Make competing demands visible.

Reconstructed professional example / synthetic data

At Statkraft, my work included resource coordination, project portfolio reporting and recurring resource meetings. This case illustrates how I would structure a capacity decision. The example, numbers and artefacts below were independently reconstructed; they are not an employer deliverable or a record of measured results.

The question

A project-based team has several concurrent commitments and a shared analyst. Every project looks manageable in isolation, but the same analyst is needed in the same week. The useful question is which commitments can be supported with the capacity actually available.

What I would establish first

Agree the planning unit and time horizon; separate committed demand from tentative requests; subtract leave and recurring operational work from available hours. Validate the demand with project owners and availability with resource owners. Missing or uncertain estimates remain visible rather than being treated as zero.

Illustrative weekly capacity view

Role	Usable hours	Demand hours	Gap
Business analyst	36	48	12 short
Process specialist	32	30	2 spare
Team lead	24	22	2 spare

The management insight

Total capacity is 92 hours against 100 hours of demand, but the analyst has a 12-hour shortfall. Four spare hours in other roles do not solve that bottleneck unless the work is transferable. A portfolio average would hide the constraint.

Decision structure

01	Confirm the conflicting commitments
02	Check skills and dependencies
03	Compare sequencing options
04	Assign an owner and review date

Make the trade-off explicit

Reconstructed professional example / synthetic data

Illustrative decision log

Option	Effect	Condition
Defer 8 analyst hours	Shortfall becomes 4 hours	Project owner accepts revised sequence
Transfer 4 analyst hours	Closes remaining gap	Split 2 + 2 across the two roles, if skills match
Keep all commitments	Shortfall remains 12 hours	Sponsor must resolve timing or capacity

Recommendation in this example

Validate the eight-hour deferral first. Split the remaining four hours across the process specialist and team lead, two hours each, only after checking skills, access and supervision needs. If the work is not transferable, record the unresolved four-hour gap and escalate the schedule decision. Do not silently assume overtime or interchangeable roles.

What the client receives

A capacity-and-demand table with named data owners, a short list of conflicts, a decision log and a repeatable update routine. A weekly update can focus on changed commitments; the decision meeting should focus on unresolved exceptions.

How I would validate value

Before changing the process, record how often conflicts are identified late and how long it takes to assemble a reliable view. After several planning cycles, compare those measures and ask resource owners whether the model reflects reality. No improvement percentage is claimed in this case.

What this demonstrates

Structuring uncertain operational data, distinguishing a capacity problem from a prioritisation problem, and presenting practical options for management. The historic evidence supports my participation in resource coordination and reporting; the model and decisions here are reconstructed examples.