

MAKE STRATEGY HAPPEN  
MiL DAYS 2009

# Management Development at Tetra Pak

*Lars Cederholm*



## Management Development at Tetra Pak

Lars Cederholm and Mårten Hedberg

Global competitive forces call for a “faster, better and cheaper approach” to product and process development. At the same time, such catchwords have a tendency to become meaningless without being grounded in the values and culture of the corporation and without being supplemented with strategic work around cooperation and alignment. The MiL Institute has been engaged to facilitate the work of management teams on key challenges facing Tetra Pak and to create and maintain strategic dialogues, appropriate structures, team working methods and leadership skills in the Development & Engineering Division of Tetra Pak. One feature of this supporting work is the Leadership Program “Building Bridges and Leading Innovation” which has been designed together with and run for the management team of Tetra Pak Packaging Materials.



**Lars Cederholm** is a Program Director and coach at MiL. Lars has an M.Sc. in Business Administration, Lund University, an M.A. in Organization Psychology, Columbia University. He also holds a diploma in Organization and Systems Development from the Gestalt Institute in Cleveland. He has 13 years of line management experience with P&L responsibilities. Lars works globally with management teams and with “out-of-the-box” experiences.



**Mårten Hedberg** is Director of Business Control in Tetra Pak Development & Engineering in Lund. Mårten has an M.Sc. in Business Administration, Lund University. He has 16 years of management experience in business, financial and production controlling at large companies such as Trelleborg AB, Tarkett AB, Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications AB. Mårten is a participant in the Leadership Program.

# **Building Bridges, Leading Innovation at Tetra Pak**

**Lars Cederholm, The MiL Institute**

## **The Tetra Pak culture and competitive environment**

Tetra Pak is encountering increasing competition and needs to focus the organization to do more with less. The main charge is to increase quality while shorten the distance between ideas to products in the market place and to lower cost at the same time. This puts the organization under significant pressure and the old Tetra Pak culture, while having delivered extraordinary results since the 1950s needs to make sure that this goals are being met through investigating new ways of working.

Tetra Pak is at its core a very sophisticated engineering culture. The metaphor for engineers tend to be the well oiled machine and the new organization is much more of a matrix with a charge to network a global, multi cultural organization of significant complexity. Rather than the welloiled machine, this new world would perhaps be more accurately described by the metaphor of a marketplace of complex interactions with significant skills in crossing boundaries. When things go wrong it may not be just because the manual is not precise enough but rather lacking of self awareness, self regulation, the ability to stand in the shoes of others, to having a fine-tuned social radar and the ability to get things done through projects and networks with competing goals and KPIs.

Some habits in a work culture is not easily thrown out through the window. There can be no quick fixes but rather, like precious piano, one must carefully walk it down the stairs making sure that nothing gets damaged on the way.

## **The background of our engagement**

In the fall of 2006 I was approached by Christer Thörn, who at the time held the position as VP HR at Development and Engineering (D&E), one of the three legs of the Tetra Pak organizational structure, the others being Supply Chain Operations and Commercial Operations. Christer had been recommended by a contact at MiL Institute to approach me about a specific intervention and team building in D&E.

Michael Grosse who is the head of D&E met with me for an interview together with Christer and a few other members of the D&E top management team and the result was a request for my support to help design and facilitate a teambuilding workshop for the top management team of D&E.

The first workshop (Nov 2006) was considered to be a significant step forward in terms of clarity and a focus on the agenda for the future.

A second workshop (March 2007) took place in Chamonix in France. This time I invited Göran Alsén, a MiL colleague, to participate since some of the issues were too complex for me to grasp alone. I needed perspectives and help to design the right

building blocks with the right timing. Christer Thörn supplied significant support from the inside of the organizations helping us to manage the many invisible boundaries.

During the Chamonix meeting we were contacted by Johan Nilsson, VP D&E for the platform Carton Bottle, which is presently in charge of a very significant investment in a new product line. Johan was leading and aligning a new organization consisting of different groups of people who now had to learn to work together to meet a significant challenge. Göran Alsén and myself have been working with Johan and his management team for a year, using a multi module approach to development. This program is about to come to its conclusion during the first half of 2009 with an audit of the management level below Johan's team to measure the impact of changes in the leadership system.

### **Focus on Packaging Materials within D&E**

Connie Kristensson, the VP and head for Packaging Materials, has a significant role in the "faster, better and cheaper strategy", in fact the really big savings must be delivered through his group. Connie had recently taken over the function and had done a very good job in pulling Packaging Materials (Printing machines, laminators, pilot plants, R&D, quality control, material specifications etc) out of the doldrums. Now his focus was to make sure that all his direct reports were sitting in the same boat, with full understanding of the journey ahead and enough training to put the oars into the water at the same time for maximum impact.

### **Entry and diagnostics**

I was contracted to help Connie Kristensson and his management team with this challenge. Our first workshop meeting took place at Hemavan in the cold of the winter. Connie wanted to make a trip that had in and of itself a symbolic value. "Let's get up on some mountain where you can see far away." Hemavan is far away, deep in the Swedish mountains far north near the border to Norway.

In preparation for the work Connie discussed his agenda with me. He felt there were some important questions he would like to focus on besides just building enough trust between people so that the team would be able to tackle deeper and difficult questions together;

- What kind of role will we have 2010 and beyond?
- Is the present structure good enough to handle the changes?
- What is our core business and can we expand our understanding?
- What do we tend to do that we need to stop doing??
- What tasks should be added and how?
- What kind of timing for significant changes?
- What do we keep in-house and what do we outsource?

After listening to what kind of support Connie wanted from me, my first intervention was to meet with the management team consisting of twelve people, almost all

engineers, all men expect the director of communication. In this first meeting I collected some basic information about how individual members perceived both the strength and the areas of improvement. People wrote on post its, handed them over to me and in a break I put all of it up on flipcharts to feed back the result and asked if there were some comments that individuals clearly disagreed with.

Some of the positive themes in this express diagnosis were an agreement of a clear strategy, a good, civil relationship between members and a leader whom people trusted and whose position was in no way challenged. Packaging material had become better disciplined around driving projects to deliver results and some savings from changes were showing up at the bottom line. This was in no way a group in crises.

The next question (In what aspect(s) do you think we as a team can do better? Areas for improvements?) gave me a good input to the next phase of the diagnostics. Some of the many issues that came up from this team of twelve were:

- Sharpen our focus on doing the right thing and be even better planners.
- Better in selling and positioning ourselves to the rest of D&E.
- Clarity around our factory projects, better understanding of what technical competencies we need to develop and better deployment projects for converting platform.
- Better in how we interact with the clusters/factories.
- Better in taking ownership of line function activities, follow up on our performance and create a sharper alignment (image?) of our vision and ambitions.
- Faster in delivering projects and solutions.
- Better at integrating with other factories.
- A tendency to discuss too much and not deliver with enough precision.
- We have pushed our personal relationship too much into the background and this is limiting how far we can go.
- We can have more energy in our management meetings.
- We can be more involved and manage PM as a whole team.

### **The importance of values and design principles**

For me it is key to be as transparent as possible with the people I am working with. At this first meeting, I felt it was important to introduce myself, not so much through my professional activities, but rather through letting the managers know what personal and professional values I aim to apply to my work. I spoke a bit about these values, gave them a copy of my talking points and asked them to give me feedback whenever anyone saw me do or say something that was inconsistent with this understanding. This is the gist of what I said:

*“ To me it is important to foster participation and make sure that you have consensus on important issues. Consensus does not imply that everyone stands exactly on the same dime but close enough to move on with integrity and support*

*When we design our workshops and activities, it is important to optimize the opportunity for input and participation.*

*In order to bring a group together, one key need is to make sure that every part of the system is differentiated and perceived by others with its needs, wants and hopes. No one wants to fully join a team without being acknowledged as individuals (and/or subgroups).*

*Any design and activity is built on data. Data collection is an important part of interventions since it forces people to reflect deeply on how they see things.*

*Resistance is energy. Change is constant, yet not always so easy to get used to. For all kinds of reasons, we need to chew before we swallow. Resistance is mostly healthy and should be seen as multi-directed energy.*

*All involved must take a systems perspective before anything important is set in motion. Be aware of what parts of the system is affected by our actions and the impact on others.*

*It is an art form and a challenge to become masters in crossing boundaries and most boundaries are not visible. Energy and resistance is found at the boundaries and knowing how to negotiate those intersections is a core skill in this matrixed world of networks and relationships.*

*To disagree with someone you don't trust can be risky. To build trust is key and the basic foundation for trust is the perception that our colleagues are competent to handle the job and that we all care about each others progress and success.*

*Whatever we do it will be in a dynamic state, redesign is constant and teaching will mostly take place when the issue is up on the table. I try to help to keep good balance between the task (what) and the process (how). The approach is ARL and that is key. Based on what we do we can reflect individually and together with others and this discipline to reflect will lead to our own management theory (the one that really works) and an ability to apply what we learn to universal situations.*

*Most challenges we face are not problems to be solved but dilemmas to be managed.*

*The tool belt is important to carry around. The best tool is to (selectively) "be for real" and use ones own feelings, thoughts, observations and interpretations as an instrument for change. "*

## **Off to Hemavan – A big step “looking in” before “looking out”**

Some of the main activities included an introduction to how each one saw themselves as managers and through selecting some photographs (tools for reflection) which “spoke” to two things:

- Where is my place in relation to the strategy as I see it?
- A picture that touches me that reveals something about me.

To meet another need for differentiation and getting to know each other better we prepared an exercise called “My Life” where each one had to write down *events* in their lives under the following headlines:

*Early childhood, Family and relatives, Schools and education, Life with my significant others, Work and Career, Important encounters in my life, Cultural and or spiritual experiences.*

Using Post It notes each one got 45 minutes to organize all these stories in some kind of chronology and in a pattern of personal choosing.

The following morning we conduct “My life” in two groups with the instruction to:

*Take your time to tell your story, bring up what you want and can (this is not psychoanalysis), the group listening to you can ask questions for clarification only and, at the end the group will give you feedback on themes and whatever else comes across from your talk.*

In Hemavan we also introduce the power of dialogue which we have kept throughout the program as a reflection tool at the end of every day and at the beginning of every morning. The interview I had conducted with each individual was now summarized in a conversation between Connie Kristensson and myself. We were positioned in a “fish bowl” with the participants around us, listening without the right to interrupt. At the conclusion of this session, each was given a handout with the interview themes organized under these headlines:

*Leadership, visions, mission and goals, organizational structure, relationships, enabling mechanisms, environment and rewards.*

The task was to read and identify dilemmas and opportunities which each participants thought were important to come to terms with in the leadership team. In small groups they were then asked to reach consensus on four or five key issues for us to tackle to give us a better chance to exceed expectations. Each group was also asked to be prepared to argue their choices on the merits and indicate what should be the main deliverables now for the coming years. Each group presented the results and one person from each subgroup was identified to edit the overlapping issues and reformulate the issues in a series of questions which would be the agenda for the workshop. The four priorities, which would end up at the top of the agenda were selected. After the presentations and some discussions and clarifications the group was ready to go to work. Using a planning tool, two groups tackled one question each and presented the recommendations together with underlying assumption and additional exchanges with the other group.

The following morning we charged the participants with the question: “How can I personally, and we as a team, make sure that we drive our intentions into action”.

After individual reflection we now introduce the learning partners to each other. The learning partner is a colleague who is there to listen to you and help you clarify how you can develop your leadership skills to meet the challenges each one of us is facing which are now becoming increasingly evident. After a brief dialogue session Connie and myself again had a conversation with the group listening. The focus of our conversation was a reflection of what the major themes were and what kind of team intentions are now being mobilized. The rest of day two we left on a snow scooter Safari (very cold) which ended with sauna (very warm) and dinner (lots of fun).

The last day was spent on designing “The Technology Road Map” where each function was drawing a picture of how this roadmap could be visualized. The vision was to have the map in such shape that it could be given to a graphic artist to bring to the next level of management (level five) for additional input. The recommendations coming out of working on the agenda were delegated to two groups for continuous work against a time goal.

The original questions were:

- How can we (PM) take responsibility for complete Factory installations?
- How can we take an extended responsibility for implementing World Class Manufacturing in our plants (factories)?

On the last day we prepared and gave each other feedback in two groups, which ended in a session where each participant prepared a declaration of an action plan for improvements, measurements and timeframes.

The Hemavan workshop ended with a session conducted by Connie where all the loose ends were identified and assignments were made to bring those issues forward.

We closed the workshop with a dialogue based on the question; “What do we have to say to leave this experience with a sense of integrity and a new beginning?”

### **Tylösand workshop with level five**

The Technology Road Map from Hemavan had now been given a professional look through the work of some graphic artists. Level five management, consisting of 35 people, were engaged with the purpose to reflect on and add to the work from Hemavan.

After setting the agenda all participants introduced themselves and stated their hopes and expectations for this workshop. Just like in Hemavan, we were using associative pictures to connect to these questions; What is taking up most of my time and effort at work and how does all that effect me both professionally and personally? What do I expect from our two days together? Members from the management team took turns to explain the different Road Maps followed by conversation around each of the maps in respective functional groups:

1. Pilot plant and Lab
2. Standard Lines + upgrades & Process Specs
3. Technology Development and Roadmap
4. PM specs & SPI (System Platform Integration)
5. Competence Development
6. Converting Machine Sales and & Suppliers.

The question was what the future would look like from the point of view of each function and individual manager. Each level five manager were asked to spend time alone writing their thoughts in answer to these questions;

- What is promoting/driving the vision? What blocks it?
- What will our work look like 2010?
- What demands are we facing as managers and associates?
- What new skills do we need in order to manage the future?
- How will we work together internally and between functions?

To escalate awareness and energy we asked people to split into pairs to compare notes and deepen the thinking followed by table conversations in groups.

After lunch each group prepared the picture of the future followed by a 15 minutes presentation per group including an opportunity for questions and answers, At this point the management team got together to prepare for a session where they were sitting in a fish bowl to exchange impressions of what they were hearing from level five in terms of understanding, new ideas and mobilization of energy.

Back into a brief conversation with the learning partner with the question, “What excites me and what do I fear or have doubts about?” The day was closed after a debrief when each one could say a few words about what impact the day had made for them personally.

The following day we started at 8:00 with mail time to make sure that everybody should be present for the agenda, which started at 9:00. A few words if anyone had some afterthoughts from yesterday and we started out forming new (mixed and interrelated) groups with the task to brainstorm with these questions in mind:

- What is it that we as Tetra Pack PM will need to do in order to achieve vision 2010?
  - How will we cooperate and take action to get there and beyond?
  - Wouldn't it be great if we.....
  - Wouldn't it be awful if we.....
- .....and then select the best five, do-able ideas using red dots;

After a report back from each group and after questions, input and challenges from the rest of us, everyone in the room was given five red dots to mark their individual choices of ideas resulting in two main ideas around which the organization should be engaged. We again split up into groups, using a problem solving method to come up with some clear recommendation for next steps

After lunch, using mixed trios, we were coaching each other how to share the results from our work with the direct reports back at Tetra Pak.

After a closing exercise we had a brief written evaluation with excellent feedback on the usefulness and quality of the result.

### **Svalbard – building the continuation of the program**

Shortly after Tylösand I had a conversation with Connie Kristensson who was asking me to begin to sketch a plan for a longer development program that would make sure that the energy that was being mobilized would continue. The task was to design a new workshop, this time with the purpose to engage the management team to begin the process of designing and take ownership for a program which would be grounded in the discovery of our individual and collective needs. If that becomes the basis of the agenda, then the implementation would really take place. The purpose should be to give an opportunity for each manager to develop a more effective way to lead the organization. The model of a long term engagement developed by Johan Nilsson and

his management team at Carton Bottle was the right way. This would not be a one time event but a series of workshops over time with different relevant focal points. The main point was that the agenda should be owned and build the foundation for a natural way to progress.

Again, to go to a far away place was to serve as a container and incubator for new thinking. We were going to Svalbard, the last inhabited place on earth before the North pole. The trip was scheduled for May when the sun is up 24 hours. The destination was to be kept a secret until the last moment so we were operating under the code name “The mountain top workshop”. The stated purpose was to paint clear and common pictures of the kinds of challenges we face as leaders and build the foundation for a program that will lead us in the right direction. The trip to Svalbard is long! And once there you know that you are in a different place.

Besides the usual check in and inclusion rituals we started off with a consensus exercise which confronted the small teams with increasingly ambiguous questions where the opportunities for disagreement were escalating. The discovery was that if you fully listen to each others thoughts and assumptions without defending your own position about how to approach each of these questions you will most likely come to a point where you can reach consensus. As one participant said in the debrief; “It makes me smarter to approach common problems with this attitude”. The true meaning being that we are not on the same spot but close enough that we can live with the chosen direction and move on. We developed methods for reaching decisions which are very much alive in this group in every management meeting.

Another key event was when we made a time line along a wall with years and quarters clearly marked. The purpose was to write our common history. Each participant was given a pack of post it notes and wrote down specific events and the impact and learning that came out of these events and then at a specific time all notes went up, the event above the line and the impact below the line. After we had walked down the history line it was tangible how much this team had done, learned and achieved and how the intensity was escalated and piling up in the last year and a half. Comments of pride, and now is the time, and we are ready to act. We are on the way from talking to doing.

Before coming to Svalbard each one had been taking two instruments, MBTI 2 and FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation Behavior) with the purpose to increase self awareness and to create a common language to talk about differences and the opportunities for growth that is imbedded in these differences when you work in groups. During the interview process preceding Svalbard we gave each individual feedback on their profiles and discussed the implications for their leadership and working with others. At Svalbard we could concentrate on the implications for the team since the basic understanding was already in place. A short lecture repeating the theory was then followed by a demonstration in the group that demonstrated how different our view can be based on looking at the same issue through the prisms of our preferences and issues. The group made a group profile and we discussed the strengths and things to look out for in terms of the least developed sides of the group.

A Norwegian MiL Faculty Member, Thorleif Thorleifsson, arrived and was introduced. Thorleif was to be our local guide to Svalbard and spoke to us about the leadership styles

of Amundssen, Scott and Stapleton in the adventures to be the first to put their flags on the poles.

FIRO-B theory and our profiles were discussed and we again looked at the implication for teamwork. The instrument is good for team building and deals with the need and frequency in how we express inclusion, control and openness and the degree in which we want others to include, control and be open with us.

The following day, after dialogue, Connie, Thorleif and myself sat down to discuss our perceptions of what was going on in the team after which each reflected on the question; which are our key development challenges as leaders? This was followed by group work with the task to make list in order of priorities of our key development challenges for our individual and collective role as leaders.

After we had heard the presentations of the group work and advocacy of the priorities, Thorleif was leading a discussion about key challenges that we needed to pay attention to as we started to design the future leadership program.

Before the Svalbard workshop we had sent out a template to each of the participants to prepare a personal leadership case. It was to be a challenge with a team or a person, an opportunity for development but not a business or a technical problem. Six cases were selected and we worked on each one using a very specific format with the multiple purpose to train active listening, coaching and reflective teams. The participants have been very gratified and surprised how much help they have been receiving by being supported by their colleagues in how to handle their personal leadership dilemmas. The leadership case methodology is now a standing feature when the group meets and it has started to migrate into level five management.

After dinner Thorleif showed a movie he had made when he and his friends sailed into the artic and the challenges they had faced.

The following day, on May 27, all of us were transported into the Svalbard wilderness and each pair was given six dogs and a sledge and off we went into the vast snow deserts. We built an igloo as a group task and this day deserves a whole story in and of itself. The igloo collapsed when it was almost ready but no problem with that; we learn from both mistakes and successes. Everything is grist for the mill. We also descended down into a vast glacial ice cave where we had to crawl through different chambers and help each other deal with some pretty strong emotions. Back home at the hotel and after reflecting on what we took away from this wilderness experience we discussed the implications for the team. If we were to build an igloo one more time, how would we go about it? Before dinner we conducted another set of leadership cases and went to bed very tired and happy.

The last day was closure time. We summarized what had been accomplished and what had been decided. We identified outstanding issues and we, after a nature walk with the learning partner, made our first outline of the future management development program which was to informed by some basic building blocks:

- Focus and follow up on activities driven by the strategy.
- Keep challenging each other, increase and synchronize cross-functional coordination.
- Keep looking at the full picture. Coordinate with key stakeholders.
- Think out of the box.
- Speed up implementation of changes, improve the involvement of the next level in driving change. Make better use of middle management.
- Be more proactive and courageous when making decisions.
- Keep releasing energy in our team, keep improving our efficiency.
- Look at how we are organized as a team. Is there another, better way?

**Building Bridges, Leading Innovation  
Tetra Pak Packaging Materials Leadership Program**

“Power is what emerges between people  
who are engaged in honest, free exchange of ideas.

Learning is when new meaning is made and thinking is expanded. Innovation is when  
these ideas are made useful”

We started this new phase of the program in November 2008. Together with Connie Kristensson we have laid out the key building blocks as they had been identified by him and his team of eleven leaders. Göran Alsén, has been introduced to the leadership team in 2008 and has been part of building the key design elements. He came in as a coach in Module 2 which took place in the beginning of March 2009.

It is important to say that the fine tuning of each module is created just before each module starts to make sure that we are delivering “fresh produce” building on what is on the radar of the team without losing sight of the long term goals as they relate to Tetra Pak strategy and the Packaging Materials (PM) strategy, as well as the agenda laid out in Hemavan and Svalbard. One way that we, the coaches, stay relevant is that we sit in on a team meeting preceding each module where our roles are to observe the process and give feedback on our observations and interpretations at the end of the meeting. That evening we fine tune the design to stay respectful of where the team is and what they are prepared to deal with as agenda items. This way of evolutionary design approach has been accepted after some discussion. It is generally accepted that this is the best way to stay fresh and involve not only the heads but also the hearts and guts of the participants.

**Module 1 (November 2008)**

**How to create and maintain a strategic dialogue**

Lennart Rohlin, who has been the President for the MiL Institute since 1977 to date and its main strategist and conceptualizer, had agreed to help me with the input on some strategic models and ways of thinking strategically. We met before the workshop to discuss some relevant questions that we could inject into the discussions about strategy. The workshop was opened by Connie, who reiterated the strategy of PM and how it is set in the context of overall Tetra Pak strategy.

Small groups were asked to discuss and *pick one or two questions from a menu* (see below) after each segment of the presentation. For reasons of protecting vital internal information, the results of the answers to these questions are not revealed in this paper.

**1. What is strategy – an introduction**

- How do you extract feedback from your strategic decisions; how do you learn?
- How do you promote your relevance to the factories?
- What is the intent of your strategy?
- What emergent forces may influence your strategy?
- How do we forge partnerships with suppliers and yet protect our PM secrets?
- What actions are we taking to keep both low cost production and premium price level?

**2. Strategic leadership and the context of strategy**

- How can we move from planning and positioning to an action driven learning process?
- How can we use both/and principles in cascading the engagement to level five?
- Which are our core values and how do we promote these values inside and outside of PM?
- Do you look at strategy development as an orderly, linear process or a combination of different core components? What do you think it should be?

**3. Strategic leadership in crafting and implementing strategy**

- Which are our strategic documents, how have they been developed and how are they used?
- How can you take more responsibility for driving the TP and TPPM strategy?
- What business are you really in?
- What roles can you identify in this room? Driver, organizer, visionary collaborator? Do we have enough perspectives to consider all aspects?

**Closure comments at the end of the day: I am walking away with....**

- Mobilization to look at the bigger picture.
- A personal commitment to understand production in the wider sense.
- The importance in aligning our entire PM organization inside and with major stakeholders.
- Communicate and challenge the organization.
- We need to create a layered strategic communication plan to be meaningful at different levels of the organization.
- We need to clarify roles and responsibilities in this leadership team.
- Allow challenges to be a two way street.
- We can speed up and we all believe it!

- Let's move ahead. No need to be overly afraid to make decisions.
- We deliver improvements....not steel.
- I like the both / and concept.
- Strategy is a learning process, over and over.
- Let's come up with the tools that will work for us.
- Good to get this input. It's up to us to translate these ideas into our own language.

## **Module 2 (March 2009)**

### **The anatomy of management teams, communication and coaching Leadership Cases**

Göran framed the day with a lecture supported by handouts. The talking points were among other things:

You need to have a common language. You have a lot of tools but a toolbox is too heavy. You need a few good conceptual tools on a belt that you can always carry with you.

Team is a specific type of group with some clear competencies. You are not just waiting for a bus. You have something to accomplish together and you have a common goal. What are you de facto doing? Are you running a network? A project team has a specific task, a management team continues to run as long as you hold a certain position. You need to clarify the purpose, interpersonal aspects and a structure that will get you to where you want to go. You also need to ask yourself the question what your role is in the bigger structure. How do I find the relation between here and out there? Are you flexible enough to handle the need for flexibility? Are we expected to be innovative? Are we clear on the task that is put upon us? Different teams have to train themselves in doing different things. What competencies do we need? What different functions do we need represented? What roles do we need to occupy? How do we create legitimacy in the organizations? How do we build differentiation and how do we handle conflict?

You already have created a certain language based on MBTI and Firo –B. These are some good tools to handle what is happening.

#### **Why are we here? Group work summary:**

- To implement strategy together with the SCO
- Translate business needs into new products
- Synchronize with other parts of the Organizations
- Develop others
- Manage the operational task

#### **Leadership Cases**

- Round one: Case owner states her case. The coach will make sure that she will present the full picture through summarizing and asking clarifying, open ended questions.
- The team gives feedback to the coach on observations, coach and coachees will also reflect.
- Round two. Coaching continues.
- Individual reflection.
- Questions for clarification to the coachee re. the case (then turn away from group).
- Group discussion. What we think, assume, feel and advise (the mentoring phase).
- Case owner comes back and reflect on take away.

### **Day two: morning dialogue**

- It is clear why we have a management team. We just need to implement and we need to fill in the gap between us and the rest of the organization.
- Great to train on coaching and leadership cases. It is real and it makes a big difference to us.
- Coaching is a very specific tool. We can help people to grow and solve problems. I will pick up and use the tool belt.
- I really enjoy working on the leadership case. It is about chemistry. We don't all have perfect chemistry but we all need to act and think like professionals. We are getting better at bringing up tough issues.
- We must force ourselves to recognize issues that are not concrete and tangible but never the less very important
- I must become a better coach. I try to help people through telling them what to do and think. I need to focus on your growth. We tend to avoid emotion and we need the courage to deal with situations when the feelings meet the facts. To allow emotions is a big step forward. A milestone in our team.
- Plan for coaching, Work with people. It is good to focus on the task of leadership.
- Coaching is a powerful tool. It allows us to think and grow. To manage the purpose of the team is a different thing though.
- Göran and Lars are a good combination. Coaching is great! We can not be perfect right away but let us really try our best to do this. Let us work on coaching on level five. We had a great day!
- Bring this all to level five. We can become better at giving feedback. Keep helping each other.
- Great day! We (I) have been growing and we are going in the right direction.
- I know that it is hard for someone to change personality but I have courage to hang in.
- Coaching is a strong tool. We have a lot more to do when it comes to this team.
- The reflection Lars did with Göran highlighting the key milestones since Hemavan was great. We need to go back and reflect on our log books. Reflection and recognition is part of moving forward. We are getting so many tools but let them happen. We don't need to try to order everything. Just let some things be and trust that the tools will be there when we need them.

### **Connie's case was the center agenda point on day two**

This case is ongoing work. It has to do with the future management system and the result from the work of three different groups is delegated to one representative from each of the work groups who will take the input further. The result will be presented in the management meeting during module 3.

### **Discussions around the future modules**

The vehicle to get into the integration with level four will be a MiL invented simulation game called the Cake Factory which will be enacted during a full day with a follow up day for the management team to digest the impact of the simulation. The

team brainstormed some ways of focusing the Cake Factory which is best run around real and clear questions.

### **Ideas for the Cake Factory**

- X functional cooperation
- Delegation of responsibilities
- Understanding of the big WE
- Communication gaps between functions
- Improve cooperation-delegation and understanding
- We work differently in different silos.
- Align the communications
- Support development for level five management.
- Implementation issues, coaching and feedback
- We can be more disciplined in implementing and follow up what we set in motion

Based on these ideas, the overarching theme for the Cake Factory would be:

*How can we communicate and work more effectively between level 4 and 5 both vertically and horizontally?*

In Module 5 in June the PM will take the initiative to meet with TP Supply Chain Operations (SCO), one of the very key stakeholder in the PM management structure. Connie is the champion and will get basic agreement to meet in a workshop format with the purpose to explore issues of common interest.

### **Ideas for the work with the SCO**

The main expectation is to select the right issues and to align the two organizations.

- Who will be the participants? Get the right people into the room
- We need input from factories
- We need to understand the issues from the SC point of view
- Align around how we take investment decisions
- Can we establish decision forums
- How do we cascade communications
- Align the way we work and define the set up and the efficiency
- Create a common understanding of the D&E process particularly TD
- Have agreements on basic condition compliance, (ex. Laminators not in good condition)
- Amount of factory support needed?
- Differences in the decision making process between PM and SC
- Projects; WCM team integration
- Common quality systems
- Maintenance and process competences
- Gather and share best practices
- Local modification of standard equipment

## **Final reflections on Module 2**

- Now we are talking management systems instead of management teams.
- Good energy here now.
- I lost the energy in the morning. I just did not see the need for change but I do see it now! I just need to adopt.
- Two great days and good work! Connie created this team and he is an icon and very respected. The real challenge is you yourself. Can you change and really empower us?
- I am looking forward to explore the management system issues. We had very good days.
- Some very good tools. Hard to use but we must stay with it and practice. We must make this our game.
- We are making very good progress. I really hope that we can take this management system to interact with level 5 and SCO.
- Göran was a good addition to the work here. I hope that all of you can take some burden off Connie. His calendar is complex and overloaded.
- We must finish our work before we engage level five and SCO. Great days!
- Great. It does not feel like we are in a crises mode.
- I continue to learn a lot. I want to be a good coach. We need to be very disciplined moving into our new responsibilities.

## **This is as far as we are at this point**

There is a very extensive documentation of the Modules to date. Each participant keep a log book reflecting on questions and insights. There are some very good reasons to celebrate the achievements of the participants to date. Now it is off to looking further ahead and further out to truly make sure that PM management is ready to be part of the integration and work as masters of the matrix.

## **The following modules**

Module 3 (April 2009)

Vertical Integration, The new management system, The Cake factory

Module 4 (May 2009)

A trip out of the box! How can we take new ideas into action. Working with artists and jazz musicians to create a bigger place for thinking about change. Feedback and personal commitments.

Module (June 2009)

How do we work with a systems view. Workshop with SCO.

Module 6 (August: 2009)

The summary and final reflections of the program.