SOSP Role Expectations Gap Table

Where imported operating model assumptions meet Vietnam default behaviors and what to design instead.

HOW TO READ THIS TABLE
Each row shows one behavior gap between what an imported operating model expects and what actually happens by default.
The right column is not a diagnosis of your team, it is a list of structural design parameters.
Fix the design. The behavior follows.

BEHAVIOR DIMENSION	IMPORTED EXPECTATION *What the operating model assumes the team will do*	GAP	VIETNAM DEFAULT BEHAVIOR *What actually happens without explicit structure*	DESIGN PARAMETER *Gap = design parameter, not performance gap*
PROBLEM ESCALATION	Identify the problem, flag it early, propose a solution before escalating. **Expected:** *proactive upward communication.*	►► vs ◄◄	Problems surface late or not at all, especially if they imply someone made an error or reflects poorly on the team. **Default:** *protect relationships, avoid delivering bad news.*	◆ Design the escalation path so sending bad news upward is structurally safe, not personally costly. **FIX** *Build explicit escalation triggers in writing. Define which problems must surface and when independent of relationship cost.*
AMBIGUITY HANDLING	When instructions are unclear, ask clarifying questions and proceed with best judgment. **Expected:** *autonomous gap-filling.*	►► vs ◄◄	When instructions are unclear, wait or complete the task as literally as possible to avoid making the wrong call. **Default:** *literal execution, low autonomous interpretation.*	◆ Ambiguity tolerance is a role design parameter. Specify the scope of independent judgment per role explicitly. **FIX** *Remove ambiguity from instructions by design. Apply the 3-Layer model: outcome, rules, task. Don't rely on the team to fill gaps the founder left.*
UPWARD FEEDBACK	Disagree openly in meetings. Challenge decisions if you see a better option. Give direct feedback to managers. **Expected:** *candid lateral and upward communication.*	►► vs ◄◄	Disagreement expressed privately, indirectly, or not at all. Public challenge of a manager's decision is face-threatening for both parties. **Default:** *harmony preservation over direct challenge.*	◆ The feedback mechanism is the design parameter, not the willingness to give feedback. **FIX** *Create structured channels for upward input that don't require public disagreement: written pre-meeting input, 1-on-1 feedback sessions, anonymous team pulse.*
CROSS-FUNCTIONAL INITIATIVE	Notice a problem in another team's area. Flag it, or act on it if you can help. Initiative across boundaries is valued. **Expected:** *lateral ownership beyond role scope.*	►► vs ◄◄	Acting in another team's area without invitation is risky, it may imply the other team isn't doing their job. Default: stay in lane. **Default:** *clear boundaries respected, lateral initiative avoided.*	◆ Cross-functional initiative requires either explicit permission or a defined coordination protocol, not cultural encouragement. **FIX** *Define cross-functional touchpoints explicitly in role design. Don't rely on voluntary lateral initiative, build the coordination mechanism into the process.*
KEY INSIGHT	These gaps are not **performance gaps.** They are **design gaps.** *The team is behaving rationally inside a structure that was not designed for this context. The fix is not training, hiring better people, or cultural coaching, it is explicit structural design.*			◆ **Gap = design parameter, not performance gap.** *Every row in this table is a place where explicit structure, not better people, closes the gap.*