

assessment and evaluation to provide strategy recommendations to optimize the performance of the target business. In some embodiments, the system may identify a benchmark competitor and determine a performance score for the benchmark competitor. In some embodiments, the system may determine a domain score of an identified benchmark competitor. In some embodiments, the system determines an updated performance score based on provided capability process data. In some embodiments, the system recommends solutions and/or KPI to solve a provided problem. In some embodiments, the system provides a platform to enable stakeholders, (*e.g.*, users) in the target business to perform a design thinking process.

[0004a] According to an aspect of the present disclosure, there is provided a method including: providing problem data, the problem data including information associated with a problem of a target business; providing pain-point and solution data, wherein: the pain-point and solution data including a pain-point and a solution associated with the problem, and at least one of the pain-point and the solution is provided by a subject matter expert; comparing the problem data to the pain-point and solution data, wherein the comparing the problem data to the pain-point and solution data comprises matching the pain-point to the problem; identifying the solution associated with the pain-point, the solution associated with the problem matched to the pain-point; determining whether or not the solution is associated with a key performance indicator (KPI), the KPI being at least one of: a solution KPI and a pain-point KPI; providing a recommendation of the KPI, when the solution is associated with the KPI; and forgoing the recommendation of the KPI, when the solution is not associated with the KPI.

Brief Description of the Drawings

- [0005] FIG. 1 illustrates a system, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0006] FIG. 2 illustrates a system, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0007] FIG. 3 illustrates a flowchart of an exemplary operation of a system, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0008] FIG. 4 illustrates a flowchart of an exemplary target business assessment process, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0009] FIG. 5 illustrates a flowchart of an exemplary competitor assessment process, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0010] FIG. 6 illustrates a flowchart of an exemplary competitor assessment process, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0011] FIG. 7 illustrates an exemplary data, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0012] FIG. 8 illustrates a flowchart of an exemplary factor analysis process, according to embodiments of this disclosure.
- [0013] FIG. 9 illustrates a graphical representation of an exemplary priority vector, according to embodiments of this disclosure.

CLAIMS

1. ~~A method comprising:~~
~~identifying at least one attribute associated with a target business, wherein the~~
~~at least one attribute corresponds to a business industry;~~
~~receiving performance data related to competitors of the target business, the~~
~~competitors being in the business industry;~~
~~wherein the performance data includes the at least one attribute and~~
~~performance variables, the at least one attribute and the performance variables~~
~~associated with the competitors;~~
~~determining factor weights, each of the factor weights corresponding to each~~
~~performance variable, wherein the determining the factor weights comprises:~~
~~determining at least one factor based on the performance variables;~~
~~determining eigenvalues corresponding to each of the factors;~~
~~selecting a first set of the factors based on a factor threshold;~~
~~applying a factor rotation to the first set of factors;~~
~~determining at least one variance associated with the first set of~~
~~factors; and~~
~~determining a first set of the factor weights based on the factor rotation~~
~~and the at least one variance;~~
~~determining multiple criteria decision analysis and analytic hierarchy process~~
~~(MCDA-AHP) weights, each of the MCDA-AHP weights corresponding to each of~~
~~the performance variables, wherein the determining the MCDA-AHP weights further~~
~~comprises:~~
~~generating a pairwise comparison matrix;~~
~~normalizing the pairwise comparison matrix; and~~
~~determining the MCDA-AHP weights by performing a first operation~~
~~on the normalized pairwise comparison matrix;~~
~~determining adaptive weights based on the factor weights and the MCDA-~~
~~AHP weights;~~
~~applying each of the adaptive weights to each of the performance variables for~~
~~each competitor;~~

determining a performance score for each of the competitors, the performance score for each of the competitors being based on the adaptive weights and the performance variables, wherein the performance score for each of the competitors is a quantization representative of a performance of a respective competitor; and

selecting a benchmark competitor based on the performance scores of the competitors.

2.——The method of claim 1, wherein the determining the factor weights and the determining the MCDA-AHP weights are in parallel.

3.——The method of claim 1, wherein the determining the factor weights further comprises:

generating a correlation matrix based on the performance variables of the competitors; and

removing at least one of the performance variables, the at least one of the performance variables having a correlation coefficient less a correlation threshold.

4.——The method of claim 1, further comprising:

pre-processing the performance data by performing at least one selected from: managing outliers, standardizing the data, and addressing data gaps.

5.——A method comprising:

identifying competitors of a target business, the competitors including at least one benchmark competitor and one or more non-benchmark competitors, wherein the competitors and the target business operate in a business industry;

receiving unstructured data associated with the competitors; and

processing the unstructured data to produce processed data, the processing the unstructured data comprising:

separating the unstructured data by domains of the target business to produce domain-structured data associated with each of the competitors; and

for each of the domains, separating the domain-structured data by least one of: a positive sentiment and a negative sentiment, wherein the separating the domain-structured data results in the processed data;

for each of the domains:

~~training a respective domain model using the processed data, the
processed data associated with the one or more non-benchmark competitors;
applying the domain-structured data to the respective domain model;
and~~

~~determining a domain score for the at least one benchmark competitor,
the domain score based on the domain-structured data.~~

6.——~~The method of claim 5, wherein the unstructured data comprises
qualitative data, and~~

~~wherein processing the unstructured data comprises:~~

~~separating the unstructured data into components using natural
language processing (NLP);~~

~~associating the components of the unstructured data to the domains, the
associating based on at least one keyword identified in each of the components
to produce the domain-structured data; and~~

~~associating each component of the domain-structured data with a positive
sentiment or a negative sentiment.~~

7.——~~The method of claim 5, further comprising:~~

~~dynamically selecting the domain model based on at least one of: accuracy,
the processed data, computation costs, and functionality.~~

8.——~~The method of claim 5, wherein the applying the domain-structured
data comprises:~~

~~applying the domain-structured data of the benchmark competitor; and~~

~~determining at least one of a positive or a negative sentiment associated with
the domain-structured data of the benchmark competitor.~~

9.——~~A method comprising:~~

~~providing assessment data, the assessment data including information
associated with assessments of a target business and performance drivers;~~

~~providing capability process data, the capability process data including
information associated with processes of the target business and the performance
drivers;~~

~~identifying domains of the target business in the assessment data;~~
~~identifying the domains of the target business in the capability process data;~~
~~for each of the domains in the assessment data and for each of the assessments of the target business, determining numbers of occurrences of the performance drivers in the assessment data;~~
~~for each of the domains in the capability process data and for each of the processes of the target business, determining numbers of occurrences of the performance drivers in the capability process data;~~
~~for each of the assessments of the target business, determining assessment data performance driver weights, wherein the determination of each of the assessment data performance driver weight is based on an occurrence number of a respective performance driver for each of the assessments;~~
~~for each of the processes of the target business, determining capability process data performance driver weights, wherein the determination of each of the capability process data performance driver weights is based on an occurrence number of a respective performance driver for each of the processes;~~
~~for each of the domains and each of the performance drivers, determining a respective assessment data aggregate performance driver weight, wherein the determination of the respective assessment data aggregate performance driver weight is based on the assessment data performance driver weights associated with each of the performance drivers;~~
~~for each of the domains and each of performance drivers, determining a respective capability process data aggregate performance driver weight, wherein the determination of the respective capability process data aggregate performance driver weight is based on the capability process data performance driver weights associated with each of the performance drivers;~~
~~for each of the domains and for each of the performance drivers, determining deviations between the assessment data aggregate performance driver weights and the capability process data aggregate performance driver weights;~~
~~determining a net deviation based on the deviations;~~
~~determining an initial performance score of the target business based on the assessments of the target business; and~~
~~determining an updated performance score of the target business based on the net deviation and the initial performance score of the target business.~~

~~10. —The method of claim 9, wherein the performance drivers include at least one of cost, quality, and time.~~

~~11. —The method of claim 9, wherein:
the determining the numbers of occurrence of the performance drivers in the assessment data comprises using NLP to identify the performance drivers in the assessment data; and~~

~~the determining the numbers of occurrence of the performance drivers in the capability process data comprises using NLP to identify the performance drivers in the capability process data.~~

~~12. —The method of claim 9, further comprising identifying the processes in the capability process data.~~

~~131.~~ A method comprising:
providing problem data, the problem data including information associated with a problem of a target business;
providing pain-point and solution data, wherein:
the pain-point and solution data including a pain-point and a solution associated with the problem, and
at least one of the pain-point and the solution is provided by a subject matter expert;
comparing the problem data to the pain-point and solution data, wherein the comparing the problem data to the pain-point and solution data comprises matching the pain-point to the problem;
identifying the solution associated with the pain-point, the solution associated with the problem matched to the pain-point;
determining whether or not the solution is associated with a key performance indicator (KPI), the KPI being at least one of: a solution KPI and a pain-point KPI;
providing a recommendation of the KPI, when the solution is associated with the KPI; and
forgoing the recommendation of the KPI, when the solution is not associated with the KPI.

~~142~~ The method of claim ~~131~~, wherein the comparing the problem data and the pain-point and solution data further comprises using NLP to match the pain-point to the problem.

~~153~~. The method of claim ~~131~~, further comprising:
determining whether or not an effectiveness of the solution to the problem is below an effectiveness threshold;

disassociating the solution with the problem, when the effectiveness of the solution to the problem is below the effectiveness threshold; and

forgoing the disassociating the solution with the problem, when the effectiveness of the solution to the problem is not below the effectiveness threshold.

~~164~~. The method of claim ~~131~~, wherein the solution is associated with a domain of the target business, further comprising:

presenting the solution;

receiving an input to filter out the presentation of second information associated with the domain; and

in response to the receiving the input to filter out the presentation of information associated with the domain, ceasing the presentation of the solution.

~~17. A method comprising:~~

~~adopting a problem statement;~~

~~generating an influence map comprising:~~

~~receiving first data, wherein the first data identifies individuals associated with the problem statement;~~

~~receiving second data, wherein the second data identifies a relationship between at least one of the individuals, at least one process, and at least one machine;~~

~~wherein the at least one process and the at least one machine are associated with the problem statement;~~

~~updating the influence map based on third data, the third data associated with a target business;~~

~~receiving empathy data related to the individuals, wherein the empathy data is associated with at least one emotion of the at least one of the individuals, the empathy data received during a lifecycle of the at least one process, the at least one process associated with the problem statement;~~

~~generating two or more persona maps based on the empathy data and the updated influence map, wherein the at least one persona map traces at least one selected from: the at least one emotion, experiences, touchpoints, pain-points, and opportunities of a persona during the lifecycle of the at least one process;~~

~~generating an experience map based on the two or more persona maps, wherein the experience map aggregates the two or more persona maps;~~

~~receiving at least one idea associated with a solution to the problem statement via a collaboration environment;~~

~~receiving an evaluation of the at least one idea, where the evaluation comprises at least one of: a desirability score, a viability score, and a functionality score;~~

~~prototyping the at least one idea; and~~

~~providing a roadmap, wherein the roadmap is configured to:~~

~~———identify at least one task associated with the at least one process associated with the problem statement,~~

~~———identify one or more of the individuals from the first data to complete the at least one task, and~~

~~———associate the at least one task with a likelihood value, wherein the likelihood value is based on a likelihood that the identified one or more individuals complete the at least one task.~~

~~18. The method of claim 17, wherein the generating the two or more persona maps includes:~~

~~receiving at least one video interview of the at least one of the individuals;~~

~~identifying at least one emotion using video facial recognition; and~~

~~associating the at least one emotion with at least one point of the lifecycle.~~

~~19. The method of claim 17, further comprising:~~

~~generating a second evaluation of the at least one idea, wherein the second evaluation is based on fourth data, wherein the fourth data is analyzed using NLP;~~

~~20. The method of claim 17, wherein the generating the influence map further comprises:~~

~~receiving an indication of a direction of influence between individuals from the first data;~~

~~receiving an indication of an intensity of influence between individuals from the first data; and~~

~~receiving an indication of intersections of individuals from the first data, machines associated with the problem statement, and processes associated with the problem statement, wherein the indication the intersections includes the direction of influence and the intensity of influence, and~~

~~wherein the updating the influence map further comprises comparing the generated influence map to the third data, the third data related to at least one of the individuals, machines, and processes associated with the problem statement.~~

~~21. — The method of claim 20, further comprising:~~

~~identifying first impactor individuals, wherein an impactor individual is associated with the direction of influence originating at the impactor individual; and~~

~~identifying second impactor individuals based on the intensity of influence between individuals from the first data;~~

~~wherein the influence map is adapted to highlight inefficiencies in a target business.~~

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

determining an initial performance score based on assessments of the target business;

determining a net deviation based on a deviation between assessment data and capability process data associated with the target business,

wherein:

the assessment data comprise information associated with the assessments of the target business and performance drivers, and

the capability process data comprise information
associated with processes of the target business and the performance drivers; and
determining an updated performance score of the target business
based on the net deviation and the initial performance score,
wherein the solution is identified further based on the updated
performance score.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
in response to an input requesting a domain score for a competitor of the target
business:

receiving an input identifying the competitor of the target business;
determining the domain score for the competitor based on separated
domain-structure data associated with the competitor; and
providing the domain score.

