

Objectives:

Portfolio  
of Choices

Note: A project (or policy) strategy is the best combination of deliverables to accomplish client goals from the broadest range of ethical choices. In a negotiation, a principled strategy is the best scenario to fulfill each side's goals from the broadest range of ethical choices.

<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>Integral or Mixed Interventions</b></p> <p>Resolve the issue with a highly integrated and tactful solution blending substantive and relational elements indistinguishably. <b>Focus simultaneously on Quality and Acceptance.</b></p>	<p><b>QA</b></p> <p>In this row, invent choices that address both Quality, Logic and Acceptance in the Decision-Value equation. (vertical equation on left).</p>	<p>Choices 1.3 Minimum on substance and relationship</p>	<p>Choices 2.3 Normal on substance and relationship</p>	<p>Choices 3.3 Supreme excellence on substance &amp; relationship</p>
<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>Substantive or Etiologic Interventions</b></p> <p>Meet goals, achieve benefits; manage the issues rationally or resolve the problem by eradicating its cause. <b>Focus on quality, logic and reason.</b></p>	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>for Quality &amp; Logic In this row, invent choices to address the Quality of the Decision-Value equation.</p>	<p>Choices 1.2 Minimum on substance</p>	<p>Hub Choices 2.2 Normal on substance or "Choices within the box"</p>	<p>Choices 3.2 Supreme excellence on substance e.g. significantly exceed expectations and goals</p>
<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>Relational or Symptomatic Interventions</b></p> <p>Build a critical mass for change. Manage perceptions or style. <b>Improve the relationship to create acceptance or at least a good climate for later interventions.</b></p>	<p><b>A</b></p> <p>for Acceptance In this row, invent choices to address the Acceptance side of the Decision-Value equation.</p>	<p>Choices 1.1 Minimum on relationship e.g. Treat them with courtesy and utmost respect regardless of how they treat you.</p>	<p>Choices 2.1 Normal on relationship e.g. Warm and gracious hospitality</p>	<p>Choices 3.1 Supreme excellence on relationship e.g. red-carpet treatment, experience or event</p>
<p><b>0</b></p> <p><b>Laissez-faire Intervention</b></p> <p>Share the facts or do none of the above.</p>	<p>Choice 0.0: Status quo What is the current situation?</p>			
<p><b>Ethical sets of Interventions</b> (Adapted from medicine)</p> <p><b>Ethical sets of Options</b> (Adapted from Sun Tzu)</p>	<p><b>0. Wait &amp; see</b> Stay put e.g.: harvest, take time to think; appoint a committee to study the issue <b>Keep your options open</b></p>	<p><b>1. Compliance</b> Minimum to get by or to stay out of trouble without "normalization of deviance" i.e. "hiding behind the curtain" e.g.: no-regret decisions; comply with regulations; No-frills service or product</p>	<p><b>2. Active</b> What is normal, standard or expected in your field e.g.: best practices; market options; Established sectorial, local or international standards (ISO); run faster, play the game better.</p>	<p><b>3. Supreme excellence</b> Create unmatched opportunity &amp; leading competitive advantage e.g.: change the rules; brand leveraging; proactive; "fix two issues with one solution"</p>

- A. Explore ALL above groups of Options in EACH intervention (row). Explore links between choices over time, geographic markets or other categorizations.
- B. Validity tests: effectiveness, cost/benefits, 360° impact, stability/sustainability, power dynamics, hidden agenda and transition-risk management (overleaf).
- C. Selected strategy that potentially meets project objectives (or interest of each party in a negotiation) from the broadest range of ethical choices.
- D. In a project or policy, consider the best alternative to the selected strategy. In a negotiation, invent the Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA).

**Objectives:**

**Decision Value** = (Quality x Acceptance x Execution) - Risk. We saw **Q** and **A** in Harvard® Brainstorming Grid. Here, we deal with Execution and Risk. Implementation (or Execution) is often fraught with perils and stakeholders' resistance in negotiations, project and policy formulation. This exercise makes it easier for each party with veto to support you and difficult not to withdraw its commitment. It helps you examine the sources of resistance to change and the consequences of change, both positive and negative, before acting. It also provides a step-by-step scenario for building allies and drafting a strategy to mitigate transition risks. For details at [www.executive.org](http://www.executive.org) and in Alain Paul Martin's workshops.

Players	Current position		Future position		Required position		Principled interventions & options to make the players allies or to keep them at bay. Brainstorm and invent mutually-beneficial deals.
	Role & mission of each player	Faction*	Power group**	Faction*	Power group**	Faction*	
Who is the <b>ultimate target</b> (rarely more than one person)? Once this target is on board, the goals can be achieved. The game is over for the opposing forces.							
A							
B							
C							
D							
What is the <b>critical mass</b> (minimum number of people whose commitment is necessary to prevent resistance to change and bring the 'target' on board)?							
E							
F							
G							
H							
What are the <b>entry points</b> to get to the critical mass? Enlist those with competence, integrity, longevity and within your sphere of influence (fairly accessible).							
J							
K							
L							
M							
N							
P							
Q							
R							
Who are the <b>natural allies</b> (supporters) who have some leverage on the entry points and on the critical mass? Use the entry points to cement your strategy.							
S							
T							
V							
W							
X							
Y							

Selected scenario for risk management (to reduce original risk to a manageable level):

Contingency plan for residual risk (damage control & graceful exit plan):