

Not everyone deserves the same meeting.

D8A.ACADEMY/RESOURCES/STAKEHOLDER-MAP

THE GRID

power × interest	2 axes, 4 quadrants
score 1-5 each	gut feel, but written
revisit monthly	← reorgs move people.

MANAGE CLOSELY

power + interest	sponsor, the PO
weekly 1:1	decisions happen here
no surprises	bad news first, live

KEEP SATISFIED

power high, no time	execs, legal
short updates	one page, monthly
never spam	← noise here costs you power.

KEEP INFORMED

keen, little power	users, support
demos, newsletter	they carry adoption
collect their pain	raw requirements

MONITOR

low power + interest	minimal effort
no meetings	a channel they can read
watch for moves	quadrants shift

GOTCHAS

interest ≠ support	blockers read too
the quiet exec	owns budget, no calls
keep it private	← maps are political.

WORTH MEMORIZING

01 The four quadrants, one row each

Who sits where, and the exact cadence each quadrant earns.

QUADRANT	TYPICALLY	THEY GET
manage closely	sponsor, PO	weekly 1:1 + drafts
keep satisfied	execs, legal	monthly one-pager
keep informed	users, support	demos + newsletter
monitor	everyone else	a readable channel

→ The grid is an effort budget. Every hour spent bottom-left is an hour stolen from the top-right, where the project actually lives or dies.

02 Trap: the three people the grid misses

Textbook mapping fails on exactly these profiles. Plan for them.

PROFILE	THE RISK	THE MOVE
high-interest blocker	reads everything, fights it	manage closely too
the quiet exec	silent until go-live, owns budget	keep satisfied anyway
the proxy	speaks "for" the users	verify with real users

→ Interview phrasing: interest measures attention, not approval. The most engaged stakeholder on my last project was the one trying to kill it.