

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

FRAMEWORK

The decision-making framework provides a frame through which management and staff can identify the best available option when making decisions related to program implementation in environments where local counterparts, specifically key consultants, face threats related to unexpected humanitarian emergencies or political crises.

FT understands crisis situations often demand decisions in a short period of time. We also recognize having a tool that prepares us to respond to these situations when they arise fosters trust among stakeholders - key consultants, partners, donors, employees, and the board of directors – and improves our ability to identify the best available options. The framework also provides for a record which enables us to learn from the decision processes we undertake.

The Framework is grounded in the organization's Standards of Conduct and Code of Ethics. In applying the framework to any given situation, we consider the organization's commitments and obligations relative to the relevant stakeholders and examine each situation in relation to the following points (Considerations).

- Approved project implementation, program of work or scope,
- Current and agreed upon contractual arrangement (legal) with employees, key consultants, etc. and scope of work,
- Available funding to implement decisions,
- Consistency, internal reputation, and
- External Reputation.

These considerations are the foundation upon which decisions are envisioned and taken.

The procedures enumerated below provide different options (from the most detailed to least detailed) for parsing out the information (known and unknown), weighing options, envisioning solutions, coming to a decision, and justifying it. The procedures are arranged in order of the most detailed to the least detailed and are recommended to be used for most complex to least complex decision processes. Procedure #1 can be used in tandem with Procedures #2 and #3 as cascading tools where a situation - for example, the situation of an individual country in turmoil the position FT will take- is assessed in its entirety; and a sub-decision process – for example, how to support individual team members in the region - is documented using Procedure # 2 or Procedure #3.

PROCEDURE #1

Individuals making decisions in these situations will undertake the following process.

1. Consider relevant facts of the situation (known).
 1. Questions that remain (unknown, need to know).
 2. Stakeholders (affected by decision).
 3. Concerns/Values (of each stakeholder).
2. Assess risk.
3. Envision possible solution(s).
4. Make decision.
5. Provide a justification.
6. Complete the Decision-Making Scoring guide

PROCEDURE #2

1. State the situation/question.
2. Develop criteria for how you will decide what is the best course of action. How will you evaluate different

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

solutions? What Considerations/Standards have priority?

3. Brainstorm solutions
4. Rank the solution using the criteria you have established.
5. Explain how the solution you chose is the best one among competing choices.

PROCEDURE #3

Complete the '4-Box' Decision-Making tool elaborating on:

1. Donor Agreement and Scope requirements.
2. Consultant Agreement and scope of work requirements.
3. Available funding to cover expenses.
4. Safeguarding considerations

APPROVALS

Decision-making tables are completed by staff outlining decisions and justifications. These are then submitted to the CEO, CFO, and Director of Operations for review and final approval.

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

PROCEDURE

TABLE: PROCEDURE #1

QUESTION/SITUATION:		
1. Relevant Facts (known)	a. Questions that remain (unknown)	
b. Stakeholders (people and/or entities affected by the decision)	c. Concerns/values of each stakeholder	
2. Possible Solutions		
3. Decision		
4. Justification		
5. Gather the Facts (known/unknown)		
6. Consider stakeholder values/concerns		
7. Address Alternatives	PROS	CONS
Option 1:		
Option 2:		
Option 3:		
<p>As you weigh each option, consider the following:</p> <p>Rules/Duties: Does the option help support a good general safeguarding principles for people to follow in similar situations?</p> <p>Virtues: Does the option help support or develop the organizational conduct we value most as individuals and at FT?</p> <p>Outcomes: Does the option produce the most good and do the least harm?</p> <p>Principles: Does the option address FT Standards of Conduct involved?</p> <p>Safeguarding: Does the option focus mostly on protecting vulnerable individuals and maintaining important relationships?</p>		
Decision Making Scoring Guide		Points Possible
Question/Situation clearly identified.		5
		Points Received

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

<p>5 pts: Question that relates to situation is clearly identified. 4 pts: Question suggests a situation but is ambiguous, vague, or not clearly identified. 3 pts: Question does not clearly relate to a question or is inappropriate for topic. 0 pts: Question not identified</p>		
<p>Basic considerations identified and explained. 5 pts: Considerations are clearly identified and their logical relation to the situation is explained. 4 pts: Considerations are identified, but their relationship to the question is illogical or not explained. 3 pts: Inappropriate Considerations are identified, and no explanation is provided. 0 pts: Considerations are neither identified nor explained.</p>	5	
<p>Stakeholders clearly identified. 5 pts: Major stakeholders clearly identified, and their claims, values, and assumptions are explored. 4 pts: Major stakeholders clearly identified, but without corresponding clarification of their position. 3 pts: Major stakeholders not clearly identified, or irrelevant stakeholders mentioned. 0 pts: Description of stakeholders is missing.</p>	5	
<p>Sufficient factual information gathered. 10 pts: Information gathered reflects good use of the time and resources available. 8 pts: Information gathered reflects adequate use of the time and resources available. 6 pts: Information gathered reflects poor use of the time and resources available. 0 pts: Information is missing.</p>	10	
<p>Additional (unknown) information necessary for decision-making identified. 10 pts: Additional information necessary for decision-making is thoroughly considered; clear explanation of what is lacking is provided. 8 pts: Additional information briefly considered, and explanation conveys what is lacking overall. 6 pts: An attempt to identify additional information is made, but explanation is unclear or not present. 0 pts: Additional information not considered.</p>	10	
<p>Minimum of 3 alternative options generated. 5 pts: 3 alternative options described. 4 pts: 2 alternative options described. 3 pts: 1 option described. 0 pts: Description of options is missing.</p>	5	
<p>Option 1 10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on Considerations and Standards, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits.</p>	10	

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

<p>8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of Consideration and Standards, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development.</p> <p>6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted.</p> <p>0 pts: Option is not described.</p>		
<p>Option 2</p> <p>10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on Considerations and Standards, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits.</p> <p>8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of Consideration and Standards, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development.</p> <p>6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted.</p> <p>0 pts: Option is not described.</p>	10	
<p>Option 3</p> <p>10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on Considerations and Standards, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits.</p> <p>8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of Consideration and Standards, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development.</p> <p>6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted.</p> <p>0 pts: Option is not described.</p>	10	
<p>Decision clearly identified.</p> <p>10 pts: Final decision is readily identified.</p> <p>6 pts: Final decision is identified but may be unclear or vague.</p> <p>3 pts: Final decision is alluded to but may be incomplete or fragmentary.</p> <p>0 pts: Final decision is not identified.</p>	10	
<p>Justification provided based on comparison of options and reference to considerations and standards.</p> <p>20 pts: Thorough reference made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and Considerations/Standards involved. Clear articulation of the rationale behind the decision. Explanation is logical and presents at least 3 supporting examples.</p> <p>18 pts: Reference made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and Considerations/Standards involved. Articulation of the rationale behind the decision is mostly complete. Explanation is logical and presents at least 3 supporting examples.</p> <p>16 pts: Partial reference is made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and Considerations/Standards involved, but key points may be missing. The rationale behind the decision may be incomplete. The explanation may not follow logically, may lack discussion of ethical perspectives, or have fewer than 3 supporting examples.</p> <p>14 pts: The consideration of perspectives, facts, and Considerations/Standards involved is incomplete. The rationale behind the decision is not clearly explained. Evidence of a logical justification for the decision reached is scant or</p>	20	

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

absent, ethical perspectives are not mentioned, or fewer than 2 supporting examples are present. 12 pts or less: The consideration of perspectives, facts, and Considerations/Standards involved is attempted. Evidence of a logical justification for the decision reached is scant or absent. Supporting examples, if provided, are insufficiently developed, or do not relate to the decision made.		
TOTAL	100	

ALTERNATE DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURE #2
1. State the situation/question.
2. Develop criteria for how you will decide what is the best course of action. How will you evaluate different solutions? What Considerations/Standards have priority?
3. Brainstorm list of solutions.
4. Rank the solution using the criteria you have established.
5. Explain how the solution you chose is the best one among competing choices.

6-BOX METHOD FOR DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURE #3	
Question/Situation:	
Donor Agreement and Scope requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term • Outcomes • Other obligations 	Consultant Agreement and Scope requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term and termination • Scope flexibility • Ability to perform work
Funding Available to cover expenses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source • Level of flexibility • Approval 	Safeguarding considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats faced • Alternative options for relief • FT options
Consistency, internal reputation, and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we replicate this decision for others in similar situations? • What are the implications or internal optics of taking such action today? 	External Reputation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications for partners or others outside of FT? • What are the optics of this decision from the point of view of the field, partner, donors, and other stakeholders.

FT DECISION -MAKING FRAMEWORK

Supporting safety of staff and consultants / life decisions driven by unsafe situation

- Use of
 - targeted FPTF project funds (e.g. Norad)
 - Use of unrestricted FPTF funds (Skoll)
 - Use of unrestricted FT funds (none available but potentially in the future)
- Is there a difference in what we can finance due to funding source?
 - Does use of FPTF funds set a precedent for the rest of FT?
- Is there a differentiation between consultants
 - At discretion of the program?
 - Part-time vs full-time?

Commented [DM1]: NAOMI: Suggest adding: process for decision-making/approval once above framework is in place. Does the framework act as policy or do individual decisions still need to be run by Program Directors / EMT / MJ?

Types of support for safety of staff and consultants

- Anything, determined in collaboration between FPTF HQ and affected staff / consultants
- Ensure equity among staff and consultants

Decisions to move that may affect ability to work

- Differentiation between driving factors

Commented [DM2]: NAOMI: Process for determining whether consultant can perform assigned deliverables from new location (before/after move)

When staff / consultants can no longer focus 100% on project objectives, what level of salary

- 100%
- Actual hours worked
- Grace period of a few months?

Commented [DM3]: NAOMI: I would also add: where projected workplans/deliverables are no longer funded, or where funding sources are on hold, due to shifts in donor strategy

Where work activities are no longer relevant

-

Shutting down country programs

- When no funding is available for activities, staff, consultants
 - Can we at least do severance?
 - Phasing out