convert experiments into scalable capabilities and durable value.

Keywords: digital transformation; smart technology; artificial intelligence; data strategy; platform ecosystem; dynamic capabilities; business model innovation; cybersecurity; human-AI collaboration; responsible innovation

Executive Summary

The phrase smart technology is attractive because it suggests that intelligence resides inside devices, models, applications, and networks. Business intelligence, however, is not a property that can be purchased in the same manner. A business becomes smarter when it reliably notices change, interprets evidence, decides at the appropriate level, coordinates action, learns from consequences, and renews its capabilities. Technology can accelerate every part of this cycle, but it can also accelerate error, fragmentation, surveillance, and dependency. The managerial task is to design the whole cycle.

The next wave is shaped by convergence. Generative and agentic AI interact with cloud and edge infrastructure, connected assets, digital twins, platforms, software-defined products, and expanding data flows. These combinations reduce economic frictions and create new possibilities for personalization, prediction, automation, and ecosystem coordination. They also create new concentrations of risk. As more actions become programmable, identity, authorization, observability, recovery, and accountability become central business capabilities rather than technical details.

This article proposes a decision-centered approach. Begin with a valuable journey or decision. Make the operating hypothesis explicit. Build the minimum trusted foundation. Experiment end to end. Evaluate adoption, behavior, outcomes, economics, experience, and risk together. Scale through persistent products and reusable platforms only after evidence supports the design. Renew the portfolio as technology, markets, regulation, and social expectations change. This approach treats transformation as an institutional learning system rather than a finite program.

1. Introduction: From More Technology to Smarter Business

The next wave of digital transformation is a strategic and organizational transition rather than a shopping list of technologies. The proposition matters because firms can accumulate cloud contracts, AI pilots, dashboards, and connected devices while customer value and operating performance remain fragmented. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that technology investment must be anchored in a coherent theory of value creation and capability renewal. Organizations can apply it when they begin with a consequential customer or operational journey and trace how information, decisions, incentives, and accountability must change. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that

would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Reviews of digital transformation show that technology creates disruption, but strategic responses, structural change, organizational barriers, and value outcomes determine the trajectory (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that visible innovation activity can conceal weak adoption, duplicated infrastructure, and unresolved ownership. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that visible innovation activity can conceal weak adoption, duplicated infrastructure, and unresolved ownership. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

2. Clarifying Digitization, Digitalization, and Digital Transformation

Consider the claim that digitization converts information, digitalization improves processes with digital means, and transformation alters the logic of value creation and organizational identity. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction

should change?” Because the three terms are frequently used interchangeably, producing inflated claims and mismatched governance, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: the declared ambition should match the depth of change in processes, structures, capabilities, and business models. Leaders should classify every initiative by its intended level of change and evaluate it against the corresponding outcomes. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Digital business strategy research argues that digital resources collapse the separation between business and IT strategy and change the scope, scale, speed, and sources of value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that a digitization project may be branded as transformation even when no decision right, customer proposition, or operating model changes. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns

adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that a digitization project may be branded as transformation even when no decision right, customer proposition, or operating model changes. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

3. The Next Wave: Convergence and Composability

New value arises from combinations of AI, data, cloud, edge, IoT, APIs, digital twins, robotics, and cybersecurity rather than from isolated tools. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, separate technology programs create incompatible data, duplicated controls, and brittle handoffs. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that firms need modular foundations that allow capabilities to be recombined safely as opportunities evolve. A concrete starting action is to design reusable services, governed data products, shared identity, observable interfaces, and explicit architectural boundaries. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Dynamic-capability research emphasizes sensing, seizing, and transforming as an ongoing process of strategic renewal rather than a one-time program (Teece, 2007; Warner & Wäger, 2019). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The

organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that composability without standards can multiply complexity faster than it creates agility. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that composability without standards can multiply complexity faster than it creates agility. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

4. The Economics of Digital Advantage

Digital technologies reduce costs of search, replication, transportation, tracking, verification, and coordination while increasing the strategic importance of complements. The proposition matters because managers often apply industrial assumptions to assets with near-zero replication cost and network effects. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that strategy should account for scale, scope, learning, switching costs, multi-homing, and the distribution of value among participants. Organizations can apply it when they map which economic friction the initiative

removes and which new dependency or externality it creates. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Digital innovation scholarship highlights reprogrammability, generativity, layered modular architecture, and distributed innovation agency (Yoo et al., 2010; Nambisan et al., 2017). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that growth can destroy value when acquisition is subsidized without a credible path to retention, trust, and monetization. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that growth can destroy value when acquisition is subsidized without a credible path to retention, trust, and monetization. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

5. Digital Business Strategy as Business Strategy

Consider the claim that digital resources blur traditional boundaries between functional IT strategy and competitive strategy. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because a digital plan can remain subordinate to business units even though platforms, data, and customer journeys span the enterprise, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: business and technology choices must be formulated as one portfolio of strategic commitments. Leaders should link market positioning, capability priorities, architecture, data, talent, and investment governance in the same strategic dialogue. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Platform and ecosystem research shows that value depends on complementarity, rules, bottlenecks, and the configuration of interdependent participants (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that alignment language may preserve silos when technology is treated as a supplier rather than a co-author of strategy. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence,

controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that alignment language may preserve silos when technology is treated as a supplier rather than a co-author of strategy. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

6. Customer Experience and the Intelligent Journey

Smart businesses integrate channels, context, prediction, service recovery, and human assistance around customer purpose. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, channel digitization can shift effort to customers and fragment the history of an interaction. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that customer experience should be designed end to end across organizational and technological boundaries. A concrete starting action is to identify moments of truth, information discontinuities, avoidable effort, vulnerability, and the conditions requiring human escalation. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Research on human-AI systems cautions that benefits depend on task allocation, calibrated trust, work design, and the ability to detect and correct machine error

(Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that personalization can become intrusive, discriminatory, or manipulative when relevance is pursued without consent and restraint. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that personalization can become intrusive, discriminatory, or manipulative when relevance is pursued without consent and restraint. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

7. Intelligent Operations and Decision-Centered Design

Operational intelligence joins sensing, analysis, decision, action, feedback, and learning. The proposition matters because dashboards often describe performance without changing the decisions that produce it. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is

the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that automation should be designed around explicit decisions, latency requirements, uncertainty, authority, and consequences. Organizations can apply it when they define who or what recommends, decides, executes, monitors, overrides, and learns for each high-value decision. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Reviews of digital transformation show that technology creates disruption, but strategic responses, structural change, organizational barriers, and value outcomes determine the trajectory (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that optimization of one step can displace cost, risk, and workload into another part of the system. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that optimization of one step

can displace cost, risk, and workload into another part of the system. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

8. Data as a Product and a Governed Asset

Consider the claim that reliable transformation depends on data that are discoverable, interpretable, timely, secure, and owned. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because central warehouses do not by themselves resolve ambiguous definitions, weak lineage, or missing accountability, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: data should be managed as products with users, service expectations, quality measures, documentation, and lifecycle ownership. Leaders should prioritize a small number of value-linked data domains and establish common semantics before scaling use cases. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Digital business strategy research argues that digital resources collapse the separation between business and IT strategy and change the scope, scale, speed, and sources of value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that data abundance can intensify confusion when incompatible metrics compete for authority. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that data abundance can intensify confusion when incompatible metrics compete for authority. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

9. Cloud, Edge, and the Modern Digital Core

Cloud and edge architectures redistribute computation, storage, control, and resilience across locations. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, migration programs can reproduce legacy complexity in a more expensive environment. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that the digital core should support elasticity, observability, security, portability, and rapid but governed change. A concrete starting action is to choose placement according to latency, sovereignty, safety, cost, connectivity, and operational continuity. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed.

Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Dynamic-capability research emphasizes sensing, seizing, and transforming as an ongoing process of strategic renewal rather than a one-time program (Teece, 2007; Warner & Wäger, 2019). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that cloud-first can become an ideology when workload economics and exit options are not examined. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that cloud-first can become an ideology when workload economics and exit options are not examined. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

10. Connected Assets, IoT, and Digital Twins

Connected products turn physical events into observable, analyzable, and increasingly actionable digital signals. The proposition matters because sensor deployment is often mistaken for operational insight and business value. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization,

and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that IoT and digital twins require a closed learning loop from trustworthy signals to decisions and verified outcomes. Organizations can apply it when they start with a costly uncertainty such as failure, quality drift, energy use, or service interruption. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Digital innovation scholarship highlights reprogrammability, generativity, layered modular architecture, and distributed innovation agency (Yoo et al., 2010; Nambisan et al., 2017). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that connectivity expands the attack surface and creates lifecycle obligations that outlast the initial project. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding

period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that connectivity expands the attack surface and creates lifecycle obligations that outlast the initial project. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

11. Generative and Agentic AI

Consider the claim that generative AI lowers the cost of producing and interpreting language, code, images, and structured knowledge, while agentic systems extend this capacity into action sequences. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because fluent output and autonomous execution can outrun validation, authorization, and institutional learning, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: AI deployment must match autonomy to evidence, stakes, reversibility, and control maturity. Leaders should separate low-risk assistance from consequential decision support and autonomous action through clear control tiers. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Platform and ecosystem research shows that value depends on complementarity, rules, bottlenecks, and the configuration of interdependent participants (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected

components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that an impressive demonstration can conceal hallucination, data leakage, brittle reasoning, and unclear accountability. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that an impressive demonstration can conceal hallucination, data leakage, brittle reasoning, and unclear accountability. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

12. Automation, Augmentation, and Human Judgment

The same technology may substitute for tasks, augment expertise, or reorganize collaboration. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, automation can erode the knowledge required to detect rare failure and supervise the system. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that task allocation should preserve human agency, learning, and meaningful control where consequences matter. A concrete starting action is to design handoffs, uncertainty displays, override rights, exception practice, and recovery procedures. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room

for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Research on human–AI systems cautions that benefits depend on task allocation, calibrated trust, work design, and the ability to detect and correct machine error (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that human-in-the-loop language can mask ceremonial approval under impossible workload. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that human-in-the-loop language can mask ceremonial approval under impossible workload. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

13. Platforms, Ecosystems, and Complementarity

Platform value depends on interactions among producers, users, complementors, rules, interfaces, and governance. The proposition matters because firms may imitate

a platform model without possessing a viable interaction, participant incentives, or ecosystem position. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that ecosystem strategy must specify complementarity, bottlenecks, roles, standards, and value capture. Organizations can apply it when they map the minimum viable ecosystem and the dependencies that no single firm controls. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Reviews of digital transformation show that technology creates disruption, but strategic responses, structural change, organizational barriers, and value outcomes determine the trajectory (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that network effects do not guarantee defensibility and may amplify harmful conduct or concentration. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that network effects do not guarantee defensibility and may amplify harmful conduct or concentration. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

14. Digital Business Model Innovation

Consider the claim that transformation changes how value is proposed, created, delivered, measured, and captured. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because new digital services are often added without resolving cannibalization, pricing, ownership, or sales incentives, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: business model experimentation should address the whole activity system rather than the front-end proposition alone. Leaders should test willingness to pay, unit economics, adoption barriers, complement needs, and operating implications together. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Digital business strategy research argues that digital resources collapse the separation between business and IT strategy and change the scope, scale, speed, and sources of value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces

confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that subscription and servitization models can transfer risk to the provider without building the capabilities to manage it. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that subscription and servitization models can transfer risk to the provider without building the capabilities to manage it. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

15. Digital Innovation and the Product Operating Model

Digital products remain unfinished and evolve through continuous discovery, delivery, measurement, and learning. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, project funding and temporary teams break continuity between creation and operation. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that persistent cross-functional product teams should own outcomes and lifecycle decisions. A concrete starting action is to give teams a stable mission, bounded autonomy, user access, engineering capability, and

measurable product outcomes. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Dynamic-capability research emphasizes sensing, seizing, and transforming as an ongoing process of strategic renewal rather than a one-time program (Teece, 2007; Warner & Wäger, 2019). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that product language can become cosmetic when budgeting, architecture, and performance management remain project-based. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that product language can become cosmetic when budgeting, architecture, and performance management remain project-based. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

16. Supply Chains, Resilience, and Control Towers

Digital supply chains combine visibility, prediction, simulation, collaboration, and response. The proposition matters because a control tower may centralize data without improving the authority or coordination needed during disruption. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that resilience requires optionality, shared situational awareness, trusted partner data, and rehearsed decision protocols. Organizations can apply it when they model critical dependencies, lead-time uncertainty, substitution options, and escalation thresholds. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Digital innovation scholarship highlights reprogrammability, generativity, layered modular architecture, and distributed innovation agency (Yoo et al., 2010; Nambisan et al., 2017). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that optimization for steady-state efficiency can remove the buffers and relationships needed under stress. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level

improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that optimization for steady-state efficiency can remove the buffers and relationships needed under stress. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

17. Cybersecurity as a Business Design Principle

Consider the claim that digital growth increases identities, interfaces, software dependencies, connected assets, and concentrations of critical data. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because security is often added after architecture and customer promises are already fixed, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: cybersecurity must be integrated into product, process, supplier, and investment decisions from the beginning. Leaders should use threat modeling, least privilege, secure development, segmentation, resilience testing, and incident learning. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Platform and ecosystem research shows that value depends on complementarity, rules, bottlenecks, and the configuration of interdependent participants (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating

discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that compliance can create false assurance when organizations cannot detect, contain, and recover from real attacks. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that compliance can create false assurance when organizations cannot detect, contain, and recover from real attacks. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

18. Privacy, Data Rights, and Digital Trust

Trustworthy data use depends on legitimacy, proportionality, transparency, security, and meaningful choice. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, legal permission can be treated as sufficient even when stakeholders do not reasonably expect the use. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that privacy should shape data minimization, purpose limitation, retention, access, sharing, and redress. A concrete starting action is to translate abstract principles into controls at collection, modeling, decision, and deletion points. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Research on human-AI systems cautions that benefits depend on task allocation, calibrated trust, work design, and the ability to detect and correct machine error (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that personalization benefits can be purchased at the cost of surveillance, exclusion, and weakened confidence. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that personalization benefits can be purchased at the cost of surveillance, exclusion, and weakened confidence. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

19. Responsible AI and Algorithmic Accountability

AI systems embed assumptions about objectives, evidence, acceptable error, and affected interests. The proposition matters because principles remain symbolic when they are not connected to procurement, deployment, monitoring, and incident authority. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that responsible AI requires risk-tiered governance, validation, documentation, human accountability, contestability, and ongoing monitoring. Organizations can apply it when they create enforceable review gates for high-impact uses and independent channels for raising concerns. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Reviews of digital transformation show that technology creates disruption, but strategic responses, structural change, organizational barriers, and value outcomes determine the trajectory (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that average accuracy can hide concentrated harm and model drift can invalidate an earlier approval. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect

technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that average accuracy can hide concentrated harm and model drift can invalidate an earlier approval. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

20. Organization Design for Digital Flow

Consider the claim that transformation performance depends on how work crosses functions, products, platforms, data domains, and risk boundaries. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because hierarchical handoffs and annual planning can make learning slower than technological change, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: organizations need stable value streams, enabling platforms, clear decision rights, and lightweight coordination. Leaders should reduce handoffs around priority journeys and assign end-to-end outcome ownership. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Digital business strategy research argues that digital resources collapse the separation between business and IT strategy and change the scope, scale, speed, and sources of value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Complementarity is central.

Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that decentralization without common standards creates local speed and enterprise fragmentation. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that decentralization without common standards creates local speed and enterprise fragmentation. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

21. Leadership, Culture, and Dynamic Capabilities

Leaders must sense change, seize opportunities, and reconfigure assets while maintaining operational credibility. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, culture is frequently invoked as the reason for failure without examining leadership behavior, incentives, and structural constraints. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that digital culture emerges from repeated decisions about experimentation, evidence, collaboration, risk, and learning. A concrete starting action is to make strategic hypotheses explicit, fund experiments, stop weak initiatives, and reward the sharing of inconvenient evidence. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Dynamic-capability research emphasizes sensing, seizing, and transforming as an ongoing process of strategic renewal rather than a one-time program (Teece, 2007; Warner & Wäger, 2019). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that urgency can become permanent acceleration that exhausts attention and reduces reflection. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that urgency can become permanent acceleration that exhausts attention and reduces reflection. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

22. Talent, Skills, and the Learning Organization

The next wave combines technical fluency with domain expertise, product thinking, collaboration, ethics, and learning agility. The proposition matters because training catalogs can grow while work design and career paths prevent transfer. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that capability building should be embedded in missions, communities, coaching, and real mobility. Organizations can apply it when they create role-based learning journeys tied to live transformation outcomes and protected practice time. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Digital innovation scholarship highlights reprogrammability, generativity, layered modular architecture, and distributed innovation agency (Yoo et al., 2010; Nambisan et al., 2017). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that reskilling rhetoric can shift transition risk onto employees without providing opportunity or demand. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business

outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that reskilling rhetoric can shift transition risk onto employees without providing opportunity or demand. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

23. Legacy Modernization and Technical Debt

Consider the claim that legacy systems embody valuable business knowledge as well as accumulated constraints. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because big-bang replacement underestimates dependencies, while indefinite patching compounds fragility, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: modernization should be sequenced around value streams, risk, architectural boundaries, and knowledge transfer. Leaders should use strangler patterns, interface stabilization, automated testing, and explicit retirement criteria. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Platform and ecosystem research shows that value depends on complementarity, rules, bottlenecks, and the configuration of interdependent participants (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating

discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that new platforms can become tomorrow's legacy when ownership and lifecycle funding are absent. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that new platforms can become tomorrow's legacy when ownership and lifecycle funding are absent. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

24. Enterprise Architecture, APIs, and Interoperability

Architecture provides the constraints that make distributed innovation coherent. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, governance may become either a blocking committee or a permissive documentation ritual. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that good architecture defines a small set of enforceable principles, reusable services, and evolutionary boundaries. A concrete starting action is to treat APIs as products, manage dependencies, and measure reuse, change lead time, reliability, and deprecation. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Research on human-AI systems cautions that benefits depend on task allocation, calibrated trust, work design, and the ability to detect and correct machine error (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that integration speed gained through point-to-point connections creates long-term coupling and hidden operational risk. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that integration speed gained through point-to-point connections creates long-term coupling and hidden operational risk. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

25. Value Realization, Finance, and Digital Metrics

Transformation value appears through revenue, productivity, risk reduction, learning, option creation, and stakeholder experience. The proposition matters because business cases demand precise long-term returns from uncertain initiatives while tolerating vague benefits after approval. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that funding should combine portfolio discipline with staged evidence and explicit strategic options. Organizations can apply it when they track adoption, behavior change, operational outcomes, unit economics, risk, and capability creation as one causal chain. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Reviews of digital transformation show that technology creates disruption, but strategic responses, structural change, organizational barriers, and value outcomes determine the trajectory (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that vanity metrics and cost-only targets can reward activity while undermining long-term value. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load,

customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that vanity metrics and cost-only targets can reward activity while undermining long-term value. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

26. Sustainability and Green Digital Transformation

Consider the claim that digital technology can improve energy, material, logistics, and asset decisions while consuming energy and accelerating device turnover. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because sustainability claims often count enabled savings but omit computing, infrastructure, rebound, and supply-chain effects, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: digital and sustainability strategies should share system boundaries, baselines, and lifecycle accountability. Leaders should measure direct footprint, enabled impact, rebound effects, and distributional consequences. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Digital business strategy research argues that digital resources collapse the separation between business and IT strategy and change the scope, scale, speed,

and sources of value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that efficiency can increase total consumption when lower cost stimulates greater use. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that efficiency can increase total consumption when lower cost stimulates greater use. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

27. SMEs, Developing Economies, and the Indonesian Context

Digital transformation occurs under uneven connectivity, capital, skills, institutional capacity, and market power. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, frameworks built for large firms can overwhelm smaller organizations and ignore informal coordination. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that small firms should pursue modular adoption around cash flow, customer access, productivity, resilience, and compliance. A concrete starting action is to use shared infrastructure, industry platforms, universities, government support, and trusted intermediaries to lower fixed costs. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Dynamic-capability research emphasizes sensing, seizing, and transforming as an ongoing process of strategic renewal rather than a one-time program (Teece, 2007; Warner & Wäger, 2019). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that dependency on global platforms can widen capability gaps and move value capture outside the local economy. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that dependency on global platforms can widen capability gaps and move value capture outside the local economy. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

28. Sector Narratives and Boundary Conditions

The meaning of smart technology changes across manufacturing, health care, banking, education, agriculture, retail, and public service. The proposition matters because generic best practices conceal differences in safety, regulation, asset life, professional judgment, and user vulnerability. The practical error is to treat a technological artifact as if it carried its own strategy, organization, and legitimacy. Technology changes what can be observed, predicted, copied, coordinated, and automated, but those possibilities become performance only through complementary investments and choices. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore not the tool. It is the business system in which customers, employees, partners, data, models, processes, incentives, and controls interact.

The governing principle is that transformation patterns should be adapted to sector-specific value, risk, and institutional conditions. Organizations can apply it when they use scenario analysis to reveal stakeholders, failure modes, decision rights, and recovery requirements. This changes transformation from a sequence of installations into a sequence of validated capability claims. A claim should specify the stakeholder problem, the mechanism through which technology changes an important decision or behavior, the complementary changes required, the evidence that would support investment, and the evidence that would trigger redesign or termination. Such discipline protects innovation without pretending that uncertainty can be eliminated.

Digital innovation scholarship highlights reprogrammability, generativity, layered modular architecture, and distributed innovation agency (Yoo et al., 2010; Nambisan et al., 2017). These findings imply that transformation is path dependent. Existing architecture, data definitions, power relationships, skills, contracts, and customer expectations shape which options are feasible and how quickly they can be exercised. Managers should therefore resist universal maturity models that imply one ideal destination. A useful framework identifies the next constraint and the next valuable capability while preserving optionality for later stages.

The principal warning is that success stories become misleading when transferred without their enabling conditions. This risk can be monitored through leading indicators: adoption by relevant users, exception frequency, workarounds, decision latency, data-quality failures, service recovery, security incidents, employee load, customer effort, and concentration of dependency. Measurement should connect technical health to human behavior and business outcomes. When one level improves

and another deteriorates, the organization should investigate the mechanism rather than average the contradiction away.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that success stories become misleading when transferred without their enabling conditions. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

29. A Roadmap for the Next Wave

Consider the claim that navigation requires repeated cycles of framing, foundation building, experimentation, scaling, governance, and renewal. It reframes the executive question from “Which technology should we adopt?” to “Which capability, relationship, or economic friction should change?” Because enterprise roadmaps become technology timelines disconnected from adoption and operating change, technology portfolios can grow faster than organizational understanding. A smart business makes the causal logic explicit: a particular digital capability changes access to information or action; this changes a decision, experience, or process; and that change creates value under specified conditions.

A sound design follows this principle: the roadmap should sequence business outcomes, capabilities, architectural dependencies, workforce transition, and controls. Leaders should establish a transformation portfolio with named outcome owners and evidence-based funding gates. The work must include both front-stage and back-stage change. A seamless customer interface, for example, may require common identity, integrated data, redesigned authority, new service metrics, supplier agreements, and incident procedures. Omitting these complements does not remove their cost; it moves the cost into delay, manual reconciliation, employee frustration, and customer failure.

Platform and ecosystem research shows that value depends on complementarity, rules, bottlenecks, and the configuration of interdependent participants (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018). Complementarity is central. Cloud without operating

discipline can increase cost; analytics without decision rights produces dashboards; AI without reliable knowledge and evaluation produces confident noise; platforms without governance attract neither durable participation nor trust. The transformation portfolio should therefore fund coherent capability slices rather than disconnected components. Each slice should be usable, secure, observable, supportable, and connected to a meaningful outcome.

The failure mode is that scaling before product–process fit institutionalizes waste and risk. Prevention requires more than executive sponsorship. It requires ownership close to the work, transparent trade-offs, technical and social feedback, and a route for people to challenge assumptions. Transformation should become safer as it scales because evidence, controls, and operating knowledge improve. If uncertainty and fragility scale at the same rate as use, growth is multiplying exposure rather than capability.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that scaling before product–process fit institutionalizes waste and risk. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

30. Conclusion: Learning Faster Than the Environment Changes

Smart business is the institutional capacity to convert technological change into trustworthy and repeatable value. From the customer's perspective, the issue appears as relevance, effort, reliability, transparency, and recourse. From the employee's perspective, it appears as tools, workload, autonomy, learning, and accountability. From the firm's perspective, technological optimism and defensive caution both fail when they substitute for disciplined learning. These views should be examined together, because a cost saving may be a transfer of effort, and a personalized service may be financed by surveillance or dependence. Smarter business does not maximize one perspective; it creates a viable relationship among them.

The strategic commitment is that firms need a renewable system of strategy, architecture, data, talent, governance, experimentation, and accountability. A concrete starting action is to treat every major digital investment as a hypothesis about customers, operations, capabilities, and social consequences. The resulting initiative should be represented as an operating hypothesis with a baseline and a bounded experiment. This makes room for discovery while preserving discipline. Evidence should include quantitative outcomes and qualitative accounts of how work and experience changed. Narratives reveal mechanisms that aggregate metrics cannot, while metrics test whether a compelling story is typical.

Research on human–AI systems cautions that benefits depend on task allocation, calibrated trust, work design, and the ability to detect and correct machine error (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The literature also suggests that digital advantage is renewable rather than permanent. Technologies diffuse, competitors imitate features, and platforms alter access to markets. Durable advantage increasingly comes from learning loops, proprietary or privileged complements, trust, ecosystem position, and the ability to reconfigure faster than rivals without losing reliability. The organization must build the capacity to repeatedly transform, not merely complete a transformation program.

A countervailing danger is that the next wave will punish organizations that confuse access to technology with the ability to transform. The appropriate response is institutional humility: act at a scale proportionate to evidence, expose assumptions, include affected expertise, and create reversible steps where possible. Consequential decisions require clear human accountability even when machine recommendations are involved. Innovation becomes responsible when the organization can explain what it is trying to achieve, who may be affected, how performance is known, and how harm will be corrected.

A board-level test is to ask for the complete chain from investment to consequence. What specific behavior or decision will change? Which data and technical services must be reliable? Which teams and partners must act differently? Who owns adoption, control, and recovery? What evidence will arrive within the next funding period? The proposal should also confront the possibility that the next wave will punish organizations that confuse access to technology with the ability to transform. Requiring this chain does not eliminate experimentation. It makes experimentation strategically legible and prevents technical delivery from being accepted as a proxy for business transformation.

Appendix A. Twenty Capabilities for Smarter Business

The profiles below are an operating vocabulary, not a maturity ranking. Each capability should be interpreted in relation to strategy, sector, scale, and risk. Development should combine knowledge, realistic practice, feedback, work redesign, and evidence of application.

A.1 Strategic sensing

Purpose: Strategic sensing is the capacity for detecting changes in technology, customer behavior, regulation, competitors, and ecosystem structure. It is visible when a team uses weak signals and field evidence to frame testable opportunities. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Technology scouting becomes trend collection. A practical response is to link sensing to a decision calendar and small discovery investments. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.2 Opportunity framing

Purpose: Opportunity framing is the capacity for translating a technological possibility into a stakeholder problem and value hypothesis. It is visible when a team states the user, friction, mechanism, complement, and outcome. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Solution enthusiasm displaces problem understanding. A practical response is to require evidence from real journeys before architecture commitment. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.3 Digital economics

Purpose: Digital economics is the capacity for reasoning about replication, network effects, switching, data, complements, and marginal cost. It is visible when a team tests unit economics and value distribution. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Scale is pursued without sustainable capture. A practical response is to model participant incentives and boundary conditions. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.4 Product management

Purpose: Product management is the capacity for owning a persistent mission and outcomes across discovery, delivery, and operation. It is visible when a team balances user value, viability, feasibility, and risk. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Project completion is confused with product success. A practical response is to fund stable teams and outcome reviews. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.5 Experience design

Purpose: Experience design is the capacity for understanding journeys, context, accessibility, emotion, and service recovery. It is visible when a team reduces effort without hiding choices or recourse. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Digitization transfers burden to users. A practical response is to observe actual use and design human escalation. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.6 Data product management

Purpose: Data product management is the capacity for treating data as a supported product for identifiable users. It is visible when a team defines semantics, quality, lineage, service, and lifecycle. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Storage substitutes for ownership. A practical response is to assign domain owners and service expectations. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.7 Data literacy

Purpose: Data literacy is the capacity for interpreting data quality, uncertainty, provenance, and limits. It is visible when a team asks how a measure was produced and what it omits. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Dashboards create false precision. A practical response is to practice decisions with ambiguous and conflicting evidence. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.8 AI evaluation

Purpose: AI evaluation is the capacity for testing usefulness, robustness, fairness, security, and failure modes. It is visible when a team uses task-specific benchmarks and human review. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Fluency is mistaken for correctness. A practical response is to build evaluation sets from real and adversarial cases. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.9 Human–AI task design

Purpose: Human–AI task design is the capacity for allocating work according to comparative strengths and consequences. It is visible when a team specifies handoffs, uncertainty, override, and recovery. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: People retain responsibility without control. A practical response is to simulate disagreement and system failure. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.10 Cloud financial management

Purpose: Cloud financial management is the capacity for connecting architecture and consumption to value and accountability. It is visible when a team makes cost drivers visible to product teams. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Elastic resources create elastic waste. A practical response is to use budgets, unit costs, and architectural guardrails. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.11 Platform engineering

Purpose: Platform engineering is the capacity for providing reusable self-service capabilities with reliability and security. It is visible when a team reduces cognitive load for delivery teams. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Central platforms become new ticket queues. A practical response is to treat internal platforms as products with users. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.12 API product stewardship

Purpose: API product stewardship is the capacity for managing interfaces as discoverable, reliable, versioned products. It is visible when a team documents contracts and deprecation. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Point-to-point integration creates hidden coupling. A practical response is to measure reuse, reliability, and change impact. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.13 Cyber resilience

Purpose: Cyber resilience is the capacity for anticipating, resisting, containing, and recovering from attack or failure. It is visible when a team integrates threats into design and rehearsal. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Compliance becomes the security objective. A practical response is to run incident and recovery exercises. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.14 Privacy engineering

Purpose: Privacy engineering is the capacity for embedding minimization, purpose, access, retention, and rights in systems. It is visible when a team can trace data from collection to deletion. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Privacy review occurs after design. A practical response is to create privacy requirements at discovery. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.15 Responsible AI governance

Purpose: Responsible AI governance is the capacity for matching oversight to impact, autonomy, and uncertainty. It is visible when a team assigns accountable owners and appeal routes. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Principles lack operational authority. A practical response is to use risk tiers and enforceable gates. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.16 Experimentation

Purpose: Experimentation is the capacity for learning causally through bounded tests and comparison. It is visible when a team defines hypotheses and disconfirming evidence. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Pilots continue without decisions. A practical response is to set exit, scale, and stop criteria. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.17 Change leadership

Purpose: Change leadership is the capacity for creating direction, participation, capability, and credible follow-through. It is visible when a team aligns words, resources, incentives, and decisions. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Culture is blamed for structural contradictions. A practical response is to make leadership behavior observable. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.18 Digital talent development

Purpose: Digital talent development is the capacity for building technical, domain, product, and relational skill combinations. It is visible when a team links learning to live work and mobility. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Course completion substitutes for capability. A practical response is to use missions, coaching, communities, and portfolios. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.19 Ecosystem orchestration

Purpose: Ecosystem orchestration is the capacity for coordinating complementors without relying only on hierarchy. It is visible when a team designs roles, standards, incentives, and dispute mechanisms. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Partners are treated as suppliers to a unilateral plan. A practical response is to map mutual dependencies and value capture. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

A.20 Value realization

Purpose: Value realization is the capacity for connecting adoption and behavior change to financial, operational, human, and risk outcomes. It is visible when a team maintains a causal scorecard. The capability creates value only when connected to a real decision or product outcome. It should therefore be assessed through work samples, scenario performance, stakeholder feedback, and observed consequences rather than self-confidence alone.

Digital tension and development: Vanity metrics survive after weak outcomes. A practical response is to review benefits and displaced costs together. Teams should record what they expected, what evidence emerged, which assumption changed, and what will be done differently. Managers reinforce the capability by aligning authority, time, incentives, tools, and career recognition with the desired behavior.

Appendix B. Twelve-Stage Transformation Roadmap

The roadmap is iterative. A pilot may reveal that the original ambition, data foundation, or operating hypothesis needs revision. Each stage should have a named owner, participation from affected practitioners and users, evidence for moving forward, and permission to stop.

B.1 Frame the strategic ambition

Action: State which customers, operations, capabilities, or business models must change and why the timing matters. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.2 Map the current system

Action: Trace journeys, decisions, data, architecture, skills, incentives, risks, dependencies, and invisible manual work. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.3 Prioritize value domains

Action: Select a small number of domains where value, urgency, feasibility, and learning potential intersect. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.4 Build the minimum trusted foundation

Action: Establish identity, data semantics, integration, observability, security, privacy, and operating ownership needed for the first domain. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.5 Design the future operating hypothesis

Action: Specify how technology, roles, decisions, controls, experience, and economics will work together. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.6 Experiment with real users

Action: Test end-to-end capability under normal, edge, failure, and recovery conditions. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.7 Evaluate mixed evidence

Action: Combine adoption, behavior, operational outcomes, economics, experience, risk, and qualitative learning. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.8 Decide to stop, adapt, or scale

Action: Use predeclared criteria and document which assumptions changed. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.9 Industrialize the capability

Action: Strengthen reliability, support, documentation, controls, talent, vendor management, and lifecycle funding. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.10 Scale through products and platforms

Action: Reuse proven components while preserving domain accountability and local learning. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.11 Manage the portfolio

Action: Balance core modernization, growth, efficiency, risk, options, and capability-building investments. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

B.12 Renew continuously

Action: Revisit strategy, architecture, skills, controls, and ecosystem position as technology and context evolve. Completion requires more than a document. The relevant teams should be able to explain the decision, remaining uncertainty, dependencies, control owner, and next learning milestone. The portfolio board should ask what would falsify the current assumption and whether the next investment buys value, knowledge, or a strategic option.

Appendix C. Applied Sector Narratives

The cases illustrate how the same technology can produce different outcomes because value, risk, institutional conditions, and work systems differ by sector.

C.1 Manufacturing

Situation: A manufacturer connects production lines and applies predictive analytics to quality and maintenance. **Tension:** The early pilot detects anomalies but technicians distrust unexplained alerts and data definitions vary by plant. **Smarter redesign:** The firm creates a common asset model, involves technicians in labeling and evaluation, links alerts to governed work orders, and measures avoided downtime alongside false alarms and learning. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

C.2 Banking

Situation: A bank introduces generative AI for service, credit documentation, compliance support, and software development. **Tension:** Separate pilots use sensitive data and produce inconsistent controls. **Smarter redesign:** The bank establishes use-case risk tiers, approved knowledge sources, evaluation standards, human accountability, monitoring, and secure shared services before scaling. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

C.3 Health care

Situation: A hospital integrates digital intake, clinical decision support, bed management, and remote monitoring. **Tension:** Efficiency improves in routine cases but exceptional patients become harder to navigate. **Smarter redesign:** The hospital designs escalation around vulnerability and uncertainty, preserves clinician judgment, measures comprehension and safety, and uses automation to release time for care. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

C.4 Agriculture

Situation: A cooperative combines weather, satellite, soil, market, and logistics data for smallholders. **Tension:** Data are fragmented, connectivity is uneven, and recommendations ignore local knowledge. **Smarter redesign:** The cooperative delivers low-bandwidth services through trusted intermediaries, validates advice with farmers, shares value transparently, and avoids dependence on a single proprietary channel. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

C.5 Retail

Situation: A retailer unifies loyalty, inventory, pricing, and fulfillment data to personalize offers and improve availability. **Tension:** Short-term conversion rises while complaints about relevance and privacy increase. **Smarter redesign:** The retailer limits sensitive inference, gives understandable choices, evaluates long-term retention, and keeps service recovery accessible. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

C.6 Public service

Situation: A government agency digitizes permits and social assistance. **Tension:** Online completion rises but citizens with limited access or complex circumstances are excluded. **Smarter redesign:** The agency provides assisted channels, makes rules and status understandable, logs recurring barriers, and treats appeal and inclusion as service outcomes. The case should be evaluated through operational results, stakeholder experience, risk, displaced work, adoption, and the quality of learning. Its lesson is not the technology itself but the configuration of complementary capabilities and accountable decisions.

Appendix D. Balanced Transformation Scorecard

A balanced scorecard connects five levels. Foundation indicators cover reliability, security, data quality, integration, and technical debt. Adoption indicators cover use by the intended people and completion of the intended journey. Behavioral indicators cover decision quality, cycle time, collaboration, exception handling, and customer effort. Outcome indicators cover revenue, cost, productivity, quality, resilience, safety, and experience. Capability indicators cover reuse, learning velocity, talent depth, and the ability to scale or retire products responsibly.

Metrics should be paired to reveal trade-offs: speed with quality, automation with appropriate override, personalization with trust, cloud consumption with unit economics, model accuracy with subgroup error, adoption with customer effort, and productivity with employee learning. A declining override rate may mean a better model or suppressed judgment; a rising digital completion rate may mean inclusion or abandonment of people who could not complete the journey. Quantitative review should therefore be joined with incident, complaint, and frontline narratives.

Glossary

Agentic AI: AI configured to pursue goals through sequences of tool use and actions with a degree of operational autonomy.

API: Application programming interface: a defined contract through which software components exchange data or invoke services.

Artificial intelligence: Computational techniques that perform tasks associated with perception, prediction, generation, reasoning, or decision support.

Automation: The execution of tasks or decisions by technology with reduced direct human action.

Cloud computing: On-demand access to configurable computing resources delivered through shared infrastructure and service models.

Composability: The ability to assemble and reassemble modular capabilities through stable interfaces.

Cyber resilience: The capacity to anticipate, withstand, recover from, and adapt after cyber incidents.

Data governance: Decision rights, standards, controls, and accountability for data across its lifecycle.

Data product: A managed data asset or service with defined users, ownership, quality, documentation, and service expectations.

Digital core: The shared architectural, data, integration, identity, security, and operational foundation supporting digital products and processes.

Digital twin: A purpose-driven digital representation connected to a physical asset or process and used for monitoring, analysis, simulation, or action.

Digitalization: The use of digital technologies and data to improve or redesign processes and interactions.

Digitization: The conversion of analog information into digital form.

Dynamic capabilities: Organizational capacities to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities, and transform the resource base.

Edge computing: Processing and storage located near devices, assets, or users to meet latency, autonomy, bandwidth, or resilience needs.

Ecosystem: A set of interdependent actors whose complementary activities jointly create and capture value.

Generative AI: AI that produces new content such as language, code, images, audio, or structured representations.

Human-AI collaboration: A designed arrangement in which people and AI systems contribute different capabilities to shared work.

Interoperability: The ability of systems and organizations to exchange and use information through compatible technical and semantic arrangements.

Internet of Things: Networks of physical assets equipped with sensing, identification, communication, or actuation.

Legacy system: An established system that continues to perform important functions but may constrain change because of age, coupling, knowledge loss, or obsolete technology.

Network effect: A condition in which the value of a product or platform changes as participation grows.

Platform: A technological and governance foundation that enables interactions or complementary products and services.

Product operating model: An organizational system built around persistent teams accountable for product outcomes across the lifecycle.

Responsible AI: The design and use of AI with appropriate safety, fairness, privacy, transparency, accountability, and recourse.

Technical debt: Future cost and constraint created by expedient technical choices, deferred maintenance, or accumulated complexity.

Transformation: A material change in organizational value creation, capabilities, structure, identity, or business model enabled partly by digital technology.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(2), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.2.3>
- Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as structure: An actionable construct for strategy. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316678451>
- Adner, R., & Kapoor, R. (2010). Value creation in innovation ecosystems: How the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(3), 306–333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.821>
- Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3>
- Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(2), 471–482. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37:2.3>
- Bresnahan, T. F., Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (2002). Information technology, workplace organization, and the demand for skilled labor. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(1), 339–376. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355302753399526>
- Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2023). Generative AI at work (NBER Working Paper No. 31161). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w31161>
- Cennamo, C., & Santalo, J. (2013). Platform competition: Strategic trade-offs in platform markets. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(11), 1331–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2066>
- Ciriello, R. F., Richter, A., & Schwabe, G. (2018). Digital innovation. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 60, 563–569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-018-0559-8>
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108>
- Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M., & Leimeister, J. M. (2019). Hybrid intelligence. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 61, 637–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00595-2>
- Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30371-6>
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.CO;2-E)
- Gawer, A., & Cusumano, M. A. (2014). Industry platforms and ecosystem innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(3), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12105>
- Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 627–660. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057>

- Goldfarb, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Digital economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1), 3–43. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20171452>
- Gong, C., & Ribiere, V. (2021). Developing a unified definition of digital transformation. *Technovation*, 102, 102217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102217>
- Gregory, R. W., Keil, M., Muntermann, J., & Mähring, M. (2015). Paradoxes and the nature of ambidexterity in IT transformation programs. *Information Systems Research*, 26(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2014.0554>
- Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(5), 1159–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639>
- Henderson, J. C., & Venkatraman, H. (1999). Strategic alignment: Leveraging information technology for transforming organizations. *IBM Systems Journal*, 38(2.3), 472–484. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.382.0472>
- Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2018). Artificial intelligence in service. *Journal of Service Research*, 21(2), 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517752459>
- Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(8), 2255–2276. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2904>
- Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human–AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, 61(4), 577–586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human Factors*, 46(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392
- Lusch, R. F., & Nambisan, S. (2015). Service innovation: A service-dominant logic perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 39(1), 155–175. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2015/39.1.07>
- Matt, C., Hess, T., & Benlian, A. (2015). Digital transformation strategies. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 57, 339–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-015-0401-5>
- Mithas, S., Tafti, A., & Mitchell, W. (2013). How a firm's competitive environment and digital strategic posture influence digital business strategy. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(2), 511–536. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.04>
- Nadkarni, S., & Prügl, R. (2021). Digital transformation: A review, synthesis and opportunities for future research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 71, 233–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-020-00185-7>
- Nambisan, S., Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., & Song, M. (2017). Digital innovation management: Reinventing innovation management research in a digital world. *MIS Quarterly*, 41(1), 223–238. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2017/41.1.03>
- Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 48(8), 103773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018>
- Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586>

- Nylén, D., & Holmström, J. (2015). Digital innovation strategy: A framework for diagnosing and improving digital product and service innovation. *Business Horizons*, 58(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2014.09.001>
- Parker, S. K., & Grote, G. (2022). Automation, algorithms, and beyond: Why work design matters more than ever in a digital world. *Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 1171–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12297>
- Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>
- Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 36(6), 495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118>
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008>
- Sundar, S. S. (2020). Rise of machine agency: A framework for studying the psychology of human–AI interaction. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmz026>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007>
- Tiwana, A., Konsynski, B., & Bush, A. A. (2010). Platform evolution: Coevolution of platform architecture, governance, and environmental dynamics. *Information Systems Research*, 21(4), 675–687. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1100.0323>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>
- Warner, K. S. R., & Wäger, M. (2019). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 52(3), 326–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001>
- Wessel, L., Baiyere, A., Ologeanu-Taddei, R., Cha, J., & Jensen, T. B. (2021). Unpacking the difference between digital transformation and IT-enabled organizational transformation. *The Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 22(1), 102–129. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00655>
- Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O., & Lyytinen, K. (2010). The new organizing logic of digital innovation. *Information Systems Research*, 21(4), 724–735. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1100.0322>