

AA Framework Comparison		
Framework	How AA Aligns	What AA Adds
<b>OKRs (Objectives &amp; Key Results)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared emphasis on clarity, alignment, and measurable movement.</li> <li>Both require surfacing constraints and focusing attention on what matters.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mechanical visibility into actual motion vs. performative progress (Motion Barometer).</li> <li>Trust conditioning to prevent false commitments (Trust Aperture).</li> <li>Decision mechanics that prevent OKRs from becoming political or ritualized.</li> </ul>
<b>EOS (Entrepreneurial Operating System)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both create shared language, structure, and cadence.</li> <li>Both emphasize clarity of roles, priorities, and accountability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A deeper mechanical model of pressure, motion, and decision.</li> <li>Tools that work in complex, cross-domain environments where EOS oversimplifies.</li> <li>A non-moralized trust system that avoids “right people, right seats” framing.</li> </ul>
<b>Lean</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared focus on flow, waste reduction, and real-time feedback.</li> <li>Both value visibility of constraints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A human-systems mechanical model explaining why flow breaks down.</li> <li>Tools for psychological and relational constraints (pressure, trust, motion).</li> <li>A governance-safe altitude model (Altimeter) Lean does not provide.</li> </ul>
<b>Agile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both emphasize iteration, responsiveness, and adaptive planning.</li> <li>Both reject heavy upfront design in favor of learning loops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A cross-domain mechanical model that works outside software.</li> <li>Trust conditioning that prevents Agile ceremonies from becoming hollow.</li> <li>A decision mechanic clarifying when to stop negotiating and decide.</li> </ul>
<b>Design Thinking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared emphasis on empathy, reframing, and iterative discovery.</li> <li>Both value exploration before solutioning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A structural model for why groups fail to move from insight to decision.</li> <li>A mechanical sequence (Separate → Run → Reveal) that prevents premature convergence.</li> <li>Trust and motion mechanics that Design Thinking lacks.</li> </ul>
<b>Situational Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both recognize leadership must adapt to context.</li> <li>Both acknowledge varying levels of readiness and capability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A non-style-based mechanical model.</li> <li>Tools diagnosing system pressure, not individual deficits.</li> <li>A governance-safe altitude model preventing micromanagement.</li> </ul>
<b>Prosci ADKAR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both address readiness, resistance, and adoption.</li> <li>Both emphasize clarity, communication, and reinforcement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mechanical model for why change stalls (pressure, trust, motion).</li> <li>Tools that operate at enterprise, team, and individual altitudes simultaneously.</li> <li>A structural alternative to “resistance” narratives.</li> </ul>
<b>PfMP (Portfolio Management Professional)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both focus on prioritization, alignment, and resource allocation.</li> <li>Both require visibility across initiatives and constraints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mechanical model for decision-making under pressure.</li> <li>Trust conditioning that prevents portfolio decisions from becoming political.</li> <li>A motion model revealing when a portfolio is stuck vs. moving.</li> </ul>

<b>Appreciative Inquiry (AI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared emphasis on human systems, participation, and surfacing what enables movement.</li> <li>• Both use inquiry to reveal conditions rather than blame individuals.</li> <li>• Both value clarity, shared understanding, and co-created insight.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools that move teams from discovery to decision</li> <li>• A governance-safe altitude model that prevents over-indexing on positivity when the real issue is structural.</li> </ul>
<b>Cynefin</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both recognize that different domains require different responses.</li> <li>• Both emphasize sense-making and avoiding oversimplification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical, repeatable method for moving groups through complexity, not just labeling it.</li> <li>• Tools that operationalize movement (Motion Barometer) and trust (Aperture) inside complex/chaotic domains.</li> <li>• A decision mechanic that prevents analysis paralysis in the “complex” quadrant.</li> </ul>
<b>Donor-Centered Fundraising (Burk)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared emphasis on trust, clarity, and reducing friction.</li> <li>• Both reject transactionalism and focus on donor experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical trust model (Aperture) instead of intuition.</li> <li>• A motion model that distinguishes real movement from “stewardship activity.”</li> <li>• A decision mechanic that prevents endless cultivation loops.</li> </ul>
<b>Moves Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both track progression and readiness.</li> <li>• Both require clarity of next steps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A non-linear motion model that replaces rigid step ladders.</li> <li>• Trust-conditioning to prevent false “readiness” signals.</li> <li>• A pressure model that explains donor hesitation without moralizing.</li> </ul>
<b>Donor Journey Mapping</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both emphasize sequencing, clarity, and experience design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical model for why journeys stall.</li> <li>• A governance-safe altitude model (Board → CEO → Org → Program → Individual).</li> <li>• A structural alternative to funnel thinking.</li> </ul>
<b>Collective Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both emphasize alignment, shared purpose, and coordinated action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical model for cross-domain motion.</li> <li>• Trust-conditioning that prevents coalition collapse.</li> <li>• A decision mechanic that Collective Impact never solved.</li> </ul>
<b>Theory of Change / Logic Models</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both require clarity of inputs, activities, and outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical model for decision-making under pressure.</li> <li>• A trust and motion model that ToCs lack.</li> <li>• A way to diagnose altitude confusion (Board vs CEO vs Program).</li> </ul>
<b>Flywheel (Jim Collins)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both emphasize momentum, clarity, and reinforcing loops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanical definition of motion (not metaphorical).</li> <li>• A trust model that prevents false momentum.</li> <li>• A pressure model that explains why flywheels stall.</li> </ul>
<b>Fundraising Funnel / Pipeline</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both acknowledge stages and progression.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A non-funnel, non-linear motion model.</li> <li>• A trust tool that prevents “top of funnel bloat.”</li> <li>• A pressure model that explains donor drop-off.</li> </ul>
<b>RFM (Recency, Frequency, Monetary)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both value clarity and segmentation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A structural model for why donors behave the way they do.</li> <li>• A trust and motion overlay that RFM cannot capture.</li> <li>• A cross-altitude model that reveals where the real constraint lives.</li> </ul>