METHOD IF-EC / V2.0 / 01 FEB 2027

Make the decision boundary visible.

Current authored reference. Use the prompts to support judgement; they do not produce an automatic recommendation.

01 Frame the decision and its boundary

Write the decision, owner and review date. Name what the decision does not authorise.

Record: A bounded decision statement.

02 Check non-negotiables first

Agree the conditions that must hold before comparing benefits. Mark each met, not met or unknown, and cite the evidence. An unknown critical condition is not a pass.

Record: Client-specific constraints and evidence; no weighted score can cancel a failed condition.

03 Trace evidence and contradiction

Record the source, population, date, numerator and denominator. Add the strongest observation against your preferred explanation, plus what remains unknown.

Record: Evidence register with an explicit counterexample.

THE CENTRAL CHANGE

> A promising signal cannot cancel a failed condition. An unknown critical condition is not a pass.

METHOD IF-EC / V2.0 / CONTINUED

Decide locally.
Reuse the reasoning.

Keep the client-specific answer separate from the firm method that helped produce it.

04 Compare proportionate responses

Compare no change, a reversible change and a larger commitment. Explain the effort, reversibility and dependency of each.

Record: Options reasoning, not a universal ranking formula.

05 Set a decision rule before the test

Define what would make you continue, revise or stop. Record who agreed the rule and when. A rule added after results is exploratory, not a pre-agreed success condition.

Record: Prospective decision rule and evidence cutoff.

06 Decide, then extract the method

Write the client decision separately from the firm lesson. Remove names, exact figures and sensitive context; keep the reasoning pattern and limitations. A second reviewer checks the proposed reusable version.

Record: Client-specific decision plus a separately reviewed method candidate.

APPLY WITH JUDGEMENT

If a known condition already rules out an option, do not invent a pilot to make that option look viable. Record the deferral, the repair required and the evidence that would justify reconsideration.

REVISION RECORD / V1.0 TO V2.0

What changed, and why it matters.

Four changes to the reasoning process. This is an authored version history, not an automatic rollout.

01 Add a separate constraint check before options.

The Harth review exposed a tempting leap from visible arrival friction to more ticket capacity; accessibility and the actual reason for requests needed separate consideration.

Record: A failed or unknown critical condition cannot be offset by an attractive demand signal.

02 Require a contrary observation and explicit denominator.

A queue is not a diagnosis; satisfaction among respondents is not completion among all enrolled learners.

Record: Every assignment records evidence against the preferred explanation.

03 Date the decision rule before observing results.

A target chosen after a pilot can make any result look successful.

Record: Separate prospective test criteria from exploratory findings; preserve the recorded cutoff.

04 Separate the client decision from a sanitised firm lesson.

The draft lesson retained a client name, exact pilot counts and private donor context.

Record: A reviewer checks the extracted method; prior client files and existing assignments are not automatically updated.

The source of a lesson can remain in a labelled client example. The reusable method contains prompts and review rules, not that client’s names, economics or thresholds.