

## Appendix

---

### *The CEO's Guide to The World of Ideas, or... Ideas Are Cheap*

**T**here is a general consensus among people of achievement about the superiority of implementation over ideas.

**Jeff Bezos:** “It’s easy to have ideas. It’s very hard to turn an idea into a successful product.”

**Larry Ellison:** “Translating a good idea into a great product is unbelievably hard.”

**Guy Kawasaki,** in response to somebody with presumably a great idea: “I hate to tell you, but you have very little. Ideas are easy. Implementation is hard.”

These high-achieving people are right, but let me challenge your understanding of what they really mean.

Their message is that an idea exists in the world of potential and, in reality, it’s very difficult to actualize it, to bring it down to earth. That’s why simply having a great idea does not automatically equal success. In fact, having a great idea is very far from success. There usually are myriads of obstacles and reasons why it might fail, regardless of the quality of the idea per se.

At the same time, having a great idea is necessary for a great success. While having an idea doesn’t necessarily guarantee success, not having an idea does guarantee failure in some way, earlier or later.

Furthermore, coming up with a great idea is unbelievably hard. It only seems easy after the fact, because great ideas are usually very simple.

The idea, its quality, and its alignment are shaping your business subtly and powerfully. It may well be beyond your conscious awareness, yet the idea defines everything in your business and around it, as well as everything you go through.

Let's consider some great ideas that people of achievement brought into the world and appreciate their beauty and power.

### **Brian Chesky (Airbnb)**

What's the idea behind Airbnb?

This is how the founder's mother perceived the idea when Brian Chesky shared with her what he was up to: "...So you built this website so that strangers can sleep in your home because you don't have enough money for rent..."

Luckily, Brian saw the idea differently. Let's take a closer look.

Brian's initial idea was, "What if you can book somebody's home just like you can book a hotel room?"

The idea was obvious under the circumstances, as all the hotels in the area were fully booked and arriving people had nowhere to stay.

This was the idea that he implemented with his own apartment, ending up renting it to a few strangers. However, he was very perceptive, and fine-tuned the idea immediately after the experience. The difference was subtle yet profound. The new idea was best expressed by Ashton Kutcher, in his conversation with Brian Chesky: "Bringing people together by opening our homes and hearts to one another".

This may sound idealistic, and perhaps even far-fetched to some people, yet THIS was the idea that was worth billions and changed the hospitality industry forever. Had Brian remained with his original idea of booking a home like a hotel, he wouldn't have gone very far.

Why?

For two reasons. First, the original idea was very weak and wouldn't survive the competition with the hotel chains. Second, Brian Chesky would never have been able to go through everything he had to go through before success came to him and his amazing startup.

Analyzing the profound experience he had with sharing his own home, he was perceptive enough to come up with the new idea which was aligned with the experience he had. Furthermore, he did realize early enough that he was not in the hotel industry, that he didn't compete with hotels at all.

Who did he compete with?

Well, in a sense, with friends and family where you would most probably stay when you visit their city. The only problem is, how many countries, cities, and communities can you visit if you only stay at homes of your old friends and you are not extroverted enough to make new friends quickly and easily anywhere and anytime?

Airbnb gives you a chance to discover new friends - anywhere, anytime. Friends who will share their homes with you, providing you with the best experience – something that very few of your old friends may be capable of doing.

Interestingly, Brian Chesky is trying to evolve his idea even further. As of this writing, its final edition is not yet fully ready. It's still a vague vision. However, it's already fascinating, when you imagine how it can play out in our not-too-far-off-future. The way he sees it, it's about a totally different lifestyle. About people traveling freely around the world without the slightest need to actually own a permanent home. This is when owning a home no longer offers any advantages, in comparison with finding a home to stay or to live, short term or long term. Owning a home becomes unnecessary, just like owning a car in some areas makes no sense any more – in those areas covered by Airbnb's cousin, Uber.

Just imagine smooth, comfortable, convenient, friendly, cheap home sharing with just the level of privacy you require.

The transformation is still on the way, but it's becoming more and more tangible. We'll see what the future brings...

## **Larry Ellison (Oracle)**

The idea of relational databases wasn't new. In fact, Larry Ellison found it in its entirety in the works of Edgar F. Codd who developed the revolutionary approach to data arrangement while working for IBM.

IBM didn't ignore the work of Edgar F. Codd either. There were a few papers published, it was presented on conferences, and there was even the team at IBM that was implementing the new approach to data.

So, what's the difference? Why was IBM so slow, clearly unable to recognize the upcoming revolution, the treasure that was born and developed in their midst?

To be sure, if IBM saw what Larry Ellison saw, Larry wouldn't have had a chance. But they didn't. The difference was in the ideas. IBM perceived one idea, while Larry Ellison perceived another idea.

Let's understand IBM's position. Their key idea was **HARDWARE**. Or, more precisely, **HARDWARE SUPREMACY**. The world was divided into hardware and non-hardware - there was nothing else. Of course, good software was always needed; after all, hardware without software is dead, but... Software was secondary. It didn't have the value on its own. Hardware reigned supreme!

Let's sidetrack for a moment, by considering Microsoft before we go back to Oracle.

This is exactly where Microsoft entered the stage, as Bill Gates saw things differently. Bill Gates introduced a funny idea, one that nobody ever had before him. The idea was: software reigns supreme; hardware is secondary; software is a thing on its own!

As a side note, it's not about who is right and who is wrong. It's about **WHEN**. Because during the earlier stages, hardware was everything indeed, and this was where IBM excelled - IBM's contribution to the world was no less than revolutionary. However, the times changed. If IBM had perceived the change, Bill Gates wouldn't have a chance. But IBM didn't.

Moreover, IBM made what seemed to be mistakes in dealings with Microsoft, by entering into the contracts that put IBM at a disadvantage, and even fueled Microsoft's meteoric rise.

Those weren't mistakes though. IBM was consistent with their IDEA, while Bill Gates was pursuing his own IDEA. They saw the same very phenomena, yet they had two totally different ideas, and those ideas subtly but powerfully shaped their companies, all their dealings and business activities, and the future of the industry, and the future of the world, for that matter.

This was very similar to what happened between IBM and Oracle later on. The RDBMS approach was to the world of data arrangement what the software in general and operating system in particular was to the world of raw hardware. It was a thing on its own. And it was of primary importance now. In fact, this was a revolution. Because a relational database, with its schema and logical organization, disconnected from physical information storage, introduces the standardized layer on which data applications can now be based.

More specifically, when you needed to develop a data application before the RDBMS revolution, you would have to start from scratch, to a large extent, while now you have the whole logical data layer that does the magic for you flexibly and powerfully. Developing data applications becomes a breeze, in comparison to massive, heavily customized effort that needed to be extended in the pre-relational-database world.

IBM was loyal to their credo, to their founding idea, in fact, to the idea that took them to greatness. Yet, this rich and powerful company was powerless and virtually non-competitive when facing somebody with a different idea in mind, the idea that created a different vision of the world - but only for the mind that possessed it.

Of course, "translating a good idea into a great product is unbelievably hard", as Larry Ellison said much later. And we should definitely believe him, as he knew what it took. His contribution to the world has been immense.

Yet, IBM was an 800-pound gorilla, and no matter how hard Larry was ready to work, IBM was capable of working much harder. But it didn't help. Larry won.

He still had to work hard to take the idea to fruition, but his victory was firmly rooted in the world of ideas. The lesson is of paramount importance: once you win in the world of ideas, only then can you, and should, work hard.

**Marc Benioff (Salesforce), Bill McDermott (SAP), Alan Trefler (Pegasystems)**

Let's compare the definitive ideas behind the three remarkable companies.

Salesforce has been almost a synonym for CRM - customer relationship management. In the Salesforce universe, a customer is everything. The universe is viewed as customers' journeys. A customer journey is mapped out, designed, redesigned, and treasured. Let's call the key idea "customer's journey".

SAP's idea is "running the world better", or, as fine-tuned by Bill McDermott, "helping the world to run better". This may be their mission, yet the idea expressed this way lacks substance. When we dig deeper, a more substantial idea is showing up:

A business is viewed as a system of interconnected processes which are to be reflected digitally. In other words, the idea is in creating a perfect digital reflection of the reality, that is to say, of all the company's processes and activities.

This may seem too intangible, but consider an epitome of the idea - a digital dashboard which shows you EVERYTHING that happens in your business anytime and anywhere - in real time. Let's call the key idea "complete digital reflection". Anything and everything is digitized to the extent that human input is unnecessary beyond actual core activities that human beings are actually performing. All is immediately and automatically digitally captured, digitally managed, and digitally directed.

But don't forget, on a higher level, SAP is not even about running the company - it's about running the world! This is where the focus on interaction and collaboration between the companies comes into play, to achieve total automation and digitization of not only what's happening in the companies, but also what's happening between the companies.

Pegasystems is introducing the idea of a model. Any particular business has its own model, which is an abstraction that describes all the business activities. The brilliance of Pegasystems is in separating business model and technology. You, as a business, don't have to deal with technology at all. You deal with an abstract layer - with a logical business model. The magic happens behind the curtain: all the technology is taken care of automatically, by auto-translating the abstract model into the language of technology. This way, technological innovations, disruptions, revolutions, all the channels are incorporated and aligned automatically, without you having to change anything. All you, a business, have to deal with, is the model which masterfully models your business logic, uniquely designed and built for your business. Let's call the key idea "model".

Briefly, here are the three distinct ideas:

- Salesforce: "customer journey"
- SAP: "complete digital reflection"
- Pegasystems: "model"

Needless to say, all the three companies have great databases, design and map out their customers' journeys, employ digital reflection of business activities, as well as use an advanced model for any given business, effectively minimizing their customers' direct exposure to the raw technologies. In other words, a very close look would suggest to us that all the three companies are doing the same very things.

Yet, in spite of the similarities, their differences are immense, even if subtle. The differences are powerfully rooted in their respective core ideas. I would go as far as to say that these tough competitors don't even compete, or - more precisely - don't have to compete. They have

to simply, very clearly, and in a creative manner, communicate a laser focus on their respective ideas to their actual and potential customers. This way, each company will have its share of the market, and even though one of the three will have the biggest share, and one of the three will have the lowest share, the order doesn't translate into an "I-am-better-than-you" framework. All three can be successful and profitable, perfectly serving THEIR respective clients.

So how do you see what your business actually needs? Which of the three would you pick? Would you focus on your customer's journey? Would you like to create a complete digital reflection of your business activities and have a unified dashboard that shows you the entirety of your business in real time? Or would you like to manage a technology-free model of your business, dealing with your business logic and let the system take care of all the technology for you on auto-pilot? What's better for your business?

The answer is, I don't know what's better, because we have to consider YOUR business idea, the definitive idea for YOUR business, because your idea and the idea of the solution you want to use must be related in some very meaningful way!

We're coming to a very important point here:

When you're bringing a solution into your business, the solution has its own idea. That idea may be a definitive idea for the company that offers the solution (or, at least, for a part of the company), yet for you, it's just one of the ideas you're inviting into your business - under the umbrella of your own definitive idea.

It's of extreme importance to relate these two ideas - for any solution you are introducing into your company, whether you buy an external product or service, or create it internally. The right choice comes from the conceptual harmony between the two ideas that are brought together, and this is very specific for your situation and for your business.

On a side note, perhaps the biggest difficulty is that most companies don't communicate their definitive ideas precisely.

Moreover, even successful companies are often not consciously aware of their core concept. The world of ideas is not easy to navigate, and even more difficult to correlate to the world of action.

To complete the saga about the three companies, let's mention Oracle - the company that competes with them all. Even though Oracle as a company has a totally different definitive idea, they naturally moved into the application market, building the applications based on their own database layer. Their business applications division is a business within a business, and has its own definitive idea, which gracefully interplays with their original idea which created RDBMS revolution.

### **Logan Green (Lyft)**

You would expect that Lyft and Uber were twins.

Not at all! They are far from each other, as the east from the west!

Uber is a better taxi. Much better taxi. If you use Uber once, you would hardly use a regular taxi ever again.

Does it sound like Lyft to you?

Well, let's hear out Logan Green. His definitive idea is totally different. He is eyeing elimination of car ownership. In his mind, and in the world that will eventually follow his mind, car ownership becomes irrelevant.

If you use both Uber and Lyft, you may not perceive the difference consciously. Yet, the difference is powerful and manifests on many levels and in various aspects of these great companies.

Travis Kalanick and Garrett Camp save us from the misery of using an old-fashioned taxi service. While Logan Green and John Zimmer are saving us from misery of owning a car.

This means that they don't compete. Well, they think they do, but they don't. The two companies can both be very successful. Moreover, if everything goes as conceived and planned, Lyft will become much bigger than Uber. In its extreme, the difference may be as the

difference between billions of dollars and trillions of dollars. Yet, this does NOT mean that Uber will be a loser - not at all. Uber will prosper in its own right, making our lives better in its own way.

### **Jack Dorsey (Square)**

There could be nothing simpler than this, you may think. The idea is “Accepting credit cards”, right?

Well, true, this was the original idea of the founders. This is what they thought, and this is what they did.

However, with this idea, their ambitious startup couldn't close even one sale!

Fortunately for humankind, they didn't give up. They observed carefully and came to the realization that their idea was something else. As per Jack Dorsey, it's plugging a shopkeeper into the economy and enabling them to make sales - more sales, more effortless sales.

The paradox is, it's really difficult to understand how in the world such a swap of ideas can do anything for the company. After all, isn't the bottom line in them just enabling us to take credit cards?

The truth is, the power of ideas can't be understood theoretically. You have to go through it. You have to tangibly feel the energy of the ideas and how great ideas generate power.

According to Jack Dorsey, once they perceived the new idea, the world suddenly became so much bigger, so many more opportunities suddenly showed up, invisible just moments before. They started making sales. The idea affected marketing, sales, operations, offerings, everything.

Later on, when Square capital was born, a business in a business, the idea was simple again: lending, loans. What else in the world could it be?

Yet, this idea couldn't possibly work. For many reasons. Careful observation brought another idea into the world: “borrowing from a friend or a relative”.

This idea changed everything. The difference was astounding. A subtle distinction between borrowing from a bank and borrowing from a friend created a new market.

### **Steve Jobs (Apple)**

Steve Jobs revolutionized the world many times over. Yet, there was one idea, one specific concept that he developed early in life, that powerfully directed him, enabling him to see and achieve what nobody else was able to see and achieve. Again, and again. This very concept manifested itself in every stormy revolution he brought about.

He eloquently expressed this idea himself, more than once. But it wasn't so easy to extract it from everything else he said, as he said many things!

What was the concept?

A computer has immense power which can be unleashed to solve your problems. But there is one big problem between you and your computer - you have to learn how to use it. Once you overcome it, the sky is your limit. This barrier must be gradually diminished, and eventually removed altogether. Removing this barrier is the priority.

Technology is able to incorporate more and more power into a computer, yet the major barrier between you and that power remains in place. We want to take that extra power and apply it toward making your interaction with a computer go smoother and easier. Eventually, the barrier will be completely removed.

Steve Jobs presented this concept on the dawn of the computer era, and remained laser-focused on it until his last day. It's really simple: taking the extra, constantly added power and use it to break the barrier. This will enable you to access the rest of the computer power intuitively and effortlessly.

“Ah, it's just user interface, why is it a big deal? Everybody was busy with user interface after all!”

No, it's not about user interface. The difference between ideas is subtle and profound. While others were busy with user interface, Steve Jobs

was precisely about taking the added power and using it to break the barrier. The more the power grew, the more of that power we could take and use exclusively to break that very barrier. Steve Jobs was very limited by the power a computer had. He was very perceptive to this, and anticipated the increase in that power, which allowed him to break the barrier more and more, and even to have the solution ready by the time the additional power “arrived”.

Decades ago this concept was hardly appreciated or understood. It took many difficult years and a few revolutions. The new generation now takes it for granted that an infant is literally using an iPhone or an iPad to communicate with the parents, play games, or browse media archives way before learning how to speak, without any learning curve whatsoever.

The core difference between Steve Jobs and everybody else was in internalizing this concept, making it a priority, being loyal to it, and being intensely focused on it all the time. It was this difference that powered Apple II, Macintosh II, iMac, PowerBook, iBook, MacBook, iPod, iTunes, iPhone, and iPad.

### **Sergei Brin, Larry Page (Google)**

Sergei Brin was obsessed with the idea of making all the world's information accessible and useful. Larry Page was obsessed with downloading all the web. Both ideas were in the world of fantasy. They were unreal and unreachable at the time. Sundar Pichai summarized it later as organizing the world's information.

These are not slogans. These are actual ideas that made all the difference.

You may wonder, weren't Jerry Yang and David Filo obsessed with the same very ideas when they created Yahoo?

The answer is, no! Their idea was the idea of the guide, and all they created was the guide. They wanted to guide you through the web. No guide can masterfully guide you through the WHOLE world! The difference is subtle indeed, yet it's immense.

Open Text crawled the web, just like Google does, but on the conceptual level “the-whole-web” ambition was missing. Interestingly, this manifested in the official change of focus - they successfully evolved into enterprise search solutions. However, this change was rather an acknowledgement of what they really were to begin with, without being fully aware of it!

Being busy with lower-level ideas like guiding, curating, listing or categorizing, couldn't possibly match Google's idea. And when your idea is different, your motivation and vision are different, and your solutions are different.

### **Mark Zuckerberg (Facebook)**

Mark Zuckerberg looked at the web, and asked a simple question: “Where are people here?”

He was the first one to ask this question. He was also the first one to take this question seriously.

Ordinary people expressing themselves on the web and connecting with each other via the web is all there is to Facebook. Once you become obsessed with such an idea, and you are intelligent and have good technical skills, you have no choice but to come up with Facebook.

The progression of ideas was logical: from representing people, to connecting people, to connecting friends, families, and groups, to bringing the world closer together, to giving people the power to build community to bring the world closer together. Building a community is a new idea, and it's a great one indeed.

If Mark Zuckerberg became obsessed with the idea of organizing the world's information, he would probably come up with Google. If Sergey Brin and Larry Page became obsessed with the idea of connecting people, they would probably come up with Facebook. But, of course, the ideas are not random. The root of the ideas people become obsessed with comes from inside, from their background and personality, from their worldview and their intellectual and emotional thirst.

Interestingly, Google's attempt to compete with Facebook failed. Why?

On the surface, Google+ was just too confusing for users. With Facebook's simplicity, it didn't have a chance.

However, this has to be understood deeper, because all Google products - with possibly one exception, Google+ - are insanely simple and intuitive to use. Simplicity is Google's credo! So, what happened to Google+? And why?

What happened was quite simple though. Google didn't bother to come up with any new ideas. Google decided to make a better Facebook. In fact, this was their definitive idea, whether they were aware or unaware.

If they had simply copied Facebook, they would, in fact, have succeeded. They would indeed have created something better than Facebook. Because they are Google!

To their bad fortune, they saw Google+ as a "better Facebook", and that "better", in their own minds, forced them to overcomplicate things and create something quite convoluted that couldn't possibly successfully compete with the simplicity of Facebook.

Here is the lesson: a sure recipe for failure is to copy somebody's idea, and then try to make a better implementation. It may only work if the one you are copying is doing something wrong, something really deficient. But if they are doing it right, you are doomed to fail, even if you are Google!

### **Jeff Bezos (Amazon)**

Yes, Amazon is about great selection, low prices, fast and reliable delivery, but... The one idea Jeff Bezos was really obsessed with, was the idea of a happy customer. Everything else was details and implementation.

This is not to be taken lightly. This is not a marketing slogan. This is what Amazon really is – "happy customer generator"!

What about Barnes & Noble?

Their idea was, and is: “selling books”. As simple as that. They tried, but failed to formulate any other great idea, hence they remained who they were - booksellers. This doesn't diminish Barnes & Noble at all; it's a great company and book-lovers love Barnes & Noble for a good reason - they love to touch books, and they love to buy books. It's such a poor and limited world when you view it in terms of winners and losers. Just because one company's market share is more, that by itself doesn't make the other company a loser!

What about Walmart?

Sam Walton said, “The secret of successful retailing is to give your customers what they want”.

Is this the Walmart's idea?

Well, yes and no. Yes - because Sam Walton meant it. And no - because their understanding of what a customer wants is limited to a low price. Everything else is secondary.

And if you disagree, just shop on Amazon, and then shop in Walmart - online or offline. You'll tangibly feel the difference between the ideas.

On a side note, Jeff Bezos took advantage of the Internet at the right time. But if he didn't, if he went into brick & mortar, or anything else for that matter, with the same obsession about a happy customer, he would also, without a shadow of a doubt, experience astounding success. He would also change the world, but we now can't figure out how exactly the world would be different. Fortunately for us, he did it on the Internet, and created Amazon, the amazing phenomenon that changed our lives so much.

### **John Legere (T-Mobile)**

With John Legere, you don't have to go too far in search of the idea. It's simple: Uncarrier! No authority matters. Rebellion. Bravery. Fearless. Fixing stupid, broken industry. Fierce opposition to Dumb and Dumber. It's all included in the brilliant term - uncarrier, which says it all.

I don't know if T-Mobile is better these days than it used to be. From my personal experience, at least in pre-John-Legere era, it was pretty bad.

But on the marketing landscape, with John Legere, the new concept behind T-Mobile transformed the company indeed.

Let me bring another example of an idea from John Legere.

First of all, I want to state clearly that I disapprove and disrespect this idea. And I am partly bringing this example to make this statement. Yes, it's brilliant indeed, though morally corrupt and intellectually dishonest.

T-Mobile came up with the plan that includes Mexico and Canada. John Legere called it Anti-Trump campaign, implying crossing the borders.

Besides being morally corrupt and intellectually dishonest, this idea demonstrates a very important principle. Definitive ideas define the companies, but at the same time, different units, parts, branches, divisions, products, various aspects or even campaigns should ideally have their own explicit ideas, under the umbrella of the main idea. And all the ideas should be interconnected in some meaningful way.

In this example, extending the area of service to Mexico and Canada is surely profitable to T-Mobile. This is not charity. Yet, extending the service is a poor concept. Not catchy. A much better concept is crossing the borders. Yet better is disregarding the borders. Even "better" is using the concept of crossing and disregarding the borders to insult the president.

I would suggest the next step for John Legere – declaring the United Unstates of America. This will take T-Mobile even higher, harmonize with Uncarrier, and surely bring plenty media attention, ultimately benefiting shareholders. After all, what else matters?

Generally, the higher a level of abstraction of an idea, and the simpler an idea is, the better.

## **Edward W. Stack (Dick's Sporting Goods)**

In this case, the idea becomes crystal clear from the very story that led to the creation of the business.

Dick Stack was working in a local store. He loved fishing, and the owner requested Dick to bring a full list of fishing supplies. Dick enthusiastically composed the list, but the store owner rejected it, adding a negative comment. Dick grabbed the piece of paper with his list, and walked out.

No, he didn't create the business when he walked out. His grandmother did. By telling him, "Dick, always follow your dreams", she effectively created a future Fortune 500 corporation. After the encouraging words and a generous \$300 "donation", he opened a storefront.

He carried fishing supplies, but if we dig for the definitive idea, we have to go a bit deeper. The idea is rooted in the conflict between Dick and his former employer. Dick knew what fishermen needed, the employer did not. His intuition failed him. The intuition of an outsider won't make him into a professional, yet, the employer was sure that he knew better than Dick.

This is it: professional counter-intuitive, skill-based, and experienced-based knowledge of what's needed, what can help, what's good - in this particular case in the fishing niche.

Later on, the company extended to other niches, and eventually became "sporting goods" retailer. Unfortunately, this generic term does a disservice, because it no longer encapsulates the essence. "Sporting" is just too wide. Besides, focusing on the concept of "sports" makes Dick's main suppliers into competitors.

The essence, and the definitive idea has never changed since the time Dick Stack quit his job. But it extended to other niches - baseball, biking, hiking, golfing, kayaking, hunting, camping, running, and so on. Pay attention - it's not just sports. It's more about active lifestyle, with the focus on one particular activity, be it sports or something else. But, what's more important it it's counter-intuitive, skill-based, experience-

based knowledge - focusing on ONE NICHE AT A TIME. By taking it too wide - sporting goods retailer - they lose their advantage.

This is exactly the reason why the company is nervous about Nike, Under Armour, and Adidas selling directly to consumers. Competitors!

Well, the company itself made its major suppliers into competitors by focusing on the wrong concept. The company is misaligned with its definitive idea, presumably without being consciously aware of it.

Well, that's Dick's. But surely Nike, Under Armour, and Adidas compete, don't they?

Yes, they do. But they don't have to. Companies like to jump into the same very idea, without extending a real effort to define themselves, and then they fiercely compete with each other, fighting for market share.

The definitive concept that we are talking about is always unique. It's a unique concept that uniquely defines and identifies. Even if we go as wide as sports overall, consider the following concepts that may lead to different business activities, unique marketing messages, and distinct customer base:

- Sports is important.
- Sports is everything.
- Passion for sports.
- Better performance.

If there were four "sports" companies, with each company picking one of the four concepts and aligning itself with it, all four companies would most probably thrive, even though inevitably one of them would have the biggest market share, while the other one would have the smallest market share.

## **Mission or vision?**

A definitive concept that we are talking about is NOT a vision, and is NOT a mission. It's just a concept. The central concept. On a level of a company, it defines the company. On a level of a company's unit, a branch, a product, an initiative, a campaign, or anything else for that matter, it defines whatever that is, and interplays with the main company's concept.

A vision is about the future, about the end result, destination.

A mission is about the impact on the society.

Of course, both, vision and mission, do correlate to the definitive concept; they have to, yet they are not it.

A company can be successful with or without explicitly perceived and formulated ideas, yet, without a shadow of a doubt, an explicitly perceived and formulated idea can take a company to the next level. Better alignment with a good idea inevitably increases the revenue and minimizes the expenses, hence making the company more profitable.

Sometimes the idea needs to be found.

Sometimes extracted.

Sometimes created.

Sometimes corrected.

Sometimes refined.

Sometimes perfected.

But never copied.

Are you ready to define yourself, to find your definitive idea, and to align all the activities with the idea, taking your life, and your business to the next level?

---

**I'm inviting you to a conversation about your business, your industry, your competitive strategy and advantage, your unique idea, your value chain, your customers' value structure, your risks and uncertainties, your milestones, your opportunities, your problems and objectives and the best strategies that will solve your problems and meet your objectives.**

**<https://vladtseytkin.com/contact>**

---