Fiduciary Duty in Complex Organizations

Decision-Making Under Uncertainty

Chung Hei Sing

February 2023

Fiduciary Duty in Complex Organizations

Decision-Making Under Uncertainty

Abstract

Fiduciary duty remains a foundational principle in institutional governance, yet its evaluation has become increasingly challenging as organizations grow more complex, delegated, and model-informed. Traditional assessments that rely heavily on outcomes or ex post performance provide weak signals of fiduciary quality in environments characterized by uncertainty and fragmented accountability. This paper reframes fiduciary duty as a decision-making discipline under uncertainty and argues that fiduciary failure is most often a governance design problem rather than a single bad decision. It introduces a Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework that enables fiduciary boards and oversight bodies to evaluate decision integrity through governance structure, uncertainty management, incentive alignment, monitoring, and escalation capacity. By shifting oversight focus from outcomes to process quality, the framework supports proportional oversight, preserves legitimate risk-taking, and strengthens institutional accountability across asset classes and organizational forms.

Keywords: fiduciary duty; governance design; decision-making under uncertainty; delegation; incentive alignment; monitoring and escalation; model risk; process-based oversight; institutional governance

How to cite this paper: Sing, C. H. (2023). Fiduciary duty in complex organizations: Decision-making under uncertainty. Working paper.

1. Introduction: Fiduciary Duty in an Era of Complexity and Uncertainty

Fiduciary duty remains one of the most durable principles in institutional governance. Whether applied to pension trustees, corporate boards, sovereign entities, or large non-profit organizations, the fiduciary obligation is meant to ensure that entrusted authority is exercised with care, loyalty, prudence, and ongoing oversight*. These core duties have not changed. What has changed materially is the environment in which fiduciary judgment is exercised.

Modern fiduciaries operate within organizational structures characterized by scale, delegation, specialization, and interdependence. Decision-making authority is distributed across boards, committees, management teams, external advisers, vendors, and increasingly, formalized models and frameworks. Legal accountability often resides at the board or trustee level, while operational control is exercised elsewhere. At the same time, fiduciaries face heightened uncertainty driven by volatile markets, long investment horizons, technological change, geopolitical fragmentation, and layered regulatory expectations.

These conditions do not weaken fiduciary duty. They expose a growing gap between how fiduciary duty is traditionally evaluated and how fiduciary decisions are actually made. After-the-fact assessments that rely heavily on outcomes, credentials, or generalized assertions of good faith struggle to distinguish between reasonable judgment under uncertainty and genuine governance failure. For oversight bodies, this creates a practical challenge: how to assess fiduciary conduct fairly, consistently, and prospectively without substituting external judgment for institutional discretion.

This paper argues that fiduciary duty in complex organizations is best understood—and evaluated for oversight purposes—as a decision-making discipline under uncertainty, rather than as an obligation to deliver particular outcomes. Outcomes matter. But they are shaped by external forces and structural changes in markets, regulation, or operating conditions that are beyond fiduciary control. What fiduciaries can control, and what regulators and oversight bodies can reliably evaluate, is whether decisions were made through governance processes that were appropriate to the importance and potential impact of the decision, the degree of uncertainty involved, and the structure of delegation in place at the time.

By reframing fiduciary duty in process-based terms, oversight bodies gain a more defensible and forward-looking lens. This approach reduces hindsight bias, improves cross-institutional consistency, and preserves legitimate risk-taking. Most importantly, it reflects a pattern observed repeatedly across sectors: fiduciary failure is usually a governance design problem, not a single bad decision.[8]

*Throughout this paper, the term ‘oversight’ is used broadly to refer to the evaluation and accountability functions performed by regulators, fiduciary boards, trustees, and other external or internal oversight bodies, depending on institutional context.

2. Fiduciary Duty as a Decision Discipline

Fiduciary duty is often described in legal or ethical terms. In operational reality, it functions as a discipline governing how decisions are made when authority is exercised on behalf of others. This distinction becomes critical in environments characterized by uncertainty, incomplete information, and reliance on delegated expertise.

2.1 Classical fiduciary duties, operationalized

The foundational fiduciary duties—care, loyalty, prudence, and monitoring—are well established. Their relevance today lies not in how they are described in theory, but in how they are applied in practice.

The duty of care requires fiduciaries to act with appropriate diligence and competence. In complex organizations, this does not imply technical mastery of every subject matter. It requires decision processes that ensure relevant information is surfaced, expert input is appropriately challenged, and the level of deliberation is appropriate to the importance and potential impact of the decision.[1]

The duty of loyalty is rarely violated through overt self-dealing alone. More commonly, it is weakened through unmanaged conflicts, misaligned incentives, or structural dependencies that shape incentives, limit independence, or make objective judgement harder to exercise. Effective loyalty therefore depends on systematic identification, disclosure, and mitigation of conflicts rather than their presumed absence.[1]

The duty of prudence is often misconstrued as an obligation to avoid risk. Properly understood, prudence requires reasoned judgment under prevailing conditions, including explicit recognition of uncertainty, downside exposure, and alternative courses of action. A prudent decision is one that reflects explicit consideration of assumptions and scenario awareness—not one that guarantees favorable outcomes.[1]

The duty to monitor obligates fiduciaries to retain oversight after authority has been delegated. Monitoring is continuous rather than episodic and requires not only information flows, but also the practical ability to intervene when conditions change or expectations are breached.[1]

Taken together, these duties describe a structured approach to decision-making and oversight rather than a promise of results.

2.2 Decision-making under uncertainty as the fiduciary core

Uncertainty is not an exception to fiduciary duty; it is the environment in which fiduciary duty is most consequential. Long-horizon investments, complex organizational systems, and model-informed decisions cannot be evaluated solely through historical precedent or probabilistic forecasts. Fiduciaries must therefore govern not only measurable risks, but also ambiguity, model limitations, and incomplete information.

In practice, fiduciary breakdowns rarely stem from a single erroneous decision. They more often reflect weaknesses in governance architecture: unclear decision rights, poorly governed assumptions, inadequate challenge, or ineffective escalation mechanisms. These weaknesses may remain latent for extended periods, masked by favorable conditions, until stress reveals them.

For regulators and oversight bodies, this complicates evaluations done after-the-fact. A narrow focus on outcomes risks penalizing reasonable judgment while overlooking structural deficiencies that make failure foreseeable. What remains consistently observable—even under uncertainty—is the quality of the decision process itself.

2.3 Process quality as a proxy for oversight evaluation

Evaluating fiduciary conduct through process quality provides a neutral and scalable proxy for oversight evaluation. High-quality fiduciary processes exhibit several common characteristics: clearly assigned decision rights, explicit treatment of uncertainty, disciplined handling of conflicts, documented reasoning, and mechanisms for ongoing monitoring and escalation.

Importantly, process-based evaluation does not dictate specific decisions or constrain legitimate risk-taking. It establishes minimum governance conditions under which discretion can be exercised responsibly. This approach aligns fiduciary oversight with proportionality principles and accommodates institutional diversity while strengthening accountability.[8]

If fiduciary duty is a decision discipline, the next question is where that discipline most often breaks down. The answer lies in organizational complexity.

3. Why Complexity Systematically Undermines Fiduciary Oversight

Complexity does not excuse fiduciary failure. It reshapes the mechanisms through which failure occurs. Modern organizations introduce structural features that weaken traditional oversight unless governance is deliberately designed to address them.

3.1 Delegation chains and diffusion of responsibility

Delegation expands institutional capacity by allowing decisions to be executed by those with specialized expertise or operational proximity. At the same time, it spreads responsibility across boards, committees, management, advisers, and third parties.

In many institutions, legal accountability remains concentrated at the top while practical control is dispersed. Without explicit governance design, this diffusion leads to ambiguity over who owns risk, who is responsible for challenge, and who has authority to intervene. Documentation fragments across entities, and accountability becomes retrospective rather than continuous.[9]

3.2 Information asymmetry and dependence on expertise

As organizations grow more complex, fiduciaries increasingly oversee activities they cannot independently verify. Reliance on experts, consultants, and analytical models becomes unavoidable. The fiduciary obligation therefore shifts from performing analysis to governing how analysis is produced, interpreted, and used.

Failures in this context rarely reflect lack of expertise. They arise when expertise substitutes for governance—when assumptions go unchallenged, dissent is suppressed, or outputs are accepted without scrutiny. Effective fiduciary oversight requires structured challenge, not technical replication.[3]

3.3 Speed, scale, and compressed decision cycles

Technological and organizational change has accelerated decision cycles and expanded scale. Automated processes and global operations reduce the time available for deliberation and intervention. Traditional governance rhythms—periodic meetings and retrospective reporting—often lag operational reality.

In such environments, fiduciary oversight must be embedded ex ante through clear guardrails, predefined escalation triggers, and retained intervention rights. Without these mechanisms in place, speed and scale amplify governance weaknesses rather than efficiency.[3]

3.4 Cross-entity and cross-border fragmentation

Many fiduciary structures span multiple legal entities and jurisdictions, each subject to different regulatory expectations. Legal responsibility may reside in one entity, while operational control rests in another. Reporting standards and risk definitions may diverge.

This fragmentation complicates both fiduciary practice and effective oversight. Organizational charts alone offer limited insight into where authority and accountability actually reside. Effective oversight therefore requires attention to governance coherence across entities rather than formal structure alone.[9]

3.5 Synthesis

Across these dimensions, complexity introduces hidden vulnerabilities that are poorly revealed by outcomes alone. Fiduciary failures often become visible only when stress tests governance arrangements. By then, the underlying weaknesses have typically accumulated over time.

These realities underscore the need for a framework that allows fiduciary integrity to be assessed before failure occurs.

4. A Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment Framework (PBFA)

Traditional fiduciary evaluation relies heavily on outcomes, intent, or professional credentials. In complex organizations, none provides a reliable basis for oversight judgment. Outcomes are noisy, intent is difficult to surface clearly, and credentials do not guarantee sound governance. What remains observable, comparable, and institutionally meaningful is the quality of the decision process itself.[11]

This section introduces a Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework designed to support oversight evaluation without substituting external judgment for managerial discretion.

4.1 The logic of process-based assessment

A process-based approach does not render outcomes irrelevant. It recognizes that outcomes alone are insufficient indicators of fiduciary quality under uncertainty. Sound fiduciary processes shape what outcomes are feasible and constrain those that should be unacceptable. Scenario awareness, assumption discipline, and escalation readiness are therefore integral to responsible outcome management.[8]

From an oversight perspective, PBFA offers three advantages:

1. Reduced hindsight bias through evaluation based on the information available at the time
2. Consistency across asset classes and institutional forms
3. Proportional application based on institutional complexity and the significance of decisions

4.2 What Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment evaluates—and what it does not

The Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment evaluates governance integrity, not decision correctness. It does not prescribe strategies, risk appetites, or operational models. Nor does it provide a safe harbor against losses. It asks whether fiduciaries exercised judgment through processes appropriate to the decision context as it existed at the time.[9]

Table: Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment – Core Pillars

Pillar	Focus
1	Decision rights and accountability
2	Governance of uncertainty and assumptions
3	Conflict and incentive control
4	Monitoring, triggers, and escalation
5	Documentation and oversight legibility

4.3 PBFA Pillar I: Decision rights and accountability

Effective fiduciary governance begins with clarity over who decides, who advises, who challenges, and who escalates. Oversight assessment should examine whether decision rights are explicitly allocated, documented, and exercised in practice.

Ambiguity in decision ownership is a recurring precursor to fiduciary failure. Evidence includes committee charters, delegation memoranda, voting records, and documentation of dissent and escalation.[7]

4.4 PBFA Pillar II: Governance of uncertainty and assumptions

Fiduciary decisions rest on assumptions. Governance quality depends on whether those assumptions are surfaced, clearly defined, and revisited over time—not on whether they prove correct. Regulators and oversight bodies should assess whether uncertainty was explicitly acknowledged, scenarios were considered, and limitations in analysis were recognized.[7]

4.5 PBFA Pillar III: Conflict and incentive control

Conflicts are structural features of modern institutions. Fiduciary loyalty depends on identifying and mitigating conflicts arising from compensation structures, adviser relationships, or overlapping roles. Presumed independence without supporting controls is insufficient.[8]

4.6 PBFA Pillar IV: Monitoring, triggers, and escalation

Delegation reallocates execution, not responsibility. Fiduciaries must retain the capacity to monitor and intervene. Monitoring should be understood as governance infrastructure, not performance tracking. Clear triggers and escalation authority are essential.[9]

4.7 PBFA Pillar V: Documentation and oversight transparency

Documentation enables third-party reconstruction of decision rationale. Regulators and oversight bodies should be able to identify objectives, alternatives considered, assumptions made, and follow-up actions. Documentation is not bureaucracy; it is the evidentiary backbone of fiduciary duty.[7]

4.8 Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment as an oversight lens

The Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework is a lens, not a checklist. It is designed to support evaluation of fiduciary conduct without prescribing specific decisions, organizational structures, or risk appetites. PBFA does not substitute external judgment for institutional discretion; rather, it provides a structured way to assess whether discretion was exercised through governance processes appropriate to the uncertainty, complexity, and significance of the decision at the time it was made.

Applied proportionately, PBFA strengthens fiduciary accountability by making decision processes transparent and reviewable, while preserving the capacity for legitimate risk-taking. It focuses attention on how assumptions were formed, how challenges were incorporated, and how authority and escalation were structured, rather than on whether outcomes aligned with hindsight expectations. In this way, PBFA enables consistent evaluation across institutions with differing mandates, scales, and operating models, without collapsing governance assessment into outcome comparison.

By framing fiduciary quality in process terms, PBFA supports forward-looking oversight and early identification of governance weaknesses. Its value lies not in narrowing discretion, but in clarifying the conditions under which discretion can be exercised responsibly in complex institutional environments.

5. Delegation Without Abdication: The Fiduciary Duty to Monitor

Delegation is not a weakness of modern governance; it is a necessity. Complex organizations require specialization, scale, and operational proximity that fiduciaries themselves cannot replicate. However, delegation reallocates execution—not responsibility. The fiduciary duty to monitor is the mechanism through which accountability is preserved once authority has been delegated.

Failures attributed to delegated agents are therefore rarely caused by the act of delegation itself. They are failures of delegation design—specifically, failures to retain governance capacity, challenge authority, and intervene when conditions change.[9]

5.1 Delegation as a fiduciary design decision

The decision to delegate is itself a fiduciary act. It reflects judgments about competence, incentives, scope of authority, and the feasibility of monitoring. Poorly designed delegation arrangements can render fiduciary oversight to a formality rather than a meaningful control.

Effective delegation design requires clarity on four elements:

1. Scope — what authority is transferred and what is retained
2. Constraints — mandate boundaries, risk limits, and conditions
3. Information — what must be reported, when, and in what form
4. Intervention — how and when fiduciaries can act if expectations are breached

Where these elements are weak, undefined, or taken for granted, delegation becomes a structural source of fiduciary risk.[9]

5.2 Common delegation failure modes

Oversight experience across sectors reveals recurring patterns:

- Outcome substitution: monitoring focuses on performance metrics while mandate compliance, risk posture, and process quality receive limited attention.
- Reputation substitution: reliance on brand, track record, or institutional prestige in lieu of active oversight.
- Incentive distortion: compensation structures reward short-term outcomes while penalizing transparency or prudence.
- Intervention paralysis: fiduciaries retain formal authority on paper, but lack the practical ability to exercise it.

These failures often coexist, reinforcing one another and obscuring governance weaknesses until stress occurs.[8]

5.3 The minimum viable duty to monitor

Monitoring should not be confused with micromanagement. It is best understood as retained governance capacity. At a minimum, fiduciaries should be able to demonstrate:

- Ongoing due diligence scaled to the importance and potential impact of the delegated mandate
- The ability to challenge information and decisions independently, rather than relying solely on self-reporting
- Mandate compliance review that is distinct from performance evaluation
- Readiness to modify, suspend, or terminate delegated authority

Where fiduciaries lack credible intervention options, monitoring becomes performative rather than substantive.[9]

5.4 Delegation chains and traceability

As delegation chains lengthen, fiduciary risk compounds. Authority may pass through multiple internal and external actors before decisions are executed. Oversight evaluation must therefore focus on traceability: the ability to reconstruct who relied on whom, based on what information, and with what authority to act.

Traceability failures often signal governance gaps rather than operational mishaps. They undermine both accountability and oversight confidence.[9]

5.5 Third-party and vendor risk as fiduciary risk

Operational failures involving service providers, technology vendors, or external operators are frequently treated as technical or contractual issues. In fiduciary contexts, they are governance issues. Concentration risk, subcontracting opacity, and contractual limits on oversight materially affect fiduciaries' ability to discharge their duties.

Effective fiduciary monitoring must therefore extend beyond financial performance to encompass operational resilience and third-party governance.[3,4]

6. Decisions Under Model Uncertainty: Model Risk as Fiduciary Risk

Models—financial, quantitative, strategic, or operational—are indispensable tools in modern governance. When governed well, they enhance discipline, consistency, and transparency. When governed poorly, they introduce a distinct form of fiduciary risk: the risk that judgment is replaced rather than informed.

Model risk is therefore not merely technical. It is fiduciary.[2]

6.1 Models as decision inputs, not decision-makers

Fiduciaries may rely on models, but they cannot delegate judgment to them. Model outputs inform decisions; they do not substitute for fiduciary reasoning. Treating models as authoritative rather than conditional undermines accountability and inflates confidence beyond what assumptions justify.

This distinction becomes especially important when models are embedded in decision frameworks or governance processes, where their outputs may acquire institutional authority by default.[2]

6.2 Sources of model-related fiduciary risk

Model-related fiduciary risk arises from multiple, often interacting sources:

- Assumption fragility: key assumptions remain implicit or untested.
- Selection bias: data inputs are chosen in ways that support preferred outcomes, creating an illusion of robustness.
- Model drift: relationships embedded in models degrade over time without detection.
- Opacity: decision-makers lack sufficient understanding to challenge outputs meaningfully.

These risks are magnified when models are used to manage expectations rather than inform judgment.[6] At the same time, these risks also directly implicate fiduciary governance under PBFA, particularly the governance of assumptions and the documentation required to make model reliance reviewable.[2]

6.3 Governance expectations for the use of models in fiduciary decision-making

Sound governance does not require fiduciaries to build or validate models themselves. It requires that institutions establish:

- Clear ownership of models and assumptions
- Independent validation proportional to model impact
- Defined limits on model use and interpretability
- Escalation protocols when outputs diverge from expectations

Absent these controls, model reliance becomes a mechanism for diffusing responsibility rather than enhancing discipline.[2]

6.4 Human judgment and override discipline

Human judgment remains essential, particularly during periods of structural change in markets, regulation, operating conditions, as well as during stress events. However, overrides must be governed with as much discipline as model use itself. Arbitrary overrides undermine credibility; undocumented overrides undermine accountability.

Effective fiduciary practice requires that overrides be rare, reasoned, documented, and reviewable.[2]

6.5 Oversight red flags

From a supervisory perspective, recurring warning signs include:

- Absence of a model inventory
- Validation treated as a formal compliance exercise
- Reliance on models without documented assumptions
- No contingency planning for model failure

These indicators often precede more visible fiduciary breakdowns.[2]

7. Fiduciary Failures as Governance Failures: Illustrative Case Vignettes

Fiduciary failures are commonly examined through outcomes: losses incurred, mandates breached, or reputational damage sustained. While outcomes may trigger scrutiny, they are weak diagnostics of fiduciary quality in complex systems. This section presents illustrative vignettes that reflect recurring governance failure modes without reliance on hindsight bias or attribution to specific institutions.[11]

7.1 The value of these stylized vignettes for regulators and oversight bodies

These vignettes intentionally leave out institution-specific details to reveal structural patterns. They allow regulators, oversight bodies, and fiduciary boards to identify vulnerabilities before outcomes force recognition. Their value lies in understanding failures, not assigning blame.[11]

7.2 Vignette I: Delegation without effective monitoring

Scenario

A fiduciary board delegates broad authority to an external manager or operating partner with performance-linked incentives. Early results meet expectations, and reporting emphasizes returns. Over time, risk concentrations increase, but monitoring remains outcome-focused. A stress event reveals risk concentrations that exceed the board's stated risk tolerance.

Governance diagnosis

- Monitoring focused on reported performance outcomes rather than on decision processes and risk discipline
- Incentive structures encouraged favorable reporting rather than transparency about emerging risks
- Escalation authority existed on paper but was not supported by clear triggers or practical mechanisms

PBFA mapping

- Pillar I: Diffuse accountability
- Pillar III: Incentive misalignment
- Pillar IV: Weak intervention capacity

The failure lies not in delegation, but in governance design.[8]

7.3 Vignette II: Model reliance and suppressed judgment

Scenario

A major fiduciary decision is informed by quantitative models embedded in governance frameworks. Model outputs are accepted at face value, with limited challenge or contextual review. Assumptions remain unchallenged as conditions evolve. When underlying conditions change in ways the model was not designed to handle, it can fail abruptly.

Governance diagnosis

- Key assumptions embedded in models were neither explicitly identified nor actively governed
- Model validation focuses on technical checks rather than on the significance and consequences of the decisions the model informs

- Human judgment was displaced by model outputs rather than deliberately structured to challenge and interpret them

PBFA mapping

- Pillar II: Poor uncertainty governance
- Pillar V: Inadequate rationale documentation

The failure reflects a failure to exercise judgment, rather than a lack of analytical capability.[2]

7.4 Vignette III: Cross-entity governance fragmentation

Scenario
An institution operates across multiple entities and jurisdictions. Strategic decisions are centralized; execution is decentralized. An operational or compliance incident reveals unclear authority and fragmented reporting.

Governance diagnosis

- Formal legal responsibility was separated from day-to-day operational control and decision authority
- No clear point of fiduciary escalation existed to address risks that cut across entities or functions
- Governance standards and expectations varied across entities, weakening the overall accountability

PBFA mapping

- Pillar I: Fragmented decision rights
- Pillar IV: Escalation failure

The fiduciary breakdown arises from structural incoherence rather than isolated misconduct. [8]

7.5 Cross-vignette synthesis

Across these vignettes, fiduciary failure emerges as an accumulation of governance weaknesses rather than a single error. Outcomes reveal failures; governance design explains them. For regulators, oversight bodies, and fiduciary boards alike, this reinforces the value of process-based assessment as a tool for early detection rather than after-the-fact fault-finding.[8]

8. Policy and Oversight Implications

The preceding sections establish fiduciary duty as a decision-making discipline governed by process quality rather than outcome realization. This reframing has direct implications for how regulators, standard setters, and oversight bodies evaluate fiduciary conduct in complex organizations.

A process-based approach does not weaken fiduciary accountability. Properly applied, it strengthens the credibility of oversight by grounding evaluation in observable governance practices rather than contested judgments about what decisions should have been made.

8.1 From outcome review to governance evaluation

Outcome-driven oversight is an imperfect proxy for fiduciary quality in environments characterized by uncertainty and delegation. Identical decision processes can yield divergent outcomes, while weak governance can persist undetected during favorable conditions.

A process-based approach to oversight addresses this asymmetry. By focusing on decision rights, uncertainty governance, conflict controls, monitoring, and escalation, regulators and oversight bodies can assess fiduciary integrity both before and after decisions are made, without relying on hindsight. This shift reduces outcome bias and improves consistency across institutions and asset classes.

Importantly, this approach preserves legitimate risk-taking. It does not require fiduciaries to avoid losses, only to demonstrate that losses were incurred within a governance framework capable of managing downside risk and responding to change.

8.2 Baseline oversight expectations for fiduciaries

Without prescribing uniform structures, regulators can reasonably expect fiduciaries to demonstrate the following governance conditions:

- Clear allocation of decision rights and accountability, including escalation authority
- Explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty, assumptions, and scenario ranges
- Active conflict identification and incentive alignment
- Retained monitoring and intervention capacity following delegation
- Clear and well-structured documentation that allows an independent third-party to reconstruct decision rationale

These expectations establish the conditions for discretion, not guarantees of outcomes. They are scalable and proportionate, reflecting institutional size, complexity, and the significance of decisions.

8.3 Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment as an oversight tool, not a compliance checklist

The Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework is not intended to operate as a checklist or safe harbor. Its value lies in its function as a diagnostic lens.

Oversight bodies, including regulators, can deploy PBFA through existing mechanisms:

- Mapping governance roles and decision responsibilities during routine reviews

- Reviewing decision records and escalation logs to understand how issues were identified and addressed
- Tracing how decisions and responsibilities flowed across delegated parties and organizational layers
- Formal statements or confirmations of model governance, scaled to the importance and impact of model use

Used in this manner, PBFA complements safety-and-soundness oversight, behavioral and market-conduct regulation, and operational resilience frameworks rather than competing with them.

8.4 Proportionality and institutional diversity

A core strength of the Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework is proportionality. Complex, systemically important institutions require more elaborate governance infrastructure than smaller or less complex entities. What matters is not uniformity of form, but sufficiency of function.

Process-based oversight therefore avoids imposing one-size-fits-all governance models while maintaining a consistent standard for fiduciary integrity.

8.5 Policy synthesis

From a policy perspective, strengthening fiduciary governance through process-based oversight enhances institutional resilience. It improves early detection of governance weaknesses and supports defensible oversight action across sectors. More importantly, it provides a shared language through which fiduciaries and oversight bodies can engage constructively before failures occur.

9. Conclusion: Fiduciary Duty as Governance Infrastructure

Fiduciary duty has not diminished in relevance as organizations have grown more complex. Its importance has increased. As authority becomes more distributed, decisions more model-informed, and accountability more fragmented, fiduciary duty functions as essential governance infrastructure.

This paper has argued that fiduciary duty in complex organizations is best understood—and evaluated for oversight purposes—as a decision-making discipline under uncertainty. Outcomes matter, but they are insufficient indicators of fiduciary quality. What endures is the integrity of governance design: how decisions are structured, how uncertainty is governed, how incentives are aligned, and how accountability is preserved over time.

The Process-Based Fiduciary Assessment framework offers regulators and fiduciary boards a practical lens through which these questions can be evaluated. It does not expand fiduciary obligations, prescribe outcomes, or eliminate risk. It clarifies how fiduciary duty operates in practice under modern conditions.

Across sectors and institutional forms, a consistent pattern emerges: fiduciary failure is rarely the result of a single bad decision. It is most often the consequence of governance designs that failed to surface critical assumptions, align incentives, or preserve intervention capacity when it mattered.

In complex systems, uncertainty is unavoidable. Fiduciary duty does not promise certainty. Its value lies in ensuring that when uncertainty materializes, governance remains accountable, transparent to oversight bodies, and capable of timely response.

References

1. ALI. (2007). Restatement (third) of trusts: Prudent investor rule (§90). *American Law Institute.*

2. BCBS. (2011). Principles for the sound management of operational risk. *Bank for International Settlements: Basel Committee on Banking Supervision.*

3. BCBS. (2015). Corporate governance principles for banks. *Bank for International Settlements: Basel Committee on Banking Supervision.*

4. FSB. (2020). Effective practices for cyber incident response and recovery. *Financial Stability Board.*

5. IOSCO. (2015). Mechanisms for trading venues to effectively manage electronic trading risks and plans for business continuity. *The International Organization of Securities Commissions*

6. Knight, F. H. (1921). Risk, uncertainty, and profit. *Houghton Mifflin Company.*

7. NACD. (2022). Audit committee blueprint. *National Association of Corporate Directors.*

8. OECD. (2010). Corporate governance and the financial crisis. *OECD Publishing.*

9. OECD. (2015). G20/OECD Principles of corporate governance. *OECD Publishing.*

10. Taleb, N. N. (2007). The black swan. *Random House.*

11. Power, M. (2007). Organized uncertainty: Designing a world of risk management. *Oxford University Press.*

12. U.S. DOL. (2015*)*. Interpretive bulletin relating to the fiduciary standard under ERISA in considering economically targeted investments. *U.S. Department of Labor.*