

Research Article

Series I - Foundations of Institutional Cognition

EA-041

Connecting Institutions Through Shared Intelligence



IDHUS Institute

Copyright 2026 © IDHUS Institute - idhus.org
Editor and Director: David González

All rights reserved.

This publication forms part of the constitutional editorial architecture of the IDHUS Institute and belongs to the Institutional Cognition Knowledge Series.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, translated or adapted without prior written permission from the Institute, except where permitted under applicable copyright legislation or for legitimate academic quotation with appropriate citation.



Index

Introduction 4

From Information Exchange to Shared Understanding 5

Shared Situational Awareness and the Emergence of Governance Intelligence 8

Conclusion 11

Introduction

The growing complexity of contemporary governance has made institutional cooperation more important than at any previous period in modern public administration. Public policies increasingly require contributions from multiple organisations possessing different forms of expertise, constitutional responsibilities and operational experience. Scientific institutions generate evidence, regulatory authorities establish legal frameworks, ministries coordinate national strategies, local administrations implement public services and international organisations provide broader perspectives on challenges that extend beyond national borders. No single institution possesses sufficient knowledge to understand the entirety of these complex realities independently. Governance therefore depends upon relationships that enable institutions to combine their different perspectives into coherent public action.

Traditionally, these relationships have been described using concepts such as coordination, cooperation, communication or information sharing. Governments invest in digital platforms, establish interdepartmental committees, create mechanisms for policy coordination and promote interoperability between administrative systems in order to improve institutional collaboration. These developments have undoubtedly strengthened the effectiveness of governance by reducing organisational fragmentation and facilitating the movement of information across public administrations. Yet they do not fully explain how institutions move from exchanging information to genuinely understanding complex situations together.

This distinction is becoming increasingly significant as governance challenges evolve beyond the capacity of individual organisations to interpret independently. Artificial intelligence, climate adaptation, cybersecurity, demographic transformation, economic resilience and public health all require institutions to integrate evidence originating from numerous disciplines and governance levels simultaneously. Simply providing access to more information does not necessarily produce better decisions. In many cases, the opposite occurs. Institutions become overwhelmed by increasing quantities of data while struggling to construct coherent interpretations capable of guiding effective public action. The central challenge therefore shifts from information management to collective understanding.

From the perspective of Institutional Cognition, this challenge introduces the concept of shared intelligence. Shared intelligence should not be confused with shared databases, common communication platforms or coordinated administrative procedures. These elements undoubtedly support institutional cooperation, yet they remain enabling mechanisms rather than the phenomenon itself. Shared intelligence refers to the cognitive process through which institutions progressively construct common representations of reality despite approaching that reality from different organisational perspectives. It enables distributed expertise to become coherent institutional understanding while preserving the diversity that gives collective intelligence its richness.

This interpretation fundamentally changes the meaning of institutional knowledge exchange. Knowledge does not circulate merely because information moves between organisations. Genuine knowledge exchange requires institutions to interpret, contextualise and integrate one another's perspectives into their own understanding. A scientific report becomes valuable not simply because it reaches policy-makers but because institutions collectively explore its implications within broader governance contexts. Operational experience generated by local administrations contributes to national strategy only when higher levels of governance understand its significance beyond isolated administrative observations. Shared intelligence therefore depends upon continuous processes of mutual interpretation rather than one-directional communication.

The previous articles in this series have progressively developed the foundations required to understand this broader perspective. We have explored institutional cognition, collective

intelligence, interoperability, trust, multi-level governance and adaptive public policy as complementary elements of intelligent governance. Each of these concepts demonstrates that effective governance depends increasingly upon institutions learning together rather than acting independently. Shared intelligence represents the natural convergence of these developments because it explains how distributed institutional learning becomes coherent collective awareness across entire governance ecosystems.

This perspective becomes especially relevant in environments characterised by permanent change. Governments today must interpret rapidly evolving technological innovation, environmental transformation, geopolitical uncertainty and changing social expectations while coordinating responses across multiple institutional levels simultaneously. Under such conditions, governance cannot rely upon isolated institutional analyses that are later combined through administrative coordination. Understanding itself must become collaborative from the outset. Institutions require cognitive mechanisms capable of integrating diverse observations into continuously evolving representations of complex public realities.

The purpose of this article is to examine how institutions construct shared intelligence across governance ecosystems. Rather than treating knowledge exchange as a technical or organisational activity, it explores how institutions collectively develop shared situational awareness through continuous interpretation, coordination and institutional learning. By understanding shared intelligence as one of the defining characteristics of Governance Intelligence, we begin to recognise that the future effectiveness of public administration depends not simply upon connecting institutions through technology but upon enabling them to think together as components of an integrated cognitive system.

From Information Exchange to Shared Understanding

The ability of institutions to exchange information has long been recognised as an essential requirement for effective governance. Public administrations invest heavily in digital infrastructures, interoperable information systems and communication networks designed to ensure that relevant knowledge can move rapidly between organisations. These investments have become even more significant as governments increasingly depend upon data originating from multiple institutional sources to address complex societal challenges. Yet despite these advances, the availability of information alone does not necessarily produce better governance. Institutions may possess access to the same data while nevertheless arriving at profoundly different interpretations of its meaning and implications.

This observation reveals one of the most important distinctions within Institutional Cognition. Information and understanding are not identical phenomena. Information consists of observations, measurements, reports, statistics or other representations of particular aspects of reality. Understanding emerges only when institutions interpret these elements within broader conceptual frameworks that explain relationships, identify significance and guide collective action. Governance therefore depends not simply upon exchanging information but upon constructing shared interpretations capable of transforming dispersed observations into coherent public knowledge.

The difference may appear subtle, yet it fundamentally changes the way institutional cooperation is understood. Conventional models of coordination often assume that communication problems arise primarily because organisations do not possess sufficient access to one another's information. The proposed solution is therefore to improve information sharing

through more effective technological systems, clearer reporting procedures or stronger organisational coordination. These measures undoubtedly reduce important barriers to collaboration, but they cannot by themselves ensure that institutions understand the information they receive in compatible ways. Shared intelligence requires something more demanding than communication. It requires institutions to develop sufficiently compatible interpretative frameworks to construct common representations of reality while preserving the diversity of their professional perspectives.

This distinction becomes particularly evident when examining how different institutions observe the same societal phenomenon. Consider the introduction of artificial intelligence into public administration. A technological agency may interpret developments primarily in terms of computational capability, innovation and digital infrastructure. Regulatory authorities naturally concentrate upon legal compliance, accountability and citizens' rights. Economic institutions examine productivity, labour markets and competitiveness, while educational organisations focus upon skills development and lifelong learning. None of these interpretations is incorrect. Each reflects the legitimate perspective of institutions fulfilling different constitutional responsibilities. Yet if these perspectives remain isolated, governance risks producing fragmented responses that fail to appreciate the interconnected nature of the transformation itself.

Shared intelligence enables these different institutional viewpoints to become complementary rather than contradictory. Instead of competing to establish a single dominant interpretation, institutions progressively integrate their specialised observations into richer representations that acknowledge the complexity of the issue under consideration. Technological innovation becomes simultaneously a legal, economic, educational and societal transformation. The governance ecosystem develops a more comprehensive understanding because every institutional perspective contributes knowledge that expands the collective interpretation rather than replacing alternative viewpoints. Intelligence therefore emerges through integration instead of uniformity.

This process depends fundamentally upon continuous interpretation. Information rarely possesses meaning independently of the institutional contexts within which it was generated. Statistical indicators require methodological explanation, scientific research reflects particular theoretical assumptions, operational reports arise from specific administrative experiences and legal analysis is inseparable from constitutional interpretation. Institutions engaged in knowledge exchange must therefore communicate not only conclusions but also the reasoning that produced those conclusions. Shared understanding develops because organisations progressively become familiar with one another's conceptual models, professional languages and analytical traditions. Over time, they learn not simply what other institutions know but how those institutions think.

The importance of this interpretative dimension increases considerably as governance environments become more complex. Contemporary public challenges frequently involve interactions between technological, environmental, economic, social and geopolitical factors that cannot be analysed adequately within any single disciplinary framework. Institutions must therefore compare different interpretations continuously while remaining open to revising their own assumptions in light of new evidence. Shared intelligence does not require complete agreement at every stage of this process. On the contrary, constructive disagreement often strengthens collective understanding by revealing dimensions of reality that might otherwise remain overlooked. What matters is that institutions possess sufficient trust, interoperability and cognitive compatibility to transform different interpretations into opportunities for learning rather than sources of fragmentation.

Artificial intelligence is likely to reinforce this need for shared interpretation rather than diminish it. Computational systems can generate increasingly sophisticated analyses, integrate enormous quantities of information and identify patterns extending across multiple policy domains. These capabilities substantially improve the observational capacity of governance. Yet artificial intelligence cannot determine independently which interpretations should guide democratic public action. Different institutions will continue to evaluate computational outputs according to their constitutional responsibilities, ethical considerations and professional expertise.

Shared intelligence therefore becomes even more important because governments must collectively interpret not only societal developments but also the insights produced by increasingly advanced computational systems. Technology expands the amount of information available, while institutions remain responsible for transforming that information into legitimate collective understanding.

An equally significant implication concerns the role of language within governance. Institutions often develop specialised vocabularies that reflect their professional traditions and operational responsibilities. Legal terminology differs from scientific language, administrative concepts differ from economic analysis and technical expertise frequently employs frameworks unfamiliar to organisations operating in other domains. These differences are both inevitable and valuable because they enable specialised knowledge to develop with considerable precision. Shared intelligence does not seek to eliminate this diversity. Instead, it creates cognitive bridges through which institutions translate specialised knowledge into forms that remain meaningful across the wider governance ecosystem. Understanding grows because different institutional languages become mutually intelligible without losing their distinctive richness.

As institutions engage repeatedly in these processes of mutual interpretation, they gradually construct shared situational awareness. This concept extends beyond the simple recognition that different organisations possess similar information. Shared situational awareness exists when institutions develop compatible representations of evolving public realities that allow coordinated judgement despite the diversity of their constitutional responsibilities. They need not agree upon every policy response, yet they increasingly recognise that they are interpreting the same underlying reality through complementary perspectives. Collective intelligence emerges because governance acquires a common cognitive foundation upon which different institutions can exercise their legitimate responsibilities coherently.

Over time, these recurring cycles of interpretation create enduring intellectual relationships throughout the governance ecosystem. Institutions become progressively more capable of anticipating how partner organisations are likely to understand emerging developments, enabling faster knowledge exchange and more effective collaborative learning. Shared intelligence therefore accumulates gradually through continuous interaction. It becomes part of the cognitive architecture of governance itself, strengthening the capacity of institutions to address future challenges with increasingly integrated understanding.

Seen from this broader perspective, connecting institutions is not primarily a technological or organisational achievement. It is a cognitive accomplishment through which diverse forms of expertise become components of a shared institutional understanding. Information exchange provides the foundation, but shared interpretation transforms that foundation into collective awareness capable of supporting adaptive governance. The intelligence of the governance ecosystem ultimately depends not upon the volume of information circulating within it but upon the depth of the understanding that institutions construct together.

This naturally raises a further question. If institutions are capable of developing shared understanding across governance networks, how does this collective awareness influence coordination, decision-making and adaptive governance over time?

Shared Situational Awareness and the Emergence of Governance Intelligence

Once institutions move beyond the simple exchange of information and begin constructing shared interpretations of reality, governance acquires a new cognitive capability that extends far beyond traditional models of coordination. This capability may be described as **shared situational awareness**: the collective capacity of institutions to maintain a coherent and continuously evolving understanding of the environments in which they operate. Rather than acting independently on the basis of isolated observations, institutions progressively develop compatible representations of complex public realities that enable coordinated judgement, adaptive decision-making and collective intelligence across the governance ecosystem.

Situational awareness has long been recognised within fields such as aviation, emergency management and military operations, where effective action depends upon maintaining an accurate understanding of rapidly changing environments. In these contexts, situational awareness refers to the ability to perceive relevant information, interpret its significance and anticipate how circumstances may evolve over time. Institutional Cognition extends this concept considerably. Governance is not concerned with the awareness of a single individual or organisation but with the capacity of numerous autonomous institutions to develop sufficiently coherent understandings that allow society to respond intelligently to complexity. Shared situational awareness therefore becomes an institutional rather than an individual cognitive achievement.

This distinction is particularly important because contemporary governance rarely encounters problems that remain confined within the responsibilities of a single organisation. Environmental transformation affects infrastructure, agriculture, public health, economic development and international cooperation simultaneously. Artificial intelligence influences education, labour markets, legal systems, cybersecurity and democratic governance. Demographic change reshapes healthcare, housing, employment, fiscal policy and regional development at the same time. Every major public challenge therefore requires institutions operating across different sectors, governance levels and professional disciplines to construct a sufficiently common understanding of evolving realities before coherent public action becomes possible.

Shared situational awareness enables precisely this integration. It allows institutions to recognise not only the specific developments affecting their own responsibilities but also the broader relationships connecting those developments to the wider governance ecosystem. A local authority may identify increasing pressures upon housing services, while regional planners observe changing patterns of population movement, national governments analyse labour market dynamics and international organisations detect demographic trends extending across multiple countries. Independently, these observations remain valuable yet incomplete. Together, they create a richer representation of societal transformation that enables every participating institution to understand its own responsibilities within a much broader context. Governance becomes more intelligent because every level observes both its own reality and its place within the larger system.

An important consequence of this process is the gradual emergence of collective anticipation. Institutions connected through shared intelligence become increasingly capable of recognising weak signals before they develop into large-scale societal challenges. Early changes detected within one part of the governance ecosystem rapidly become meaningful to other institutions because shared situational awareness provides the interpretative context necessary to understand their wider implications. Local operational observations may reveal the first

indications of national trends. Scientific discoveries may reshape regulatory thinking long before practical consequences become immediately visible. International developments may influence domestic strategic planning before their effects reach individual communities. Governance therefore becomes increasingly proactive because institutions collectively perceive patterns while they are still emerging rather than after they have become fully established.

This anticipatory capability fundamentally strengthens adaptive governance. Traditional administrative systems often respond to events after sufficient evidence has accumulated to justify action, by which point opportunities for early intervention may already have diminished. Shared intelligence shortens this interval by enabling institutions to compare observations continuously, allowing emerging knowledge to circulate before complete certainty becomes available. Decisions remain carefully considered and democratically accountable, yet they are informed by governance systems capable of recognising evolving complexity more rapidly than isolated institutional analyses would permit. Adaptation therefore becomes progressively more timely because collective awareness develops alongside societal change.

Artificial intelligence will almost certainly reinforce this capacity by substantially expanding the observational reach of governance ecosystems. Advanced analytical platforms can integrate information generated across numerous institutions, identify subtle correlations between apparently unrelated developments and support real-time monitoring of increasingly complex policy environments. Digital twins, semantic knowledge graphs and predictive modelling systems may assist governments in constructing dynamic representations of evolving societal conditions that are continuously updated as new information becomes available. These technologies significantly enhance the ability of institutions to perceive complexity, yet they do not independently generate shared situational awareness. Computational analysis identifies relationships, but institutions remain responsible for interpreting their significance, balancing competing priorities and exercising democratic judgement. Shared intelligence therefore emerges through the interaction between technological capability and institutional cognition rather than through either dimension operating alone.

Equally significant is the role of collective awareness in strengthening institutional coordination. Coordination becomes considerably more effective when institutions share compatible understandings of the realities they seek to influence. Administrative disagreements frequently arise not because organisations pursue fundamentally incompatible objectives but because they interpret underlying situations differently. Shared situational awareness reduces these interpretative divergences by creating common cognitive reference points through which institutions evaluate evidence and discuss emerging developments. Organisations remain free to exercise independent judgement according to their constitutional responsibilities, yet their decisions become more coherent because they originate from increasingly compatible representations of reality.

This cognitive coherence also strengthens democratic governance. Shared intelligence should never be interpreted as eliminating institutional diversity or encouraging uniformity of opinion. Democratic societies benefit from pluralism, professional specialisation and constitutional checks that prevent excessive concentration of authority. Shared situational awareness does not replace these characteristics but provides a common foundation upon which different institutions can exercise their legitimate responsibilities more effectively. Ministries, regulatory agencies, scientific organisations, local governments and judicial institutions continue contributing distinct perspectives, yet they increasingly understand how those perspectives relate to one another within the wider governance ecosystem. Diversity becomes a source of richer collective intelligence rather than administrative fragmentation.

Over time, repeated cycles of shared interpretation gradually create increasingly sophisticated governance networks capable of sustaining collective awareness across extended periods of societal transformation. Institutions become familiar with one another's analytical approaches, recognise recurring patterns of interaction and develop common conceptual frameworks that facilitate future collaboration. These accumulated experiences become part of the institutional memory of the governance ecosystem itself. Shared intelligence therefore evolves

cumulatively, allowing governance to build progressively richer representations of reality through continuous institutional learning. Each cycle of collaboration strengthens the cognitive architecture available for addressing subsequent challenges.

Seen from this broader perspective, shared situational awareness represents one of the defining operational mechanisms of Governance Intelligence. It transforms distributed institutional observations into coherent collective understanding, enabling governance ecosystems to perceive complexity, anticipate change and coordinate adaptive responses while preserving constitutional diversity and democratic accountability. Institutions become connected not simply through communication technologies or administrative procedures but through continuously evolving representations of reality that they construct together.

Conclusion

Throughout the evolution of modern public administration, governments have invested considerable effort in improving communication, coordination and information sharing between institutions. These developments have strengthened administrative effectiveness by reducing organisational fragmentation, improving access to knowledge and facilitating collaboration across increasingly complex governance systems. Yet, as this article has argued, the future of governance depends upon a capability that extends significantly beyond the efficient movement of information. Institutions must also develop the capacity to construct shared understanding. Only then can distributed expertise become genuine collective intelligence.

The central argument developed throughout this article is that **shared intelligence emerges not because institutions possess access to the same information but because they progressively construct compatible interpretations of reality through continuous institutional learning**. Information alone remains cognitively neutral until it is interpreted within meaningful conceptual frameworks. Governance therefore depends not simply upon connecting organisations through technological infrastructures but upon enabling them to exchange reasoning, contextual understanding and institutional experience. Shared intelligence transforms isolated observations into coherent public knowledge by allowing diverse institutional perspectives to converge without eliminating their distinctive contributions.

Seen from this perspective, knowledge exchange acquires a far richer significance than is often recognised within traditional models of public administration. Institutions do not merely transmit reports, datasets or analytical outputs. They exchange ways of understanding complex realities. Scientific organisations contribute theoretical explanations, public administrations provide operational experience, regulatory authorities interpret constitutional implications and political institutions integrate these different perspectives into broader strategic judgement. Every exchange therefore enriches the collective cognitive capacity of governance by expanding the range of interpretations available for institutional learning. Intelligence develops because understanding circulates continuously throughout the governance ecosystem rather than remaining confined within individual organisations.

The article has also demonstrated that shared situational awareness represents one of the most important consequences of this process. Institutions operating across different governance levels, policy domains and professional disciplines gradually develop compatible representations of evolving public realities that allow coordinated judgement despite their constitutional diversity. This shared awareness strengthens governance because organisations become capable of recognising the significance of one another's observations while integrating those observations into broader interpretations of societal change. Coordination consequently evolves from the alignment of administrative activity towards the alignment of institutional understanding.

Particular attention has been given to the relationship between shared intelligence and adaptive governance. Contemporary societies evolve with increasing speed, generating interactions between technological, environmental, economic and social transformations that no individual institution can adequately interpret in isolation. Shared intelligence enables governance ecosystems to detect emerging patterns earlier, compare different forms of expertise more effectively and refine collective understanding continuously as new evidence becomes available. Adaptive governance therefore depends not only upon responsive institutions but also upon governance networks capable of maintaining coherent situational awareness despite permanent uncertainty and accelerating complexity.

Artificial intelligence will undoubtedly strengthen these capabilities by substantially expanding the analytical and observational capacities available to public institutions. Intelligent knowledge graphs, semantic reasoning systems, digital twins, advanced simulations and

collaborative analytical platforms will increasingly support governments in integrating evidence originating from numerous organisations simultaneously. However, the value of these technologies ultimately depends upon institutions that are capable of interpreting computational insights collectively. Artificial intelligence can connect information with remarkable efficiency, yet only institutions can transform that information into legitimate public judgement through democratic deliberation, professional expertise and constitutional responsibility. Shared intelligence therefore remains fundamentally institutional even within increasingly AI-enabled governance systems.

Perhaps the most important implication concerns the future architecture of governance itself. Governments should no longer regard institutional connectivity primarily as a technological or administrative objective. Instead, they should recognise that the most valuable connections are cognitive in nature. Institutions become genuinely connected when they are capable of learning from one another, interpreting complexity together and constructing shared representations of reality while preserving the diversity of perspectives that gives collective intelligence its strength. Governance ecosystems therefore become progressively more intelligent not because individual organisations accumulate more information but because the relationships between those organisations support richer processes of collective understanding.

This perspective also clarifies why institutional diversity should be regarded as one of the greatest assets of modern governance rather than as an obstacle to coordination. Different organisations inevitably develop specialised expertise, professional cultures and constitutional responsibilities because they observe different dimensions of public reality. Shared intelligence does not attempt to eliminate these differences or replace them with uniformity. Instead, it creates the cognitive conditions under which diversity becomes mutually reinforcing. Every institutional perspective contributes unique knowledge that expands the collective understanding available to the governance ecosystem. Intelligence emerges through the integration of complementary viewpoints rather than through the dominance of any single interpretation.

Ultimately, connecting institutions through shared intelligence should be recognised as one of the constitutional foundations of Governance Intelligence. It enables governance ecosystems to transform communication into understanding, coordination into collective awareness and distributed expertise into adaptive public judgement. As societies become increasingly interconnected and public challenges continue to grow in complexity, the capacity of institutions to think together will become at least as important as their capacity to act together. The future of public administration will therefore depend not simply upon more advanced technologies or more efficient organisational structures but upon the continuous development of shared institutional intelligence capable of learning, adapting and evolving alongside the societies it serves.