

BA (Hons) Leadership and Management Skills for The Workplace

Student name: Mark Samuels

Student number: 2318279

Module code: LCLM6002

Lecturer: Rexton Nting

Course name: design and Thinking

Session: June 2026 term

Beyond Fragmentation: Applying
Systems Theory and Design Thinking
Logistics in the UK SME Sector Contents

1. Introduction	
2. Strategic Landscape: Opportunity Areas in the UK Market	
• 2.1 The Friction of Expectations: Market Gaps	
• 2.2 Technological Enablers and Drivers	
• 2.3 Viability and Scalability	
• 2.4 The Economic Context of Rural and Suburban Fragmentation	
• 2.5 Systems Theory and the 'Information Silo' Effect	
• 2.6 The Hostile Marketplace and Incumbent Rigidity	
2. Design Thinking: Empathizing and Defining the Challenge	
• 3.1 Empathizing: The Anatomy of Friction	
• 3.2 Defining Root Causes: Progressive Abstraction	
3. Ideation and Venture Concept Development	
• 4.1 Ideation: The Morphological Approach	
• 4.2 Prototyping: The Minimum Viable Product (MVP)	
• 4.3 The Innovation Logic: Systems Integration	
4. Testing, Refinement, and Strategic Viability	
• 5.1 Systemic Validation: The VSM Homeostasis Test	
• 5.2 The Innovation Pipeline: Stage-Gate Governance	
• 5.3 Strategic Viability and Risk Management	
5. Conclusion	
6. References	

1. Introduction

COVID-19 did not simply interrupt UK commerce, it pushed it into a faster digital shift that had already been forming beneath the surface, but which suddenly became unavoidable, especially for SMEs built on physical presence, face-to-face service, and local dependency, where operations were re-routed almost overnight without planning or structural preparation; WhatsApp became a sales channel, social media effectively replaced the shopfront, and cloud-based tools filled basic coordination gaps, as the boundary between local trade and digital infrastructure blurred into something less defined, less stable.

But the transition was uneven, and that matters, because what emerged was not a clean digital transformation but a patchwork of tools stitched together under pressure, often functional in the short term yet structurally weak when viewed as a system, with many SMEs relying on disconnected platforms that do not scale properly or integrate cleanly with logistics, customer management, or forecasting needs, especially in rural contexts where delivery density is low and operational friction remains high.

Now the urgency has faded, but the system has not reset, and businesses are left operating inside those early choices, still dependent on emergency-built digital workflows that were never designed for long-term efficiency or coherence; attention has shifted towards sustainability and design quality rather than basic adoption, with increasing pressure on firms to move beyond surface-level digital presence, beyond simple booking tools or social media activity, toward systems that actually resolve structural inefficiencies instead of masking them.

This portfolio examines that shift through Design Thinking as both method and lens, linking human-centred analysis with established innovation frameworks to map where the UK market currently fails to serve real operational needs, and where viable opportunities for new ventures exist, then translating those insights into structured concept development using Stanford's five-stage model; the work is split into two parts, first a mapping of market gaps, technological enablers, and constraints, and second an application of Design Thinking to shape a scalable venture concept grounded in those findings.

The core argument sits underneath the analysis, simple but firm, innovation is not just about technology being available, it depends on whether human need, operational structure, and commercial logic align in practice, and when they do not, systems may function on the surface but remain inefficient underneath.

2. Strategic Landscape: Opportunity Areas in the UK Market

The UK post-pandemic commercial environment sits inside a wider cycle of what (Schumpeter, 1942) described as 'creative destruction', where older retail and service structures collapse under pressure while new digital configurations attempt to replace them, though not always cleanly or efficiently; what began as a need-pull response during lockdown disruption has since stabilised into something more systemic, where digital tools are no longer optional but embedded into everyday commercial practice (Trott, 2017), even if the integration remains uneven across sectors and geography.

2.1 The Friction of Expectations: Market Gaps

The most persistent gap sits in last-mile delivery, or more precisely the mismatch between consumer expectations and SME capability, where customers now expect near-instant, platform-level convenience shaped by large logistics incumbents, while independent producers continue to operate through fragmented, manual systems that were never designed for scale or coordination; using Beer's Viable System Model, this can be read as a breakdown in coordination and autonomy, where smaller firms lack the systemic structure to manage logistics efficiently in isolation (Checkland & Scholes, 1999), and the result is not just inefficiency but structural disadvantage.

And this is where the friction becomes visible in practice. SMEs often rely on ad hoc coordination through messaging platforms or informal ordering systems, which creates what can be described as a fragmentation trap, information is scattered, demand signals are weak, and delivery planning becomes reactive rather than predictive, plus the cost per delivery rises disproportionately in low-density areas where route optimisation is poor or absent; a venture opportunity therefore exists in building a coordination layer that aggregates local demand, aligns supply, and reduces logistical inefficiency through shared infrastructure rather than isolated effort.

2.2 Technological Enablers and Drivers

The current innovation environment is shaped by a convergence of knowledge-push technologies, particularly AI-driven predictive systems and API-based cloud infrastructure, alongside need-pull pressures driven by regulation, sustainability targets, and ESG reporting requirements (Trott, 2017), where compliance is no longer peripheral but increasingly central to operational design; SMEs are being pushed into digital transformation not only for efficiency, but because environmental accountability now requires measurable optimisation of logistics and supply chains.

Besides this, technological capability has shifted in a way that makes coordination systems more feasible than before, with predictive analytics enabling route optimisation, demand

forecasting, and reduction of 'dead miles', while system-level integration allows small actors to behave collectively without losing individual autonomy; within this context, Miller's systems theory becomes relevant, particularly the idea of maintaining balance or 'homeostasis', where efficiency is not just output driven but system-sustaining (Miller, 1979), especially in environments where fragmentation previously made coordination too costly to implement.

2.3 Viability and Scalability

Scalability in this environment depends less on ownership of infrastructure and more on orchestration, specifically Platform-as-a-Service models that reduce entry barriers while enabling distributed participation, and this aligns with Cooper's Stage-Gate model, where strategic fit and iterative validation determine whether an innovation can move beyond concept into sustainable deployment (Cooper, 2011); the key constraint is not technological feasibility but whether the system can be adopted across fragmented, low-density markets without requiring heavy capital investment from individual actors.

And this is where Blue Ocean thinking becomes relevant, not as theory alone but as practical positioning, since competing directly with established logistics giants such as Evri or DPD is structurally unrealistic for small ventures, instead the opportunity lies in creating a parallel space focused on hyper-local coordination, shared delivery infrastructure, and community-level aggregation of demand (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005); the model depends on leveraging existing assets rather than building new ones, which reduces cost, increases adaptability, and avoids direct confrontation with scale-heavy incumbents, though it also introduces dependency on network participation and behavioural alignment across users.

2.4 The Economic Context of Rural and Suburban Fragmentation

The split between urban and rural commercial performance is not just geography or population density, it reflects a deeper structural imbalance in how digital markets have evolved, where cities absorb most of the innovation flow while rural areas sit outside the main circulation of investment, infrastructure, and logistics development; urban centres benefit from dense venture capital activity and highly optimised delivery systems, yet rural markets remain thinly served, producing what can be described as a logistics divide that shapes who can realistically participate in digital commerce and who cannot.

And the effects are not neutral; they compound over time. Producers in rural areas face higher friction in reaching customers even when demand exists, particularly as consumer behaviour shifts toward ethical purchasing and 'buy-local' preferences that are structurally hard to fulfil in low-density regions; at the same time, consumers are pushed back toward mass-produced, centralised supply chains simply because local fulfilment is inefficient or unavailable, which creates a contradiction between values and access, preference and practicality.

So, the economic cost sits on both sides, lost market potential for SMEs, and reduced access to sustainable consumption for consumers, plus increased reliance on carbon heavy logistics

networks that reinforce existing centralisation. Any viable innovation model has to treat this rural–urban divide not as background context but as a core design variable, something the system is built around rather than something it tries to smooth over.

2.5 Applying the Design Thinking Framework

To move from a broad market analysis to a practical venture concept, the Stanford Design Thinking framework provides the core methodology, creating a structured process that translates market gaps into human-centred solutions rather than technology-led assumptions.

The process begins with **Empathize**, focusing on the experiences of rural producers and suburban consumers to understand both the operational and personal impact of fragmented logistics systems. Rather than relying on demographics alone, this stage identifies the day-to-day friction, inefficiency, and burnout created by existing delivery models.

The **Define** stage then applies progressive abstraction to separate symptoms from root causes, producing a focused "How Might We" statement that frames the challenge as one of system coordination rather than simply improving delivery services.

With the problem established, **Ideate** uses morphological analysis (Zwicky, 1948) to explore alternative logistics models, leading to a decentralised, community-based network instead of a conventional warehouse-centred approach. The concept deliberately moves away from existing industry assumptions.

The solution is then developed through a low-fidelity **Prototype**, where a concierge style Minimum Viable Product (MVP) simulates node-based fulfilment without requiring major investment, allowing demand patterns and operational flow to be tested before large-scale development begins.

Finally, **Test** combines the Stage-Gate Model (Cooper, 2011) with Beer's Viable Systems Model (1985), exposing the MVP to real operational conditions while treating failures as feedback for continuous refinement rather than indicators of project failure.

Using this framework keeps every stage of development grounded in iteration and evidence, ensuring the final venture responds to genuine user needs instead of becoming another example of knowledge-push technology without practical value.

3. Design Thinking: Empathising and Defining the Challenge

Innovation in the post-pandemic UK context often stays shallow, digital tools get added on, but the underlying system barely changes, so you get surface upgrades without structural shift, which is exactly why Design Thinking is used here as an entry point rather than decoration, it forces attention back onto lived experience, operational friction, and the gaps between what systems promise and what they actually deliver.

3.1 Empathising: The Anatomy of Friction

The core issue starts with fragmentation of effort, especially for rural producers who now rely on WhatsApp, Instagram, and similar informal channels to manage orders, which at first looks flexible but quickly becomes restrictive; information sits inside disconnected message threads, scattered across time and platforms, and that creates a kind of operational blur where demand cannot be properly tracked, forecasted, or structured into usable inventory logic, plus the producer shifts role gradually, from maker to informal logistics manager, often without recognition or compensation.

On the other side, rural consumers face a different but linked problem, a convenience gap shaped by low delivery density and weak logistical coverage, where large-scale providers prioritise high-volume routes and ignore dispersed demand zones, leaving users in a position where ethical preference for local goods conflicts with practical access to delivery systems; this produces what can be described as constrained choice, not lack of interest, but lack of infrastructure support to act on that interest consistently.

Using Miller's Living Systems Theory, the breakdown becomes clearer at a structural level, particularly in information processing, where producers cannot reliably communicate availability in real time, and consumers cannot interrogate or respond to that availability in a structured way (Miller, 1979), so the system fails not at intention but at coordination, and that distinction matters.

3.2 Defining the Root Causes: Progressive Abstraction

Moving from symptoms to structure requires stripping back layers until only the system failure remains visible, starting with the obvious symptom, rural businesses cannot provide fast or consistent delivery, which appears operational but is downstream of deeper constraints.

At the next level, the functional barrier is cost and inefficiency, where low order volumes and fragmented delivery coordination make each journey disproportionately expensive, especially in dispersed geographies where routing cannot be optimised effectively.

From this, the core challenge becomes clearer and is framed through the How Might We approach, not as a slogan but as a constraint definition that still leaves space for design:

"How might we design a collaborative, hyper-local logistics ecosystem that uses existing community assets to aggregate dispersed demand, enabling rural SMEs to achieve urban-level delivery efficiency without losing their independent and artisanal identity?"

This shifts the problem framing from individual business failure to system design failure, and that change is important, because it moves the focus from fixing shops to redesigning the coordination layer itself, where the real leverage sits.

4. ideation and venture concept development

To transcend the limitations of the current fragmented digital landscape, we must avoid the temptation of incrementalism. Instead, we employ a strategy of radical business innovation, fundamentally reconceiving the supply chain from a centralized, incumbent-dominated model to a decentralized, peer-to-peer ecosystem.

System / Framework	Application in this Venture	Strategic Value
Morphological Analysis	Breaking logistics into: Coordination (Centralized vs. P2P), Asset Ownership (Private vs. Community), and Fulfilment (Warehouse vs. Node).	Maps all possible solutions; avoids the "obvious" path by forcing exploration of P2P/Community nodes.
Soft Systems Methodology (SSM)	Mapping the "problem situation" (Stage 2) of rural SMEs, from fragmented WhatsApp use to systemic failure.	Ensures the venture addresses the <i>social</i> reality (shopkeeper trust) not just the technical code.
Miller's Living Systems	Diagnosing the "Information Silo" as a failure of the Decider and Channel/Net subsystems.	Provides a biological justification for why the platform must act as an "information integrator."
Stage-Gate Model	Moving from Discovery → Gate 1 (Idea) → Gate 3 (Development) → Gate 5 (Launch).	Demonstrates professional rigor; reduces investment risk at each developmental milestone.

4.1 Ideation through Morphological Analysis

The ideation stage applies morphological analysis (Zwicky, 1948) to split the logistics problem into distinct dimensions rather than treating it as one fixed system, so Coordination Architecture, Asset Ownership, and Fulfilment Logic are separated, examined in parallel, then recombined into structured configurations that can be tested against real operational constraints; within this setup, coordination can be centralised or distributed, ownership can be proprietary or community-shared, and fulfilment can be warehouse-based or node-based, which opens a full solution space rather than narrowing the design too early.

And once these variables are combined, most options fail under practical pressure.

That structure is the Distributed Node Exchange (DNE), which moves logistics away from traditional hub-and-spoke courier dependency and instead embeds fulfilment into existing local infrastructure, where every day retail spaces, especially corner shops, are repositioned as functional logistics nodes rather than passive commercial points; this reframing matters because it converts existing capacity into operational infrastructure without requiring heavy new investment.

There is also a biological analogy used here, deliberately, not as decoration but as structure, where the system resembles a circulatory network with distributed nodes managing local flow while coordination happens across multiple points rather than a central hub, reducing the bottlenecks and failure risks typically associated with last mile delivery in rural contexts; in this sense, the DNE is not just a digital layer on retail, it is a redistribution of logistical responsibility across a self-organising network.

4.2 Prototyping: The Minimum Viable Product (MVP)

Following the Inspire–Ideate–Implement cycle (IDEO, 2020), the MVP is deliberately reduced to its core function, testing whether aggregated local demand can operate as a viable system before any large-scale infrastructure is built, because complexity is deferred until evidence justifies it, not before.

The Producer Portal is designed for speed and low friction, mobile-first, minimal interaction, allowing inventory updates in one action or near-one action use, often in environments that are not digitally structured such as farms or back-room retail spaces, where cognitive load and time constraints are high and inconsistent input methods would otherwise break adoption.

The Node Dashboard sits inside participating corner shops and acts as a coordination and dispatch point, but also as an incentive structure, since shopkeepers receive commission for acting as consolidation hubs; it is evaluated through desirability, feasibility, and viability at the point of interaction rather than as abstract criteria, because adoption depends on lived practicality not theoretical fit.

The Consumer Interface abstracts the entire backend complexity into a single basket experience, where products from multiple independent suppliers appear unified, even though they originate from distributed nodes, which is important because user experience depends on perceived simplicity, not system visibility.

Crucially, the MVP avoids immediate reliance on automated routing systems, instead using a “wizard-of-oz” approach where coordination is initially manual, allowing real demand patterns to emerge before committing to high-cost algorithm development; this aligns with Cooper’s Stage-Gate Model (2011), where progression through Gate 2 and Gate 3 is conditional on validated real-world performance rather than assumption driven scaling.

4.3 Strategic Innovation Logic: Why This Concept Succeeds

The Distributed Node Exchange works because it avoids the common trap of overbuilding technology before confirming system demand, instead responding directly to need-pull pressure in the UK market, particularly the demand for reliable home delivery in areas that are structurally underserved, while resisting the knowledge-push tendency to construct complex logistics infrastructure too early.

And this separation matters. It changes timing and risk.

Through parallel product development, both the digital platform and the physical node network evolve together, which reduces lag between system design and operational reality, and improves time-to-market without requiring full upfront integration; organisationally, this also increases adaptability, as described by Trott (2017), since responsiveness becomes embedded in structure rather than added later.

The economic logic is simple but structural, bundling reduces per-unit delivery cost, shared nodes reduce infrastructure burden, and community participation turns logistics from a pure cost centre into a distributed utility, which reframes last-mile delivery not as a weakness but as a collectively sustained function within the local economy.

5. Testing, Refinement, and Strategic Viability

Moving the Distributed Node Exchange (DNE) beyond prototype stage requires more than interface testing or basic functionality checks, it needs system-level stress testing that looks at how the whole architecture behaves under pressure, not just isolated components; innovation here is cyclical rather than linear, as Trott (2017) notes, so feedback loops are continuous, feeding refinement through governance structures and ongoing system evaluation rather than discrete testing phases.

Simple testing breaks down at this point. The system is too interconnected.

So, the evaluation framework combines Stage-Gate governance with the Viable Systems Model (VSM), using both to assess whether the DNE can survive both real-world conditions and simulated stress scenarios, not just whether it performs in controlled environments.

5.1 Systemic Validation: The VSM Homeostasis Test

Using Stafford Beer's (1985) Viable System Model, the DNE is treated less as a platform and more as an adaptive system with interdependent subsystems, where viability depends on whether coordination, information flow, and adaptation remain balanced under environmental complexity, not just whether outputs are efficient in isolation.

The system is assessed across three levels of performance.

Actuality refers to current performance, so the basic test is whether the DNE can coordinate real deliveries within a 24-hour window using existing community transport, while also exposing where rural variability disrupts consistency; pilot results here form a baseline, not just for success measurement but for identifying fragility in the coordination layer under real constraints.

Capability shifts to potential performance under pressure, particularly through AI supported routing and demand forecasting, where simulated peak conditions such as seasonal spikes are used to identify saturation points before they occur in reality; this functions less as prediction and more as stress mapping for system limits.

Potentiality focuses on long-term survival under disruption, including scenarios such as aggressive pricing from incumbents or sudden demand shifts in key regions, testing whether the system can reroute and reconfigure without losing its core function; in VSM terms, this is about whether homeostasis holds under hostile environmental change.

Across all three levels, the DNE is treated as a living, open system following Miller's (1979) interdependent subsystem logic, where breakdowns in information flow between producer, node, and consumer are not treated as failure events but as diagnostic signals that guide adjustment in API structure and coordination logic.

Failure becomes signal rather than collapse. A feedback mechanism.

This reframes the DNE as a self-correcting system rather than a static platform, capable of maintaining stability while adapting to disruption, even under conditions of creative destruction as described by Schumpeter (1942).

5.2 The Innovation Pipeline: Stage-Gate Governance

As mandated by Cooper's (2011) *Stage-Gate* model, we treat the pilot not as a launch, but as a critical entry point to 'Gate 4: Go to Testing.' This gate-based governance protects the venture from "scope creep" and ensures that financial resources are only committed when the system proves it can handle the load.

Gate	Focus	Testing Method	Success Metric
Gate 3	Proof of Concept	"Wizard-of-Oz" prototyping	< 5% logistics failure rate
Gate 4	Market Testing	A/B testing of consumer app interface	20% growth in local shop footfall
Gate 5	Launch Strategy	Scaling to 10+ node locations	Maintain < 10% delivery cost per unit

5.3 Strategic Viability and Risk Management

Long-term viability is then assessed through Blue Ocean Strategy (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005), focusing on how value creation and cost reduction interact when infrastructure is shared rather than individually owned, since community nodes reduce delivery overhead while increasing perceived convenience for consumers and income opportunities for shopkeepers, which shifts the value-cost curve rather than simply optimising within it.

And this creates the defensive layer. Not impenetrable, but resistant.

Because while a large firm can replicate software or infrastructure models, it cannot easily replicate embedded local relationships, and that becomes the strategic moat of the DNE, where viability is not just technical performance but the integration of system design with social structure, making the venture less vulnerable to direct replication and more stable within its niche operating environment.

6. Conclusion

The trajectory of the UK digital economy, when viewed through Design Thinking, has already moved beyond adoption as advantage, it is no longer a differentiator, it is a baseline condition for survival across nearly all commercial sectors, yet the speed of this transition has left behind a fractured landscape where systems exist, but rarely integrate cleanly or equitably; digitisation happened fast, structure lagged behind, and the result is uneven rather than coherent.

What emerges from this analysis is not a shortage of technology, but a mismatch in how it is deployed, especially in relation to SMEs and rural markets, where platforms have often replicated centralised urban logic instead of responding to low-density, distributed conditions; through the Stanford Five-Stage Design Thinking framework, combined with systems-based analysis, it becomes clear that viable innovation sits less in building larger platforms and more in coordinating what already exists, reshaping relationships between actors rather than replacing them.

The Distributed Node Exchange (DNE) sits within that shift, not as a product in isolation but as a structural reconfiguration of local economic activity, where independent retailers are repositioned as functional nodes within a wider logistics system, effectively addressing last-mile inefficiencies while also reinforcing local commercial ecosystems that were previously operating under fragmented and underutilised capacity; it is a system redesign, not just a service layer.

Across the methodological frameworks applied—Stage-Gate governance, Beer’s Viable System Model, and morphological analysis of logistics architecture—the same pattern appears, that feasibility is not the limiting factor, but coordination is, and once coordination is treated as the core design problem, the viability of distributed, community-embedded systems becomes not only possible but strategically coherent in environments where incumbents struggle with rigidity and scale dependency.

Ultimately, digital transformation in the UK context is less about technological accumulation and more about organisational intelligence, requiring a shift in mindset where technology is treated as infrastructure to be arranged rather than a product to be delivered, and where successful systems depend on the integration of Head, Heart, and Hand, analytical design capability, empathy for operational strain, and the practical ability to implement lean but scalable models in real environments.

Looking forward, the most resilient commercial structures will likely be those that embed themselves deeply into local contexts while remaining digitally interoperable at scale, balancing systemic efficiency with human-centred design, and adapting continuously rather than locking into rigid forms, especially in a market environment that remains unstable, uneven, and still in transition.

9. references

- Beer, S. (1985) *Diagnosing the System for Organizations*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Brown, T. (2009) *Change by Design: How Design Thinking Transforms Organizations and Inspires Innovation*. New York: Harper Business.
- Check land, P. (1981) *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Check land, P. and Scholes, J. (1999) *Soft Systems Methodology in Action*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Christensen, C.M. (1997) *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Cooper, R.G. (2011) *Winning at New Products: Creating Value Through Innovation*. 4th edn. New York: Basic Books.
- IDEO (2020) *Design Thinking Process*. Available at: <https://designthinking.ideo.com/> (Accessed: 28 June 2026).
- Kim, W.C. and Mauborgne, R. (2005) *Blue Ocean Strategy: How to Create Uncontested Market Space and Make the Competition Irrelevant*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Liedtka, J. and Ogilvie, T. (2011) *Designing for Growth: A Design Thinking Tool Kit for Managers*. New York: Columbia Business School Publishing.
- Miller, J.G. (1979) *Living Systems*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Porter, M.E. (1985) *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Stanford d. School (2020) *An Introduction to Design Thinking Process Guide*. Available at: <https://dschool.stanford.edu/> (Accessed: 28 June 2026).
- Trott, P. (2017) *Innovation Management and New Product Development*. 6th edh. Essex: Pearson.