



Requirements & Transformations for Edge Organizations – Part I

IC2RTS 2005 Edge Organizations Track

Dr. Mark E. Nissen

Naval Postgraduate School

Sponsored in part by OASD-NII, through its CCRP.
Research coordinated through the Center for Edge Power.

Motivation

- ✦ Edge organization is fresh OD approach
- ✦ Question comparative & contingent performance
- ✦ Research problems with methods & contradictions
- ✦ COT as bridge method
- ✦ Center for Edge Power: MY, MD, MU R program
- ✦ This study:
 - Phase 1 – specify requirements & transformation pathways
 - Characterize C2 orgs appropriate for war on global terror

Contingency Theory

- ✱ No one, “best” way to organize
- ✱ Rational, design view of organizations
- ✱ Contingencies: environment, technology, interdependence, I-processing, others
- ✱ Organize to improve & maintain “fit”
- ✱ See Lawrence & Lorsch (67), Perrow (67), Thompson (67), Galbraith (77), others

Organization Consultant

- ✱ Scholarship-based expert system
- ✱ Research propositions → ES rules
- ✱ Input: 6 org dimensions (Q&A)
- ✱ Output (rule-based inference):
 - Diagnose misfits
 - Recommend transformations
- ✱ See Burton & Obel (04)

Diagnosing C2 Organizations

- ✱ JTF unit of analysis
- ✱ Analyze as Hierarchy (Alberts & Hayes 03)
- ✱ 2 mission-environmental scenarios:
 - “Cold War” – relatively stable & predictable
 - “Global Terror” – relatively problematic & challenging
- ✱ ID misfits, requirements & transformations
- ✱ Analyze Edge characterizations also

Scenario Differences

Table 2 Input Differences between Cold War & Global Terror Scenarios

Cold War	Global Terror
6 – 15 separate locations	Greater than 30 locations
100 – 500 mi ave distance	500 – 3500 mi ave distance
Few different markets	Many different markets
Few foreign markets	Many foreign markets
Standard, hi-volume technology	Specialized, custom technology
Semi-routine technology	Non-routine technology
Semi-divisible technology	Indivisible technology
Strong dominant technology	Weak dominant technology
Low uncertainty	High uncertainty
Low equivocality	High equivocality
High capital	Low capital

OrgCon Results

❄ Cold War scenario

- Good fit overall
- Misfits: Defender strategy, H & V differentiation

❄ Global Terror scenario

- Poor fit overall
- Misfits: Defender strategy, H & V differentiation, large units, centralization, micromanagement, formalization, I-media, Bureaucracy, others

Edge Design Requirements

Table 3 Edge Organization Design Requirements

Organization Area	Design Requirements*
Organization size	Small, possibly specialized units
Climate	Externally focused: Rational Goal or Developmental; use fewer written rules and procedures
Management style	Less micro-involvement; rapid & reliable knowledge flows; incentives based on results; coordination through meetings; allow employees more latitude
Organizational characteristics	Less centralization, differentiation and formalization; Simple Structure with flat hierarchy
Technology	Specialized, custom, non-routine, indivisible, low-capital, heavy & rich information flows
Strategy	Prospector or Analyzer

* Transformation pathways correspond as a set.

Contributions

- ✦ Illustrate use & utility of COT in mil C2
- ✦ Ground Edge analysis in Contingency Theory
- ✦ ID relative fits & misfits of current C2 orgs
- ✦ Induce requirements for Edge org
- ✦ Delineate transformation pathways
- ✦ Action plan for leaders & policy makers
- ✦ Inputs for computational experiments

Limitations & Future Research

✿ Limitations

- Bridge research method, interpretation & judgment
- C2 is relatively new domain for OrgCon

✿ Future research

- Analyze Edge orgs directly
- Fieldwork for model validation, calibration, extension
- Complementary studies ongoing & planned
- Center for Edge Power welcomes informed input