

## Blurry responsibility after a decision

Organisational core case · decision-to-implementation drift · responsibility diffusion

**Date:** 2025-12-16

**Language:** en

**Confidentiality:** internal

**Discipline profile:** organisation\_leadership

**Comm. space (D-module):** off

Mode full

Reflection off

A-band  $\approx$  5–7 · mixed-to-adult

M-band (Leadership group)  $\approx$  6–8 · high

IA-Box → inadult\_asymmetry

D-module off · indirect strain noted (no D profile)

### INPUT THESIS & INFORMATION BASIS

#### Thesis (verbatim):

A decision is made, but responsibility for follow-up becomes diffuse.

#### Minimal scene:

A strategic decision is formally approved. In the aftermath, it becomes unclear who is responsible for communication, implementation and follow-up.

#### Observations (descriptive):

- A formal strategic decision is approved by a leadership circle.
- After approval, no clear owner for communication, implementation, and follow-up is visible.
- Operational execution relies on informal initiative rather than explicit mandate.
- Downstream effects include delays and inconsistent execution risk.

#### Assumptions / uncertainties:

- Assumption: mid-sized organisation with distributed leadership and formal decision bodies.
- Uncertainty: exact decision protocol (handover steps, minutes, ownership fields).
- Uncertainty: whether responsibility assignments exist in writing but were not communicated.
- Bias risks: retrospective blame bias; role loyalty bias.

**Model note:** This is a structural reading of enactments, roles and conditions — never a global claim about a person.

## CASE SNAPSHOT

A strategic decision is formally approved. In the aftermath, it becomes unclear who is responsible for communication, implementation and follow-up.

### Guiding question:

How does blurred responsibility after a decision affect maturity in practice and structural asymmetry?

### Actors (roles only):

- **Leadership group** – decision authority
- **Operational managers** – implementation role
- **Staff** – affected recipients (depend on clear guidance)

### Context structures:

- Formal decision-making bodies and reporting lines.
- Hierarchy and downstream dependency on clarity.
- Handover boundary between decision and implementation.

## ROLES & ENACTMENTS

### Roles:

- Leadership group – formal authority to decide and assign ownership
- Operational managers – implementers dependent on clear mandates
- Staff – indirect affected parties (workload, uncertainty, exposure to inconsistency)

### Observed / proposed enactments:

- Observed enactment: collective approval without explicit owner, timeline, or follow-up protocol.
- Observed enactment: responsibility rhetorically shared, practically shifted downstream.
- Viable alternative enactment: name a responsible lead with mandate, resources, and milestones.
- Repair enactment option: retroactive clarification (owner + communication + follow-up cadence).

## STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS

- Hierarchy: decision authority sits at leadership level; execution distributed.
- Institutional setting: “institutional” publicity (internal legitimacy and accountability expectations).
- Dependency: operational and staff roles depend on clear ownership and communication.
- Coordination risk: drift at the handover boundary (decision → implementation).

Structures are not “excuses”; they are the action-constraints the model reads against.

## ACRPD – STRUCTURAL READING

### A – Awareness (A ≈ 5–7/10)

High awareness at the decision moment, with reduced awareness of downstream propagation of ambiguity and partial recognition of responsibility gaps.

### C – Coherence (mixed)

Narrative coherence (“shared leadership / collective ownership”) conflicts with enacted incoherence (missing concrete assignment, timelines, and follow-up).

### R – Responsibility (drifting)

The key responsibility point is decision closure and handover. Responsibility is rhetorically shared but practically shifted, producing downstream confusion and delays.

### P – Power / agency (high at leadership level)

Leadership had the power to assign ownership and resources; alternatives for clear accountability existed and were not used, increasing responsibility share (M).

### D – Dignity in practice (not analysed; module off)

D-module is not activated. Only an indirect note applies: prolonged uncertainty and exposure can generate dignity strain, without person-level claims.

## IA-BOX – ASYMMETRY CHECK

### T · Tension

fulfilled: unclear

The decision outcome is clear, but responsibility pathways are not transparent.

### J · Judgment

fulfilled: false

No justification is given for leaving responsibility diffuse after a binding decision.

### TB · Toolbox

fulfilled: false

Ambiguity persists beyond the initial phase; it is not time-bounded.

### R · Repair

fulfilled: true

The situation remains reversible: ownership can still be clarified retroactively.

### IA summary:

The asymmetry becomes problematic through missing justification and missing time-boundedness. Because reversibility remains available, the label is `inadulthood_asymmetry` rather than an irreversible lock-in.

## TRAJECTORY

### As observed:

t0 (decision) → t1 (implementation start) → t2 (delays) shows a decline in effective maturity driven by responsibility diffusion rather than lack of intent.

### Alternative trajectory:

If ownership, communication, and follow-up cadence are assigned at t0 or corrected early at t1, the trajectory stabilises and prevents escalation at t2.

### Pivot point:

The pivot is the handover moment: decision closure with (or without) explicit owner, mandate, timeline, and review mechanism.

## **INTERVENTION LEVERS**

- Name a single accountable owner (RACI/DRI) at decision closure.
- Define communication responsibility (who informs whom, by when, and via which channel).
- Attach a time-bounded follow-up mechanism (milestones + review date).
- Resource the owner (authority, time, and cross-functional access) to avoid symbolic ownership.
- Install an escalation / repair path if ambiguity reappears (reversibility).

## **KEY FINDINGS**

- Clear decision does not equal clear responsibility.
- Awareness remains relatively high, while maturity declines through diffusion.
- Asymmetry is not illegitimate per se, but becomes problematic over time.
- Structural levers exist to restore clarity.

### **Conclusion for practice**

Organisational maturity depends less on decision quality alone than on sustained responsibility clarity across time, especially at the decision-to-implementation boundary.

### **What would change this reading?**

Access to the exact decision protocol, written ownership assignments, and evidence of (or absence of) early repair actions would sharpen IA transparency/justification and shift A/M bands.

MIPPractice\_case · example\_2\_org\_core ·  
ACRPD / IA reading

Schema: MIPPractice\_case\_v2.0\_full\_with\_model\_reference · stable · Model &  
schema: [maturity-in-practice.com](https://maturity-in-practice.com)