AEA by Ivory & Co.

Intelligence Architecture Standard

Version: v1.0.0 — Published Anchor: Understanding

1. Definition

Intelligence Architecture defines how the enterprise establishes, maintains and develops the understanding required by its architectures to operate across time and horizons.

Intelligence Architecture is the architecture of Understanding.

Its governing question is:

What is required for the enterprise to understand what an architecture has determined must be understood?

Intelligence does not independently determine what every part of the enterprise ought to know.

The architecture that owns the subject establishes what it needs to understand and why.

Intelligence architects how that understanding can be established.

The governing flow is:

Source Architecture !’ Requirement of Understanding !’ Intelligence Fulfilment !’ Understanding !’ Source Architecture

2. Why Intelligence Architecture Exists

An enterprise cannot operate coherently merely because data, documents, systems, reports, experts and AI are available.

It must be able to establish what those sources mean, how they relate, what evidence supports them, what remains uncertain, what has changed, what context matters and how understanding should be maintained through time.

Every AEA architecture creates requirements for understanding.

Directional may need to understand whether strategic assumptions remain valid.

Domain may need to understand how a Capability is performing.

Ecosystem may need to understand a relationship or dependency.

Environment may need to understand enablement requirements or conditions.

Execution may need to understand work, evidence or performance.

Expression may need to understand audiences and experience.

Possibility may need to understand conditions sufficiently to form hypotheses.

Reality may require an information and evidence basis sufficient to establish correspondence with actuality.

Trust may require understanding relevant to warranted reliance.

Workforce may need to understand Roles, skills, sourcing or Participants.

The need originates with the architecture whose proposition depends upon that understanding.

Intelligence provides the architecture through which that need can be fulfilled.

> Intelligence exists because enterprise understanding must be architected, not assumed.

3. Requirement of Understanding

A Requirement of Understanding is a requirement established by a source architecture identifying what must be understood, and why that understanding is required, in order to establish, maintain, develop or apply one of its architectural propositions.

The Requirement of Understanding remains owned by the source architecture.

Examples include:

- Directional requiring understanding of whether a strategic assumption remains supportable;
- Domain requiring understanding of whether a Capability is producing its intended outcome;
- Ecosystem requiring understanding of a material dependency;
- Execution requiring understanding of whether work is being performed as intended;
- Expression requiring understanding of differences relevant to contextual expression;
- Possibility requiring understanding sufficient to create or challenge a Hypothesis;
- Reality requiring an adequate basis to establish correspondence with actuality;
- Trust requiring understanding relevant to a Reliance Condition;
- Workforce requiring understanding of the skills or fulfilment characteristics required for a Role.

Intelligence must not invent a Requirement of Understanding merely because information exists.

> The subject architecture determines what must be understood. Intelligence determines what is required to establish that understanding.

4. Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement

An Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement defines what Intelligence requires in order to satisfy a Requirement of Understanding.

Depending upon the requirement, this may include:

- Signals;
- Data;
- Information;
- Evidence;
- sources;
- Source Authority;
- provenance;
- semantics;
- metadata;
- lineage;
- context;
- interpretation;
- confidence;
- contradiction;
- temporal context;
- memory;
- or another intelligence requirement.

The Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement belongs to Intelligence because it describes the architecture necessary to establish understanding.

This creates two distinct propositions:

> Source Architecture Requirement of Understanding — What must we understand, and why?
>
> Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement — What is required for us to establish that understanding?

These propositions must not be collapsed.

5. Understanding

Understanding is an enterprise's established comprehension of a subject sufficient to locate what is known, the basis upon which it is known, the context in which it applies, the uncertainty that remains and the meaning relevant to the originating Requirement of Understanding.

Understanding is not merely stored information.

It is not simply access to data.

It is not the existence of evidence.

It is not confidence.

It is not actuality.

It is not Trust.

Understanding may remain incomplete, contested, conditional or uncertain.

A conformant Intelligence Architecture preserves those conditions rather than manufacturing false coherence.

> Understanding can be useful without pretending uncertainty has disappeared.

6. Organisational Knowing

Intelligence Architecture establishes the conditions through which the enterprise can know and continue to know.

This includes the ability to:

- sense;
- acquire;
- identify;
- classify;
- connect;
- interpret;
- contextualise;
- evidence;
- challenge;
- derive;
- retain;
- retrieve;
- update;
- and appropriately retire or supersede

the information required to maintain organisational understanding.

Intelligence therefore extends beyond reporting and analytics.

It includes the architecture required for the enterprise to preserve the basis, context and

continuity of what it understands.

> Intelligence Architecture is the architecture of organisational knowing.

7. From Signal to Understanding

A useful runtime progression is:

> Signal !’ Data !’ Information !’ Evidence !’ Knowledge !’ Understanding

This progression is conceptual rather than a mandatory processing pipeline.

A Signal is an observable indication potentially relevant to a Requirement of Understanding.

Data is a recorded representation capable of being processed or interpreted.

Information is data placed into sufficient meaning or context to inform a subject.

Evidence is information relevant to supporting, challenging or establishing a proposition.

Knowledge is retained and usable comprehension established from relevant information, evidence, interpretation and context.

Understanding is the contextual comprehension necessary to make sense of what is known, why it is known, how confidently it is known, what it means for the originating requirement and what remains uncertain.

Not every Requirement of Understanding requires every stage.

The architecture must not manufacture intermediate objects where they add no value.

8. Evidence

Evidence is information relevant to supporting, challenging or establishing a proposition.

Evidence must remain attributable to its source and context where material.

Evidence may support a proposition without conclusively proving it.

Multiple pieces of evidence may conflict.

Repeated statements originating from the same underlying source do not become independent corroboration merely because they appear in multiple places.

Human discussion may constitute evidence, but it is filtered through memory, perception, interpretation and communication.

AI-generated material may assist analysis but does not become independent evidence merely because it is confidently expressed.

> Evidence must remain distinguishable from assertion, repetition and inference.

9. Source and Source Authority

A Source is an origin from which information, evidence, signals or other intelligence material is obtained.

Source Authority concerns the standing of that source in relation to the proposition being understood.

Access to a source does not establish Source Authority.

Frequency of use does not establish Source Authority.

Technical connectivity does not establish Source Authority.

Popularity does not establish Source Authority.

A source may be highly authoritative for one proposition and weak for another.

> Source access "` Source Authority.

Where the authority of a source originates in governance, law, relationship, role, credential, system-of-record designation or another architecture, Intelligence preserves that authority context without acquiring ownership of its origin.

10. Provenance and Lineage

Provenance establishes where relevant intelligence material came from.

Lineage establishes how it has moved, transformed, combined or derived through its lifecycle where that history is material to understanding.

Provenance and lineage allow the enterprise to distinguish:

- original source from reproduction;
- direct evidence from derived interpretation;
- independent corroboration from repetition;
- current material from superseded material;
- and authoritative source from convenient copy.

AI-generated summaries, transformations and derivations must preserve sufficient provenance to prevent the transformed material from being mistaken for its source.

> Transformation must not erase origin.

11. Semantics and Context

Understanding depends upon meaning.

Semantics establishes the meaning of information and the terms, concepts and relationships required to interpret it consistently.

Context establishes the circumstances necessary to interpret intelligence material appropriately.

Relevant context may include:

- subject;
- source;
- time;
- horizon;
- location;
- population;
- conditions;
- assumptions;
- method;
- relationship;
- version;
- scope;
- perspective;
- or another material qualifier.

The same information may support different interpretations under different contexts.

Intelligence must therefore preserve context where loss of that context would materially alter understanding.

12. Confidence

Confidence expresses the strength of the basis supporting an element of understanding.

Confidence is explanatory and evidence-bound.

It must not become a universal score that collapses materially different propositions.

Confidence may be influenced by matters such as:

- Source Authority;
- evidence quality;
- independence of corroboration;
- completeness;
- currency;
- consistency;
- provenance;
- method;
- uncertainty;
- and contradiction.

These factors must remain visible where material.

A high volume of weak information must not automatically create high confidence.

Repetition must not be treated as corroboration.

Confidence must not be inferred from the fluency or certainty of AI-generated language.

Confidence describes the basis of understanding. It does not establish actuality or warranted reliance.

13. Contradiction and Ambiguity

Intelligence Architecture must support contradiction.

Where sources, evidence or interpretations conflict, the architecture must not silently collapse them into a single answer merely for convenience.

Contradiction may itself be material intelligence.

Ambiguity may also be legitimate.

A conformant architecture preserves:

- what conflicts;
- the basis of each proposition;
- relevant Source Authority;
- context;
- confidence;
- and what remains unresolved.

Unknown or contested understanding is preferable to invented certainty.

14. Derivation

A Derivation is a governed transformation through which an intelligence result is produced from

one or more inputs.

Derivations may include formulas, calculations, classifications, aggregations, models, inference mechanisms or other established transformations.

Where a derived result is used by another architecture, ownership remains separated.

For example:

Source architecture defines the proposition or measure !’ Intelligence may own the derivation !’ Reality captures the resulting actual value where the result represents actuality.

The formula does not become Reality merely because it produces an actual value.

The actual value does not become Intelligence merely because Intelligence produced the derivation.

Derivation logic must remain traceable where material.

15. Time and Horizons

Intelligence Architecture operates across time and horizons.

Time locates information, evidence, knowledge and understanding in relation to when something occurred, was observed, was recorded, became known or remained applicable.

Horizon locates understanding in relation to the temporal perspective from which the enterprise is reasoning.

Intelligence may support understanding of:

- historical conditions;
- current conditions;
- emerging conditions;
- and future-facing propositions.

This does not transfer ownership of those propositions.

Historical and current actuality remain Reality propositions.

Future hypotheses remain Possibility propositions.

Strategic commitments remain Directional propositions.

Intelligence provides the architecture through which the relevant understanding can be established across those horizons.

16. Organisational Memory

Organisational Memory preserves understanding and its basis across time.

It enables the enterprise to retain:

- what was understood;
- what evidence supported it;
- what assumptions applied;
- what context mattered;
- what decisions or interpretations were made where relevant;
- what subsequently changed;
- and what has been superseded.

Organisational Memory must not silently overwrite history.

A changed understanding does not mean the previous understanding never existed.

Where material, the enterprise must be able to distinguish:

- historical understanding;
- current understanding;
- superseded understanding;
- and unresolved contradiction.

Learning requires memory of what changed, not merely storage of the latest answer.

17. Information Governance

Information Governance within Intelligence Architecture concerns the rules necessary to ensure intelligence material can validly support organisational understanding.

This may include requirements concerning:

- classification;
- provenance;
- semantics;
- metadata;
- quality;
- access;
- retention;
- version;
- lineage;
- evidence handling;
- context;
- and appropriate use.

Information Governance does not confer authority merely because information is controlled.

Security access does not determine Source Authority.

Permission to edit does not determine proposition ownership.

The detailed governance mechanisms may intersect with AEA Governance, Trust and Environment depending upon the subject.

18. Intelligence Demand and Supply

Intelligence can be understood as an architecture connecting demand for understanding with the supply required to fulfil it.

Demand begins outside Intelligence:

Source Architecture !’ Requirement of Understanding

Intelligence then architects fulfilment:

Requirement of Understanding !’ Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement !’ Source / Signal / Data / Information / Evidence / Context / Interpretation / Confidence / Memory !’ Understanding

The resulting Understanding returns to the source architecture.

This is not a one-time pipeline.

A changed architectural proposition, new evidence, altered context, contradiction or elapsed time may create a renewed Requirement of Understanding.

19. Purpose-Specific Assembled Understanding

Enterprise work frequently requires understanding assembled across several architectures.

Examples may include:

- strategic planning;
- BOAS construction;
- SOP construction;
- board or governance views;
- management views;
- operational diagnostics;
- scenario work;
- or other purpose-specific enterprise representations.

Intelligence enables the understanding necessary for these compositions by making relevant architectural propositions knowable, traceable and contextual.

It does not thereby acquire ownership of the resulting render.

Intelligence enables assembled understanding. AEA in Action performs cross-architecture composition.

A Strategic Plan is not an Intelligence object.

A BOAS is not an Intelligence object.

An SOP is not an Intelligence object.

A board pack is not an Intelligence object.

Their composition methods and purpose-specific construction protocols belong in AEA in Action or another governed application layer.

20. Intelligence and Directional Architecture

Directional owns strategic scope and choices.

Where Directional requires understanding to establish, test or reconsider those choices, Directional originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Intelligence may establish understanding of assumptions, evidence, context, change or other matters relevant to direction.

It does not choose the strategic direction.

Directional chooses. Intelligence enables the enterprise to understand what informs that choice.

Strategic planning remains a cross-architecture render rather than a native object of either architecture.

21. Intelligence and Domain Architecture

Domain owns Business Models, Value Chains, Capabilities and their durable architectural propositions.

Where Domain requires understanding of a Capability, value logic, measure or related proposition, Domain originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Information about a Capability is not the Capability.

Where a Domain measure requires a formula or derivation, Intelligence may own the derivation.

Where the resulting value represents actual Capability condition or performance, Reality captures the actual value.

> Domain defines the proposition. Intelligence enables understanding. Reality captures actuality.

22. Intelligence and Ecosystem Architecture

Ecosystem owns Actors, Relationships, Exchanges and Dependencies.

Where Ecosystem needs to understand a relationship, dependency, commitment, exchange or Actor context, Ecosystem originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence establishes the information, evidence, context and interpretation required to satisfy it.

Information about an Actor is not the Actor.

Understanding a Relationship does not transfer ownership of the Relationship to Intelligence.

23. Intelligence and Environment Architecture

Environment owns physical and technological enablement requirements and their fulfilment.

Where Environment requires understanding of enablement requirements, configurations, constraints, performance or other relevant propositions, Environment originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Environment may provide systems, platforms, repositories, tools and runtime through which intelligence is stored or processed.

Technical hosting does not transfer Intelligence ownership to Environment.

> Environment enables Intelligence. Intelligence establishes Understanding.

24. Intelligence and Execution Architecture

Execution owns the enterprise's instructions for how work is performed.

Where Execution requires understanding of work, evidence, performance, exceptions, variants or other relevant propositions, Execution originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Operational Metrics remain Execution-owned.

Intelligence may establish the information, evidence, provenance or derivation required to interpret them.

Reality captures actual operational values.

BOAS and SOP remain cross-architecture renders.

Intelligence enables the understanding required for their composition; AEA in Action constructs

them.

25. Intelligence and Expression Architecture

Expression owns Enterprise Identity and the contextual expression of that identity to relevant audiences.

Where Expression requires understanding of audiences, perceptions, experience, context or differences material to expression, Expression originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Reality may capture Perspectival Actuality concerning how an individual or collective actually perceives the enterprise.

Intelligence may establish broader understanding from those observations.

Expression determines whether that understanding warrants a different Audience Segment or expression.

> Intelligence may explain the audience. It does not create the Audience Segment.

26. Intelligence and Possibility Architecture

Possibility owns enterprise optionality, What Ifs, Hypotheses and other future possibilities.

Possibility requires understanding in order to hypothesise.

Possibility therefore originates Requirements of Understanding concerning the matters it needs to understand in order to imagine, test or develop a possibility.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

The resulting Understanding returns to Possibility, which uses it to create, challenge or develop Hypotheses.

> Possibility requires understanding in order to hypothesise. Intelligence enables that understanding to be established. Possibility converts resulting understanding into hypotheses about enterprise future.

Intelligence does not own the Hypothesis.

27. Intelligence and Reality Architecture

Reality owns Actuality.

Intelligence owns Understanding.

The distinction is fundamental.

> Understanding is not Actuality.

Reality may require information, evidence, provenance, context or derivation sufficient to establish correspondence with actuality.

Reality originates that Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects its fulfilment.

Reality then captures the actual Position, state, value, Movement or retrospective Trajectory as applicable.

A highly confident understanding does not automatically establish actuality.

Likewise, actuality may exist even where the enterprise does not yet understand it.

Reality asks what is or was actually the case. Intelligence establishes what the enterprise can understand about it and on what basis.

28. Intelligence and Trust Architecture

Trust owns warranted Reliance.

Intelligence owns Understanding.

Confidence in understanding is not the same proposition as warranted reliance.

Trust may originate Requirements of Understanding concerning identity, authority, integrity, control, assurance, autonomy, Reliance Attributes, Trust Indicators, transferred trust dependencies or other matters relevant to reliance.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

A Trust Score is not an Intelligence confidence score.

A high-confidence understanding that a party behaved in a particular way does not by itself determine whether another party should rely upon them in a particular context.

Trust makes that architectural determination.

29. Intelligence and Workforce Architecture

Workforce owns Roles, Skills Required, Sourcing, Participant Types, Workforce Structures, Assigned Entities and related participation propositions.

Where Workforce needs to understand skills, sourcing options, participant characteristics, gaps, learning requirements or other Workforce matters, Workforce originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment.

Information about a Participant is not the Participant.

Information about a Role is not the Role.

Participant data must not silently become an upstream determinant of Role design merely because Intelligence can access it.

30. Intelligence and AEA Governance

AEA Governance controls the authority, lifecycle, version, change, conformance, release and archival treatment of governed AEA material.

Intelligence may establish understanding from governed records.

It does not acquire governance authority over those records merely because it can access, interpret or connect them.

Likewise, AEA Governance may establish authoritative sources, records or versions that Intelligence must preserve as Source Authority context.

Knowing a governed proposition does not confer authority to change it.

31. Intelligence and AEA in Action

AEA in Action applies the Architecture Set to enterprise work.

It may use Intelligence to:

- assemble understanding across architectures;
- construct purpose-specific views;
- diagnose conditions;
- explore scenarios;
- build BOAS and SOP renders;
- support strategic planning;
- create management or governance views;
- and enable other cross-architecture applications.

The methods through which those compositions are performed are not automatically Intelligence Architecture doctrine.

Intelligence makes the architecture knowable. AEA in Action makes the architecture usable for a purpose.

32. Governing Principles

Intelligence Architecture is the architecture of Understanding.

Intelligence Architecture is the architecture of organisational knowing.

The source architecture originates the Requirement of Understanding.

Intelligence architects fulfilment of that requirement.

Information about X is not X.

Understanding is not Actuality.

Confidence in understanding is not warranted Reliance.

Source access is not Source Authority.

Repetition is not corroboration.

Volume is not evidence quality.

Fluency is not confidence.

Evidence must remain distinguishable from assertion, repetition and inference.

Transformation must not erase provenance.

Contradiction must not be silently resolved for convenience.

Unknown or contested understanding is preferable to invented certainty.

The architecture must preserve context where loss of context would materially change meaning.

The source architecture owns the proposition or measure. Intelligence may own the derivation. Reality owns the actual value where the result represents actuality.

Historical and current actuality remain Reality. Future hypotheses remain Possibility. Strategic commitments remain Directional.

Organisational Memory must preserve meaningful change in understanding across time.

Intelligence enables assembled understanding. It does not automatically own the resulting render.

Strategic Plans, BOAS, SOPs and similar cross-architecture compositions are not native Intelligence objects.

Knowing a governed proposition does not confer authority to change it.

33. AI Protocol

AI can materially assist Intelligence Architecture.

It may assist with:

· sensing;
· extraction;
· classification;
· semantic alignment;
· summarisation;
· comparison;
· contradiction detection;
· provenance tracing;
· pattern identification;
· evidence organisation;
· contextualisation;
· derivation;
· challenge;
· retrieval;
· memory support;
· and candidate interpretation.

AI must not:

· originate a Requirement of Understanding on behalf of a source architecture without an established basis;
· assume that available information is required merely because it is accessible;
· treat itself as Source Authority;
· treat its own generated output as independent evidence;
· convert repetition into corroboration;
· convert source volume into evidence quality;
· infer authority from access;
· infer actuality from confidence;
· infer Trust from confidence;
· treat fluent language as evidence of correctness;
· erase provenance through summarisation or transformation;
· silently reconcile contradictory sources;
· infer missing information and present it as established;
· remove uncertainty because an answer is expected;
· overwrite historical understanding without preserving meaningful change;
· convert a derived value into a directly observed value;
· acquire ownership of another architecture's proposition because it can interpret it;
· treat a Strategic Plan, BOAS, SOP or other assembled render as an Intelligence object;
· make a governed decision merely because it can establish relevant understanding;
· approve, publish, release or alter governed architecture without the required authority;
· or expose proprietary AEA in Action composition methods as though they were Published Standard doctrine.

AI may assist the enterprise to understand. It must not manufacture knowing, actuality, reliance or authority.

34. Conformance

A conformant application of Intelligence Architecture must preserve, where applicable:

1. the source architecture originating the Requirement of Understanding; 2. the Requirement of Understanding and its purpose; 3. the Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement; 4. relevant Sources; 5. Source Authority context; 6. Signals, Data, Information and Evidence where material; 7. provenance; 8. lineage where material; 9. semantics; 10. context; 11. derivation where applicable; 12. confidence and its basis; 13. contradiction and uncertainty; 14. temporal context; 15. horizon; 16. Organisational Memory; 17. distinction between Understanding and Actuality; 18. distinction between confidence and Reliance; 19. source ownership of the proposition being understood; 20. and separation between Intelligence enablement and AEA in Action composition.

35. Non-Conformance

An application is non-conformant where it:

· makes Intelligence the independent owner of what every architecture must understand;
· treats a Requirement of Understanding as Intelligence-owned when it originates in another architecture;
· treats information about an architectural object as the object itself;
· treats data availability as understanding;
· treats access as Source Authority;
· treats repetition as independent corroboration;
· treats confidence as Actuality;
· treats confidence as Trust;
· treats AI-generated output as independent evidence without an appropriate source basis;
· erases provenance through transformation;
· silently resolves contradiction;
· invents missing information;
· suppresses uncertainty to create a clean answer;
· treats a formula and its resulting actual value as the same architectural proposition;
· treats forward hypotheses as Intelligence-owned;
· treats historical actuality as Intelligence-owned;
· treats Strategic Planning as a native Intelligence object;
· treats BOAS or SOP as native Intelligence objects;
· treats a board pack or management view as a native Intelligence object merely because Intelligence contributes to it;
· or uses understanding as authority to alter a governed proposition.

36. Published Gaps

GAPS — None currently identified that prevent publication of this Standard.

Detailed information schemas, source classifications, confidence methods, evidence models, provenance structures, memory mechanisms, derivation specifications and purpose-specific assembly protocols belong in the downstream Intelligence Architecture package or AEA in Action as appropriate.

Their absence from this Published Standard does not constitute an architectural doctrine gap.

37. Publication Position

Intelligence Architecture provides AEA with its architecture of Understanding.

It establishes a deliberate separation between the enterprise's need to understand something and the architecture required to satisfy that need.

The need originates with the architecture that owns the proposition:

> Source Architecture !’ Requirement of Understanding

Intelligence then architects the fulfilment:

> Intelligence Fulfilment Requirement !’ Sources !’ Signals !’ Data !’ Information !’ Evidence !’ Context !’ Interpretation !’ Confidence !’ Memory !’ Understanding

The resulting Understanding returns to the source architecture without transferring ownership of the subject to Intelligence.

This allows the enterprise to understand its direction, capabilities, relationships, environments, work, expression, possibilities, actuality, reliance and participation while preserving the architectural identity of each.

It also establishes the boundary between knowing and the other propositions with which knowing is easily confused:

> Understanding "` Actuality
>
> Confidence "` Reliance
>
> Access "` Authority
>
> Information about X "` X

And it preserves the final application boundary:

> Intelligence enables assembled understanding. AEA in Action performs cross-architecture composition.

The governing architecture is therefore:

> The source architecture determines what must be understood and why. Intelligence Architecture determines what is required for the enterprise to establish, maintain and develop that understanding across time and horizons.