

SRD Application Playbook v0.7.0

SRD Application Playbook

How any practitioner applies Signal-Response Distance in their own engagement work

Document Version: 0.7.0 **Status:** Inaugural release — replaces the prior *Strategic Architecture Playbook v0.6.0* (relocated to engagement-only practice materials) **Updated:** 2026-06-09 **Source paper:** *Signal-Response Distance: A Diagnostic Construct for AI-Era Organisational Responsiveness* (Olivier 2026, Working Paper v0.3) **Publisher:** Soaring Wings (Pty) Ltd

Reading This Playbook

This Playbook is the **methodology surface companion** to the SRD source paper. The paper specifies the diagnostic construct (what it is); the Playbook specifies how a practitioner applies it (how it runs).

It is scoped deliberately. This Playbook covers SRD application — how any practitioner (independent consultant, internal architect, transformation advisor, academic researcher) runs an SRD diagnostic in their own context. It does **not** cover Soaring Wings's commercial consulting practice, pricing structure, engagement archetypes, or partner-channel framing. Those belong to the practice, not the methodology, and live in engagement-only materials.

The structure has six parts:

- **Part A — Foundations.** The EE theoretical grounding that the diagnostic rests on and the SRD construct as built.
- **Part B — The Engagement Protocol.** The five-phase application protocol from signal selection through consequentiality follow-up.
- **Part C — Diagnostic Disciplines.** The methodological disciplines that distinguish a real SRD diagnostic from a structured opinion (anti-confirmation gate, inter-analyst reproducibility, threshold operationalisation).
- **Part D — The Anti-Overreliance Triad.** The AI-era discipline that prevents diagnostics from confirming themselves when AI augments the analyst.
- **Part E — Patterns of SRD Application.** Engagement-typed and quadrant-derived patterns that have surfaced across applications to date.
- **Part F — Open Questions & Research Agenda.** What's still unknown; the v0.8 / v1.0 commitments.

Citation discipline. Any concept, theory, or framework that originates outside the SRD framework is cited at first substantive mention, with the chapter or section of the source named. The Lineage block at the end of this Playbook lists all references. The §A theoretical grounding draws extensively on Dietz & Mulder (2024); the SRD construct itself is specified in Olivier (2026); the §D anti-overreliance discipline is anchored on Dell'Acqua et al. (2026).

Part A: Foundations

The substrate the SRD diagnostic rests on. Foundations rarely change; they shape how every application of the framework is delivered.

A.1 — The SRD Construct

Signal-Response Distance is a measurable construct for the elapsed time between the moment a strategically-relevant signal becomes available in an organisation’s environment and the moment the organisation’s response is committed and observable. The construct is operational, not conceptual: the existing strategy literature has named the importance of organisational responsiveness across forty years (Stalk on time-based competition; Boyd on the OODA loop; Haeckel on sense-and-respond; Teece on dynamic capabilities; Eisenhardt on speed of decision-making; Cohen & Levinthal on absorptive capacity; Snowden on signal complexity) but the temporal gap that responsiveness depends on has been consistently named without being instrumented.

SRD provides the measurement instrument: decomposed across three primary intervals (detection, interpretation, implementation), placed against signal complexity in a four-quadrant diagnostic matrix, and anchored in the six-stock capability stack derived from dynamic-capabilities and absorptive-capacity literatures.

Full construct specification: Olivier 2026 (Working Paper v0.3).

A.2 – The Six-Stock Capability Stack

The response moves through six capability stocks before it actually lands. Each has its own delay. The total response distance is the sum.

1. **Sensing** – recognising the signal arrived. (*Lineage: Teece 2007.*)
2. **Acquisition** – taking in the information that changes the picture. (*Lineage: Cohen & Levinthal 1990, potential absorptive capacity.*)
3. **Assimilation** – turning information into something actionable. (*Lineage: Cohen & Levinthal 1990, realised absorptive capacity. Most “stuck transformations” have an Assimilation problem disguised as something else.*)
4. **Seizing** – committing resource and authority. (*Lineage: Teece 2007.*)
5. **Reconfiguring** – changing structure and process to respond. (*Lineage: Teece 2007. Longest-cycle stock.*)
6. **Reflexive** – learning whether the response worked. (*Lineage: Argyris on double-loop learning, anchored in capability terms.*)

Executives usually assume the bottleneck is Seizing. More often it’s Assimilation or Reflexive. The diagnostic forces measurement before assumption.

A.3 – The Diagnostic Matrix

Each measured signal is classified by response distance × signal complexity into one of four quadrants:

	Low complexity	High complexity
Short SRD	Q1 – Well-Instrumented	Q2 – Augmented Frontier
Long SRD	Q3 – Instrumentation Gap	Q4 – Slow-Complex Zone

Quadrant placement is the diagnostic’s compressed output. Each quadrant has a distinct intervention prescription. Misplacement is the most expensive error the diagnostic produces; placement-protocol discipline (§C.4) is what guards against it.

A.4 – EE Theoretical Foundation

Attribution. §A.4 derives from Dietz, J. L. G. & Mulder, H. B. F. (2024). *Enterprise Design: Fundamentals – Settling an Enterprise Business and Devising the Enterprise Organisation*. The Enterprise Engineering Series. Cham: Springer Nature.

No theory in this section is original to the Playbook. The SRD contribution at §A.4 is the engagement protocol that uses the EE theory set as analytical machinery for the diagnostic; the engineering contribution at §A.5 is the EssentialModelKit implementation. Each theory below names the source chapter inline.

The EE theory set (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §4.4) specifies eleven interlocking theories of which four are load-bearing for SRD application:

PSI Theory (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §4.4.4 + §7)

Performing in Social Interaction. Frames organisational coordination as transaction patterns (request, promise, execution, accept) between actors. Used in SRD diagnosis to decompose response-chain failures into coordination primitives: a missing promise, a request without acceptance, a broken execution chain. PSI-decomposed analysis surfaces structural fragilities that signal-response delay measurements alone cannot.

ALPHA Theory (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §4.4.7 + §8)

The *organisational essence theory*. Distinguishes the essential model of an organisation from its implementation. Provides the four-layer abstraction (O-Original, I-Informational, D-Documental, M-Material) that anchors where each SRD chain point operates: the I-Layer is where $t_0 \rightarrow t_1$ (detection) and $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ (interpretation) live; the D and M layers carry implementation latency.

TAO Theory (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §4.4.3 + §5)

The *function-construction theory*. Separates business *function* (affordances offered) from *construction* (how the artefact is built). Used inside SRD diagnostics to identify where organisations have over-coupled response function to legacy construction, producing structural delay.

OMEGA Theory (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §4.4.6 + §7)

Modular coordination-structure theory. Applied when an SRD diagnostic identifies that the binding constraint requires structural redesign rather than incremental compression.

DEMO Methodology (Dietz & Mulder 2024, §11)

Design and Engineering Methodology for Organisations. The methodological packaging that operationalises the EE theory set. The EssentialModelKit corpus referenced in §A.5 is the operational implementation of DEMO concepts.

The full theoretical chapters of PSI, ALPHA, TAO, OMEGA and DEMO are specified in Dietz & Mulder (2024) and not reproduced here.

A.5 — Operational Implementation

The **Essential Model** that the Soaring Wings reference platforms load at launch is the operational implementation of §A.4 inside working software. Following the DEMO methodology and Organisational Essence Revealing (OER) method, the methodology repository holds 155 concepts across the PSI / ALPHA / TAO / OMEGA partitions, 44 relationships, 12 competency questions, 5 JSON schemas, and a 66-fixture action-rule corpus.

The Soaring Wings contribution at §A.5 is the engineering implementation — the schema design, the rule corpus, the coordination-fact ledger with hash-chain integrity verification — applied to the Dietz & Mulder theory set. The theory itself is cited, not claimed.

Repository: `/EssentialModel/` in the Soaring Wings methodology repo.

Part B: The Engagement Protocol

How an SRD diagnostic runs. Five phases. Each phase produces something the next phase depends on. Nothing produced for its own sake.

B.1 — Signal Selection

The opening discipline. One costly-and-absorbable signal-response chain, picked deliberately. The diagnostic depends on the signal being non-trivial; signal selection determines whether the engagement is rigorous or theatrical.

Decision criteria for a load-bearing signal:

1. **Costly** — the signal-response chain has real economic, operational, or strategic consequences. Trivial signals produce trivial diagnostics.

2. **Absorbable** — the organisation can plausibly respond within a meaningful window. Signals with no response option produce findings the organisation cannot act on.
3. **Bounded** — the chain has identifiable t_0 (signal arrival), t_1 (recognition), t_2 (interpretation), t_3 (decision), t_4 (response committed). Unbounded chains produce unmeasurable distance.
4. **Recent** — the chain is from the current strategic window. Historical chains drift outside the contemporary window assumption (cf. SRD-and-AI window contraction).

Common signal classes:

- Competitive: a competitor strategic move requiring response within an industry cycle.
- Customer: a behaviour-pattern shift requiring product or operating-model response.
- Regulatory: a regulatory change requiring compliance posture response.
- Internal: an operational performance signal requiring intervention before tail-risk realises.

Output: A named signal-response chain, scoped, with t_0 anchored.

Handoff to B.2: The chain definition + t_0 anchor + window estimate.

B.2 — Delay Diagnosis

The measurement phase. Delay profile across the six capability stocks for the named chain. Measured, not assumed.

Method:

- Interviews with actors at each chain point. The interviews are structured against the PSI transaction pattern (request, promise, execution, accept) to surface where coordination acts actually broke.
- Artefact review: governance trace, decision-log review, action-item tracking, retrospective documentation.
- Time-stamping: each chain point's t-value anchored against observable artefacts where possible.

The discipline against confirmation: the diagnostic must measure each stock independently. Pre-committing to a binding-constraint hypothesis before measurement contaminates the diagnostic. The anti-confirmation gate (§C.1) is the formal control.

Output: A delay profile — t-values per stock — with the evidence each value rests on. Inter-analyst reproducibility verification (§C.2) where multiple analysts have measured.

Handoff to B.3: The delay profile + evidence trail.

B.3 — Bottleneck Finding

The interpretation phase. Naming the binding constraint — the place leadership wasn't looking.

Method:

- The binding constraint is whichever stock has the largest measured-vs-window ratio, not the largest absolute delay. A 4-week delay in a 6-week window is more constraining than an 8-week delay in a 26-week window.
- Triangulation (§C.5): the binding finding is cross-checked against at least one of: a parallel signal-response chain at the same organisation; a known industry comparator; the engagement's own consequentiality follow-up if a prior diagnostic exists.

The Anti-Confirmation Output 3b discipline: the diagnostic must produce a stated alternative interpretation that, if correct, would invalidate the binding-constraint finding. The engagement deliverable includes Output 3b as a first-class artefact, not a defensive appendix.

Output: Named binding constraint + Output 3b alternative interpretation + the disconfirming signal that would surface if the alternative is correct.

Handoff to B.4: The binding constraint + Output 3b.

B.4 — Intervention Design

The prescription phase. Re-sequenced actions that fit existing capability and authority.

Method:

- The intervention targets the binding constraint specifically. Capability investment in non-binding stocks is wasted budget at best, load-adding at worst.
- The intervention is designed to fit within the current operating model unless §A.4 ALPHA/TAO analysis has surfaced that the binding constraint requires structural redesign.
- The intervention is **resequenced**, not additive. Most SRD findings produce re-ordering of the existing programme, not new programmes.
- Quadrant-specific prescriptions: Q1 protect what works; Q2 invest in augmentation layer with anti-overreliance discipline; Q3 fix the measurement pathway (re-route, don't re-build); Q4 distinguish pathology from posture before prescribing.

Output: Intervention specification + sequencing recommendation + the specific quadrant placement that justifies the intervention shape.

Handoff to B.5: The intervention design + the consequentiality measurement framework.

B.5 — Consequentiality Review

The anti-confirmation discipline applied across time. 6- and 12-month follow-up of what changed, what didn't, and what the diagnostic missed.

Method:

- Pre-engagement commitment to the consequentiality follow-up cadence. Engagements without committed follow-up cannot claim SRD-diagnostic status (§C.6).
- At each follow-up: the diagnostic claim is evaluated against the observed outcome. Where the claim survives, it strengthens; where it doesn't, it's amended or retracted.
- The follow-up is honest: positive outcomes that the diagnostic predicted strengthen the claim; positive outcomes that the diagnostic did *not* predict are flagged as the diagnostic having missed something; negative outcomes test the diagnostic against the alternative interpretation from Output 3b.

Output: A consequentiality record that lives with the engagement permanently. Findings that the consequentiality review disconfirms get amended in the Pattern Library (Part E) rather than quietly retired.

Handoff: Engagement closes; pattern record opens.

Part C: Diagnostic Disciplines

The methodological disciplines that distinguish a real SRD diagnostic from a structured opinion. Each discipline addresses a specific failure mode the framework alone does not prevent.

C.1 — The Anti-Confirmation Gate

A diagnostic that produces only confirmation of leadership's existing hypothesis adds no information. The anti-confirmation gate is the formal discipline against this failure mode.

Specification:

1. The diagnostic must produce **Output 3** (the binding-constraint finding) **and Output 3b** (an alternative interpretation that, if correct, would invalidate Output 3).
2. Output 3b must specify the **disconfirming signal** that would surface if the alternative interpretation is correct.
3. The engagement deliverable carries both Output 3 and Output 3b as equal-weight artefacts.

This is the SRD methodology's load-bearing falsifiability standard. Full specification in Olivier 2026 §6.1.

C.2 – Inter-Analyst Reproducibility

The diagnostic's measurement claim depends on whether two trained analysts, independently applying the protocol to the same chain, produce comparable delay profiles. If they don't, the measurement is not a measurement.

Specification:

- Where engagement scope permits, two analysts measure independently and reconcile after.
- Agreement metrics: Cohen's κ for categorical assignments (state classifications, coupling shapes, status zones); intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) for continuous t-value differences.
- Where agreement is low, the protocol is the suspect, not the analysts. The protocol gets amended; the engagement's confidence interval widens accordingly.

Full specification in Olivier 2026 §6.7.

C.3 – Threshold Operationalisation

Every measurement threshold must be operationally defined before measurement begins. What counts as “signal arrived”? What counts as “response committed”? What counts as “implementation observable”? Where these thresholds are left implicit, analyst disagreement masquerades as diagnostic disagreement.

Specification:

- Each chain point t_0 through t_4 has a written threshold definition.
- The threshold definition is shared across analysts before measurement.
- The threshold definition is included in the engagement deliverable so consequentiality follow-up can hold the threshold steady.

Full specification in Olivier 2026 §2.3.

C.4 – Signal-Identification & t_0 Anchoring

The single most-distorted measurement is t_0 — the moment the signal “arrived.” Without protocol discipline, t_0 drifts retrospectively: a signal the organisation eventually responded to is dated back to when the responder was hired, not when the signal was actually available.

Specification:

- t_0 is anchored against observable external artefacts where possible: a competitor announcement, a regulatory filing date, a customer-cohort behaviour shift visible in the organisation's data feed.
- Internal t_0 classes (intra-organisational signals) require their own protocol — the originator's first artefact, the first internal mention with date-stamp, the first explicit recognition.
- t_0 disagreement between analysts is itself diagnostic information about the organisation's Sensing capability.

Full specification in Olivier 2026 §2.0 and §2.7.

C.5 – Within-Engagement Triangulation

The diagnostic's binding-constraint finding for a single signal-response chain is strengthened when triangulated against at least one independent reference:

- A parallel signal-response chain at the same organisation (different signal, same operating model).
- A known industry comparator with measured SRD on a similar signal.
- A prior engagement's consequentiality follow-up at the same organisation.

Single-chain diagnostics carry a stated confidence note acknowledging the absence of triangulation; engagements scoped for multiple chains apply the triangulation method explicitly.

Full specification in Olivier 2026 §6.5.

C.6 — Consequentiality Follow-Up

Already specified in §B.5 as a phase. Re-emphasised in §C.6 as a discipline: an engagement that does not commit to 6- and 12-month consequentiality follow-up cannot claim SRD-diagnostic status. The follow-up is the methodology's accountability mechanism against the diagnostic confirming itself in absence of contact with reality.

Full specification in Olivier 2026 §6.1.

Part D: The Anti-Overreliance Triad

The AI-era discipline that prevents diagnostics from confirming themselves when AI augments the analyst. Each of the three disciplines addresses a specific failure mode that AI-augmented knowledge work produces.

Empirical anchor. Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland III, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Kraye, L., Candelon, F. & Lakhani, K. R. (2026). *Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier*. *Organization Science* 37(2): 403–423. DOI 10.1287/orsc.2025.21838. A pre-registered randomised field experiment with 758 BCG consultants demonstrating that AI assistance produces materially different outcomes inside vs outside an invisible “jagged” capability frontier. Inside-frontier tasks gain +33.9% quality / +12.2% completion / +25.1% faster; outside-frontier tasks lose 19 percentage points correctness while AI makes the wrong answers more persuasive (+17.9–25.1% subjective coherence quality on incorrect outputs).

The methodology gap the Triad closes: anti-confirmation defences (§C.1 and the Pattern Library disconfirming-signal gate) are always-on but undifferentiated — they treat every AI-augmented task as equally risky. The Dell'Acqua finding establishes that AI-augmented knowledge work is not uniformly risky. The Triad adds **frontier-position uncertainty** as a prior-stage defence — an ex-ante estimate that an AI-augmented task is inside, at-edge, or outside the AI tool's capability frontier — and routes low-confidence outputs to additional scrutiny before they enter the engagement chain.

D.1 — Frontier-Position Awareness

Naming, for each decision class, whether you're inside or outside the model's reliable zone. Treating that judgement as a first-class governance artefact, not an unstated assumption.

Specification:

- For each AI-augmented task in the engagement chain, the practitioner names: inside-frontier (high confidence the model handles this), at-edge (uncertain), outside-frontier (high confidence the model doesn't reliably handle this).
- The frontier-position estimate is refreshed at the cadence of the underlying capability shift — for fast-moving model capabilities, at engagement start; for stable tasks, quarterly.
- Outside-frontier and at-edge outputs are routed to additional scrutiny (D.2 disconfirming-signal authoring) before entering the engagement chain.

D.2 — Disconfirming-Signal Authoring

For each AI-assisted output, producing in advance the specific signal that would indicate the output is wrong. Looking for it. Acting on it when it appears.

Specification:

- The discipline lives in *writing the signal down before the answer arrives*. Authoring disconfirming signals after the AI output exists is too late — the answer biases the authoring.
- Each disconfirming signal has an observable indicator the practitioner can check.
- Where the disconfirming signal surfaces during the engagement, the corresponding AI-assisted output is treated as suspect and rerun through human-only analysis.

D.3 — Anti-Confirmation Review

Periodic structured review of where AI was wrong and the organisation didn't catch it. Honest learning loops, instrumented at the reflexive stock level.

Specification:

- The review's value is in admitting what was missed; the format that doesn't permit admission produces no learning.
- The review is engagement-portfolio-level, not engagement-specific: patterns of AI failure across engagements compound into Pattern Library entries (Part E).
- The review feeds the methodology's own consequentiality discipline: where AI-assisted findings have proved wrong, the Pattern Library carries the amendment.

Full specification: Playbook §D.7 (this section) cross-references Olivier 2026 §6.8 (the SRD source paper's frontier-position uncertainty amendment).

Part E: Patterns of SRD Application

How learning from one SRD application compounds into the next. Two cuts: engagement-typed patterns (what the application looks like on the surface) and quadrant-derived patterns (what the application is structurally).

E.1 — Engagement-Typed Patterns

Recurring application shapes that have surfaced across multiple engagements. Each is a way an SRD diagnostic typically opens:

- **Instrumentation-rich, response-poor applications.** Organisation has signals, dashboards, reports — but the path from signal to decision is broken. SRD typically diagnoses Q3 (Instrumentation Gap).
- **Authority-lagged transformation applications.** Diagnostic is right, recommendation is sound, decision rights have not moved with the strategy. SRD typically surfaces a Seizing-stock binding constraint with operating-model coupling.
- **Strategy-visible, architecture-invisible applications.** Strategy articulated, architecture nowhere in the conversation. SRD typically diagnoses the gap as an absent assimilation layer with strong sensing.
- **Capability-map-complete, execution-stalled applications.** Every capability mapped, execution still hasn't moved. SRD typically reveals a Reflexive-stock binding constraint — the organisation isn't learning from its own response cycles.

E.2 — Quadrant-Derived Patterns

The three published deep patterns (currently on the methodology surface as `/patterns/*`):

- **Augmented Frontier (Q2).** The strategic prize. Where AI investment lands hardest and the upside justifies the discipline required to avoid the downside.
- **Instrumentation Gap (Q3).** Simple signal, slow organisation. The fix is in the measurement pathway. Cheaper than the executive team expected.
- **Slow-Complex Zone (Q4).** Where most strategic failure lives — and where some organisations operate deliberately. Distinguishing pathology from posture before the intervention matters.

The Well-Instrumented (Q1) pattern is forthcoming; v0.8 release pack will include it.

E.3 — Pattern Library Discipline

Patterns enter the Library provisionally when they surface in a single application. They graduate to confirmed status when they recur across two or more independent applications with consequentiality follow-up confirming the diagnostic call. They become **methodology principles** only when they recur across three or more unrelated applications with cross-sector or cross-scale variation.

Patterns that fail the disconfirming-signal gate (§C.1) get amended or retired. The Library is a working archive, not a manifesto.

Part F: Open Questions & Research Agenda

What's still unknown. The honest version, dated.

F.1 — Empirical Contact Pending

The SRD source paper v0.3 refines the construct against two prospective applications (KAP Industrial Holdings, federated holding company; OMBank, tier-2 South African bank) and against a structured peer-review pass. The construct's empirical depth is still narrow.

Commitments:

- v0.4: empirical depth broadens with a third anchor application (in scope for 2026-Q3).
- v0.5: structured Cohen's κ inter-analyst measurement applied to at least one engagement.
- v1.0: cumulative empirical record of at least five completed applications with consequentiality follow-up.

F.2 — Theoretical Extension Candidates

The v0.4 absorption candidate: System Dynamics (Forrester / Sterman) as the primary lineage anchor. The argument: the SRD framework is structurally System-Dynamics-in-disguise; the t-state space is stocks; the t-intervals are delays; the diagnostic matrix is a phase plane. v0.4 candidate flagged in the source paper; absorption pending evaluation against engagement application.

The v0.5 absorption candidate: high-reliability organisations / crisis-response / mindfulness literatures (Weick & Sutcliffe 2007; LaPorte & Consolini 1991; Weick & Roberts 1993). Detection-side antecedents of $t_0 \rightarrow t_1$ under uncertainty. Flagged in Olivier 2026 §3; absorption pending an application context that surfaces high-reliability or crisis-response framing.

F.3 — Methodological Discipline Gaps

Open methodological questions the Playbook does not yet have a position on:

- **Cross-cultural validity.** All applications to date are South African. Whether the diagnostic protocol holds in cultures with materially different decision cadences (Japanese ringi, Northern European consensus, US-public-company quarterly) is empirically open.
- **AI-era window-contraction parameters.** §A.3 places signals against the window; how fast windows are actually contracting in different sectors is unmeasured.
- **Sector specificity.** Financial services applications dominate the empirical record. Sector-specific calibration libraries are not yet built; the Playbook treats this as a v0.8+ workstream.

F.4 — Engagement & Contribution

Reviewers, practitioners, and partners are invited to:

- Apply the diagnostic and surface where the protocol fails or surprises.
- Propose pattern additions to the Pattern Library based on field application.
- Submit critical readings of the working paper and Playbook for substantive review.

Methodology enquiries: contact@soaringwings.ai. Consulting engagements that apply the framework commercially: ajolivier.com.

Lineage & References

Inline citations throughout this Playbook point to the entries below. Concepts and sections without an inline citation are this work's contribution. The Playbook applies a citation asymmetry: **cite what is derived; claim only what was produced.**

Load-bearing sources for §A

Dietz, J. L. G. & Mulder, H. B. F. (2024). *Enterprise Design: Fundamentals — Settling an Enterprise Business and Devising the Enterprise Organisation*. The Enterprise Engineering Series. Cham: Springer Nature. The entirety of §A.4 (the EE theory set: PSI, ALPHA, TAO, OMEGA, DEMO) derives from this source.

Olivier, A. (2026). *Signal-Response Distance: A Diagnostic Construct for AI-Era Organisational Responsiveness*. Working Paper v0.3. Soaring Wings Consulting. The SRD construct specification this Playbook applies (§A.1, §A.2, §A.3, the engagement protocol in Part B, the diagnostic disciplines in Part C).

Load-bearing source for §D

Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland III, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Kraye, L., Candelon, F. & Lakhani, K. R. (2026). Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier. *Organization Science* 37(2): 403–423. DOI 10.1287/orsc.2025.21838. The empirical anchor for the Anti-Overreliance Triad in Part D.

Six-stock stack lineage (§A.2)

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 28(13): 1319–1350. Sensing / Seizing / Reconfiguring as the meta-capabilities; the upstream framing for stocks 1, 4, 5.

Cohen, W. M. & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35(1): 128–152. Potential and realised absorptive capacity — the structural framing for stocks 2 and 3.

Argyris, C. (1976). Single-loop and double-loop models in research on decision-making. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21(3): 363–375. Double-loop learning anchored in the Reflexive stock (stock 6).

Supporting sources

- **Gibson, J. J. (1979).** *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. The affordance theory Dietz & Mulder draw on in §5.2 of *Enterprise Design: Fundamentals*.
- **Forrester, J. W. (1961).** *Industrial Dynamics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **Sterman, J. D. (2000).** *Business Dynamics: Systems Thinking and Modeling for a Complex World*. Boston: McGraw-Hill / Irwin. The System Dynamics lineage referenced in §F.2 as the v0.4 absorption candidate.
- **Weick, K. E. & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007).** *Managing the Unexpected: Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. The high-reliability organisations literature referenced in §F.2 as the v0.5 absorption candidate.

Full reference list — including Stalk, Boyd, Haecel, Eisenhardt, Snowden, Pentland, Galbraith, Langley, Helfat, Pavlou & El Sawy, Wilden, Baum & Wally, LaPorte & Consolini, Zahra & George — is held in Olivier 2026 (SRD source paper, §10 References) and not reproduced here.

Citation discipline statement

This Playbook applies the following attribution rule: any concept, theory, or framework that originates outside the SRD methodology must be cited at first substantive mention, with the chapter/section of the source named. Practitioner formulations (the five-phase engagement protocol, the diagnostic disciplines, the EssentialModelKit implementation) are not cited because they are this work's contribution. Reviewers and partners are invited to surface uncited concepts that should be attributed; the Playbook treats every such correction as a v0.x.x patch release.

Source of truth:

/Users/andreolivier/Documents/00_GitHub/09_SoaringWings_Methodology/Playbook/SRD_Application_Playbook.md

Companion paper:

/Users/andreolivier/Documents/00_GitHub/09_SoaringWings_Methodology/Papers/SRD/SRD_v0.3.md **Maintainer:**

Andre Olivier (AJ Olivier — practitioner; Soaring Wings (Pty) Ltd — publisher) **Version history:** CHANGELOG.md in repo root