

**LEFT
BRAIN
RIGHT
STUFF**

HOW LEADERS MAKE WINNING DECISIONS

PHIL ROSENZWEIG

P
PROFILE BOOKS

First published in Great Britain in 2014 by
PROFILE BOOKS LTD
3A Exmouth House
Pine Street
London EC1R 0JH
www.profilebooks.com

First published in the United States of America by
Public Affairs, a member of the Perseus Books Group

Copyright © Phil Rosenzweig, 2014

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Clays, Bungay, Suffolk

The moral right of the author has been asserted.

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under
copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may
be reproduced, stored or introduced into a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without
the prior written permission of both the copyright owner and
the publisher of this book.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the
British Library.

ISBN 978 1 78125 135 5
eISBN 978 1 84765 973 6



The paper this book is printed on is certified by
the © 1996 Forest Stewardship Council A.C.
(FSC). It is ancient-forest friendly. The printer
holds FSC chain of custody SGS-COC-2061

CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Crunch Time on a Hot August Night	1
Chapter 2: The Question of Control	23
Chapter 3: Performance, Absolute and Relative	45
Chapter 4: What It Takes to Win	64
Chapter 5: Confidence . . . and Overconfidence	80
Chapter 6: Base Rates and Breaking Barriers	101
Chapter 7: Better Decisions over Time	123
Chapter 8: Decisions of a Leader	145
Chapter 9: Where Models Fear to Tread	165
Chapter 10: When Are Winners Cursed?	191
Chapter 11: Starting Up, Stepping Out	218
Chapter 12: The Stuff of Winning Decisions	238
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	253
<i>For Further Reading</i>	257
<i>Notes</i>	261
<i>Bibliography</i>	293
<i>Index</i>	309

CRUNCH TIME ON A HOT AUGUST NIGHT

1

COMPARED WITH MANAGING, TRADING WAS ADMIRABLY DIRECT.
YOU MADE YOUR BETS AND EITHER YOU WON OR YOU LOST.

MICHAEL LEWIS, *LIAR'S POKER*, 1989

It was a billion-dollar decision, give or take a few million.

On the night of August 12, 2010, Bill Flemming, president of Skanska USA Building, faced a tough choice. Get it right, and the upside could be very lucrative. Get it wrong, and the results could be disastrous.

The story began a year earlier, when the National Security Agency (NSA) announced plans to build a computer facility for the security information it gathers around the world. The Utah Data Center (UDC) would be fully self-contained, with its own power plant and water supply, and would come equipped with anti-terrorism defenses. The site for this sprawling complex was the abandoned airfield at Camp Williams, a National Guard base in a lonesome canyon south of Salt Lake City. A forbidding location, but ideal for this purpose. It was vast, remote, and very secure.

Skanska USA Building was a division of the Swedish-based company, Skanska, and a leader in the North American construction industry. It had a strong record of large and successful projects. The company had recently completed the MetLife Stadium in New Jersey, home of the football Giants and Jets, a state-of-the-art marvel that could hold eighty-two thousand fans. It was currently at work on dozens of projects, from the renovation of the United Nations building on Manhattan's East Side to the World Trade Center Transportation Hub, the network of train and subway stations under Ground Zero.

The UDC was doubly attractive to Flemming. It was a “design/build” project, meaning that the contractor handled both design and construction. Flemming explained: “If you can come in with a better design—more efficient and smarter functionality—and if you have methods to build the facility faster, then you might beat the other bidders.”¹

But Skanska wouldn't be bidding alone. Several other top construction companies were just as eager to win the deal.

The first step was to answer the NSA's Request for Qualifications, which asked for a list of relevant experience and resources. Skanska USA Building, working with a partner, Okland Construction Company, was one of twelve bidders to submit an RFQ in February 2010. Two months later, the NSA eliminated seven and invited just five—Skanska and four others—to submit formal bids. They were given sixty days.

Over the next weeks, Flemming and his top aides worked with a team of subcontractors to prepare the bid. The NSA was explicit about the layout and capacity it wanted and also defined the technical standards. Although no price was stated, it was rumored that Congress had appropriated more than \$1 billion. For prospective

bidders the message was clear: it was more important to provide the best performance than to meet a specific price.

On June 16 Skanska USA Building submitted a bid for the Utah Data Center with a price tag of \$1.475 billion. And then it waited.

In early July the NSA issued its reply. All five bids had come in between \$1.4 billion and \$1.8 billion, substantially more than the government wanted to spend. Now the NSA narrowed the scope of the project, keeping the key elements but eliminating a few redundancies. Technical performance was just as important, and the schedule was unchanged. For the first time the NSA specified a target price: \$1.212 billion. Now price was a crucial element. A bid in excess of that amount would be rejected for noncompliance.

The same five companies were invited to submit new bids, with Best and Final Offers due on August 13, just six weeks away.

Now it was game on. At Skanska USA Building's head offices in Parsippany, New Jersey, a large conference room was dedicated to the UDC bid. Only approved personnel were allowed inside, their access limited by swipe cards. A team of twenty-five pored over every aspect of the project, looking for ways to lower the cost. Removing some redundancies helped, but there was still a long way to go. Everyone was focused on a single goal: how to get to *one-point-two-one-two*.

For the next six weeks, during the hottest summer on record, Flemming's team looked for ways to drive down costs.² They worked with their subcontractors to streamline the procurement process, buying in bulk or working directly with suppliers to cut out middlemen. They looked closely at the contingency for risk, a standard part of any bid. After concluding that certain inputs were unlikely to rise over the next three years, they were able to reduce the contingency. They also reviewed the provision for management fees, in effect

what they would earn. By committing to working more quickly and efficiently, they were able to lower the bid still further.

By early August Skanska USA Building's bid stood at \$1.26 billion, now tantalizingly close to the target of \$1.212 billion. Could Skanska take out even more and eliminate that \$48 million gap, producing a bid that was low enough to win but high enough to earn a profit? Or would going lower expose Skanska to serious losses?

As he pondered the way forward, Flemming considered several factors. The UDC would take three years to build, during which time it should be possible to find additional savings. The question was how much. Skanska had reason to be optimistic. In an industry known for cost overruns, Skanska USA Building had often done better than budget. It had won the MetLife Stadium contract with a bid of \$998 million, well below its nearest rival, and still found a way to earn greater profits than expected.³ The World Trade Center Transportation Hub was currently running ahead of schedule and also below cost. Surely further savings would be possible for the UDC as well. Flemming commented: "The experience that I've had over the years is typically, you can get someplace between another 3 percent and 4 percent out." Taking out 3 percent would bring Skanska from \$1.26 billion to \$1.222 billion, still short of the goal. Reaching \$1.212 billion would require lowering the bid by 3.8 percent, which was very ambitious but not impossible.

The problem was that coming in exactly at the target might not be enough. Skanska was up against four large, experienced contenders. Although none was likely to "take a flier"—the industry phrase for a lowball bid designed to win at any price—the chances were good that at least one would come in below the threshold. If Skanska did no better than meet the target, it would lose to a more aggressive rival. To win would call for going even lower.

Flemming also considered the policies of his parent company. Skanska's headquarters in Stockholm had an edict known as the Five Zeros. All construction projects were to be safe (zero accidents), ethical (zero ethical breaches), of high quality (zero defects), and green (zero environmental incidents). Above all, they had to be profitable (zero loss making). There was good reason to stress profit in the construction industry. Even at the best of times, most projects earned only small margins, so that one loser could wipe out the profits of several good ones. Losing money on a large project was unacceptable, and Flemming knew it.

Yet playing it safe and missing out on a large, high-profile project was also unthinkable. As president, Flemming was concerned about questions of reputation. What would the joint venture partner think if, after months of hard work, the project fell through because Skanska had been unwilling to make a big bet? Would it ever work with Skanska again? As for rival companies, would they conclude that Skanska lacked nerve? And what about Flemming's staff, the people he worked with day in and day out? If he wasn't willing to go the extra mile, would they see him as prudent and wise, or would they wonder if he was overly cautious and risk averse? As for the parent company, it wanted to avoid losses, but also wanted to win big deals. Successful managers didn't just walk away from big-ticket projects; they found ways to win contracts *and* make them succeed. Of course, never far away was the specter of failure. The worst outcome of all would be to win the bid, but lose money.

The Best and Final Offer was due at four o'clock the next afternoon at Army Corps of Engineers offices in Baltimore. As night fell, Bill Flemming agonized: "I'm staring at a number that's about \$50 million too high, and I know I could be disqualified if I don't get to the government's number. Fifty million out of \$1.26 billion isn't that much. Do we risk going in with a bid that's over the limit, and

maybe not get it? Or do we take a lower amount and trust that we can find some innovation?”

Eventually Flemming made the call: Skanska would enter a bid of \$1.2107 billion, placing the company \$1.3 million under the target. How it would earn a profit wasn't entirely clear. Flemming explained: “We'll take the chance that somewhere along the line we can become even more productive—by improving our scheduling, or finding ways to work faster, or discovering ways to reduce our costs.”

With that, the meeting broke up. The bid team worked through the night, finalizing stacks of documents and assembling binders. The next afternoon, the final bid was delivered to ACE offices on South Howard Street in Baltimore barely an hour before the deadline.

Back at Skanska the mood was positive. Flemming recalled: “We were optimistic. We had been struggling to get to the number, but we did it. We felt good.”

THINKING ABOUT DECISIONS

Not many of us will have to make a decision quite like the one that Bill Flemming faced on that hot August night. We won't have to submit a bid worth more than a billion dollars, with hundreds of jobs at stake and with the clock ticking down. But in other respects, Flemming's decision was typical of thorny decisions we face in many walks of life, not just business but also politics, sports, and the military. These decisions are complex, consequential, and laden with uncertainty. Learning to make better decisions—smarter, wiser, and more likely to lead to success—is a high priority.

In recent years a large number of books have been written about decision making. Many draw on the findings of research in

cognitive psychology. Human beings, we have learned, are not the rational creatures we read about in economics textbooks. They make predictable errors, or biases, which often undermine their decisions.

By now we're familiar with many of these errors, including the following:

- People are said to be overconfident, too sure of themselves and unrealistically optimistic about the future.
- People look for information that will confirm what they want to believe, rather than seeking information that might challenge their hopes.
- People labor under the illusion of control, imagining they have more influence over events than they really do.
- People are fooled by random events, seeing patterns where none exist.
- People are not good intuitive statisticians, preferring a coherent picture to what makes sense according to the laws of probability.
- People suffer from a hindsight bias, believing that they were right all along.

The standard advice for making better decisions is to be aware of our tendency for common biases and to find ways to avoid them. That makes sense for many kinds of decisions. But as we'll see, it's not sufficient for others, including many of great importance.

THE VIEW FROM THE 32ND FLOOR

A few months after the events described here, I met with Bill Flemming and two of his colleagues at Skanska's US corporate