COHISTIC GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK™

CGF™ CANON — VERSION 1.0

Governing Enterprise Coherence Through Distributed Intelligence, Accountable Judgment, and Coordinated Action

Integrale Architecture™ Canonical Series | Founder Approved November 6, 2026

Canonical identifier: CGF-CANON-1.0 | IntegraleArchitecture.com

EXECUTIVE DECLARATION — THE ENTERPRISE GOVERNANCE CHALLENGE

Modern enterprises are governed through numerous interacting mechanisms. Boards establish oversight expectations; executives set priorities; business units exercise delegated authority; portfolio committees allocate investments; architecture review boards evaluate architectural decisions; and risk and compliance functions establish controls. Product teams, operational managers, and increasingly autonomous systems make decisions within their respective domains.

Each mechanism may be legitimate and effective within its own responsibilities. Yet the enterprise can remain poorly governed as a whole. Decisions may be individually defensible but collectively inconsistent. Governance bodies may overlap without coordinating. Accountability may be assigned locally while consequences extend across organizational boundaries. Escalation may occur too late, or unnecessary escalation may delay decisions that could safely be made closer to the work.

> **The problem is not simply inadequate governance. It is insufficient coherence among the enterprise's distributed governance capabilities.**

Cohistic Governance™ establishes an architectural approach that connects enterprise purpose, contextual intelligence, decision rights, coordinated action, accountability, and continuous learning. It seeks the appropriate distribution of authority, supported by sufficient enterprise coherence.

PART I — CANONICAL FOUNDATIONS

1. Canonical Definition

> **Cohistic Governance™ is a context-sensitive, intelligence-enabled approach to governance that coordinates distributed decision-making, preserves enterprise coherence, and sustains accountability without requiring unnecessary centralization.**

The Cohistic Governance Framework™ provides the architectural principles, attributes, decision mechanisms, information structures, and operating practices through which this approach can be established and sustained.

1.1 Canonical Purpose

- Make consequential decisions at appropriate levels of authority.
- Maintain coherence across organizational, architectural, managerial, and technological boundaries.
- Balance enterprise-wide interests with legitimate local autonomy.
- Resolve conflicting objectives, dependencies, and decisions.
- Coordinate implementation of decisions affecting multiple parties.
- Preserve accountability without unnecessary bureaucracy.
- Apply evidence, contextual intelligence, and sound judgment.
- Learn from governance outcomes and improve arrangements over time.

1.2 Central Governing Question

> **How can an enterprise distribute authority and decision-making while preserving sufficient coherence, coordination, accountability, and adaptability to achieve worthwhile outcomes?**

1.3 Foundational Doctrine

> **Governance coherence does not require governance uniformity.**

Different decisions may warrant different decision-makers, evidence requirements, consultation mechanisms, controls, and escalation pathways. CGF seeks appropriate coherence rather than a single governance process for every concern.

1.4 The Meaning of Cohistic

Cohistic denotes an approach in which coherence emerges through deliberate integration of complementary governance attributes, contextual intelligence, and coordinated decision mechanisms. It combines concern for the enterprise as a whole with respect for its constituent domains, capabilities, responsibilities, and decision authorities. It is the architecture of coherent governance across distributed authority.

PART II — THE TEN CO ATTRIBUTES AND COGNITION

2. CGF Reference Model

The framework is organized around ten complementary Co attributes, supported by Cognition as the central intelligence capability. These are mutually reinforcing qualities—not sequential phases, departments, or mandatory committees.

3. The Ten Co Attributes

3.1 Coherency

Governance decisions should contribute to an intelligible and sufficiently aligned enterprise whole.

Practitioner questions: Does this decision support enterprise objectives? Is it compatible with other consequential decisions? Could local optimization create enterprise-wide harm?

Indicative evidence: Decision alignment assessments; architecture dependencies; conflict records; outcome measures.

3.2 Comprehensiveness

Governance should consider the material dimensions and consequences of a decision without requiring exhaustive analysis.

Practitioner questions: Have material impacts, stakeholders, affected domains, and plausible second-order consequences been considered?

Indicative evidence: Impact assessments; stakeholder coverage; dependency and risk analyses.

3.3 Consistency

Comparable decisions should use compatible principles and criteria unless context justifies variation.

Practitioner questions: Are similar decisions treated comparably? Are exceptions justified? Are standards and precedents understood?

Indicative evidence: Decision records; standards; exception registers; policies.

3.4 Collaboration

Governance should enable relevant participants to contribute knowledge, concerns, and judgment without implying equal authority.

Practitioner questions: Were the right participants engaged? Were disagreements surfaced? Was consultation meaningful?

Indicative evidence: Consultation records; stakeholder contributions; documented dissent.

3.5 Coordination

Governance should align interdependent decisions and actions across enterprise boundaries.

Practitioner questions: Which decisions depend on others? Are implementation responsibilities, sequencing, and resources aligned?

Indicative evidence: Dependency maps; integrated roadmaps; coordination agreements.

3.6 Collective

Governance should appropriately consider the interests and consequences of the enterprise as a collective system.

Practitioner questions: Whose interests are affected? Are benefits and burdens considered beyond the immediate sponsor?

Indicative evidence: Enterprise impact assessments; stakeholder consequence analysis.

3.7 Contextual

Governance mechanisms should fit decision circumstances, significance, risks, and authority requirements.

Practitioner questions: How consequential, urgent, uncertain, or risky is the decision? What assurance is proportionate?

Indicative evidence: Decision classification; routing rationale; contextual risk assessment.

3.8 Connected

Governance should connect decisions, authorities, information, capabilities, and outcomes.

Practitioner questions: Can decision-makers obtain relevant information? Are related decisions and outcomes traceable?

Indicative evidence: Governance information architecture; integrated registers; reporting relationships.

3.9 Co-created

Governance should incorporate appropriate shared development and ownership when multiple parties must contribute to success.

Practitioner questions: Should affected parties help design the solution? Are cross-domain commitments jointly understood?

Indicative evidence: Joint design records; shared agreements; commitment records.

3.10 Continuous

Governance should remain responsive to changing conditions, observed consequences, and learning—not impose constant intervention.

Practitioner questions: What triggers reconsideration? Are obsolete controls retired? Does learning improve decisions?

Indicative evidence: Monitoring arrangements; review triggers; revised policies.

4. Cognition — The Central Intelligence Capability

Cognition is the integrating intelligence capability at the center of Cohistic Governance. It enables the enterprise to develop and apply understanding, reasoning, evidence, experience, contextual awareness, and judgment across the ten Co attributes. Cognition is not an eleventh Co attribute.

Sources include human expertise, architecture models, operational and financial information, stakeholder experience, institutional memory, analytics, simulation, AI and agentic systems, risk and compliance intelligence, historical decisions, and observed outcomes.

AI can help identify dependencies, detect anomalies, evaluate alternatives, retrieve precedents, and monitor outcomes. Analytical capability does not itself establish legitimate authority.

CGF-01 — Accountable Cognition: Cognition shall support, rather than obscure, accountable governance judgment and decision authority.

PART III — EIGHT GOVERNING PRINCIPLES

Principle 1 — Value Before Bureaucracy

Governance mechanisms should be justified by their contribution to worthwhile outcomes, risk management, accountability, and decision quality.

Principle 2 — Context Before Uniformity

Requirements should be proportionate to significance, circumstances, uncertainty, and consequences.

Principle 3 — Coherence Without Compulsory Centralization

Decisions should be made close to relevant knowledge and responsibility, while preserving necessary enterprise coordination.

Principle 4 — Judgment Beyond Compliance

Compliance matters, but governance also requires judgment about value, alternatives, consequences, and enterprise fitness.

Principle 5 — Proportionate Intervention

Oversight, consultation, escalation, and assurance should match the potential consequences.

Principle 6 — Explicit Accountability

Decision authority, implementation responsibility, and outcome accountability should be clear.

Principle 7 — Evidence and Traceability

Material decisions should be supported by appropriate evidence, rationale, and links to concerns and outcomes.

Principle 8 — Continuous Learning

Governance should improve through feedback, observed outcomes, changing conditions, and reassessment.

PART IV — GOVERNANCE ARCHITECTURE

6. Six Architectural Elements

Enterprise Governance Context

Purpose, obligations, objectives, culture, operating arrangements, constraints, and stakeholder relationships.

Governance Capabilities

Capabilities for policy, evaluation, decisions, coordination, assurance, and learning.

Decision Rights and Authority

Distribution of legitimate authority across boards, executives, management, domain leaders, architects, operations, and bounded autonomous systems.

Governance Intelligence

Information, knowledge, models, evidence, and analytics required for cognition.

Coordination and Assurance Mechanisms

Relationships, processes, controls, interfaces, escalation, and reviews connecting decisions with execution.

Governance Outcomes and Adaptation

Evidence of coherent decisions, accountable actions, outcomes, and responsiveness.

These elements may be implemented through existing enterprise capabilities; CGF does not require a separate governance organization.

PART V — SIX-FUNCTION GOVERNANCE OPERATING MODEL

Function 1 — Establish Context

Determine concerns, obligations, stakeholders, decision environment, authority boundaries, and requirements.

Typical outputs: Governance Context Profile; decision criteria; stakeholder and authority map.

Function 2 — Design Federated Governance

Establish appropriate distribution of authority, consultation, coordination, escalation, and assurance. Federation is a design option, not a universal organizational prescription.

Typical outputs: Governance Operating Model; Decision Rights Matrix; governance interface map.

Function 3 — Classify and Route Matters

Assess significance and identify decision authority, consultation, and assurance pathways.

Typical outputs: Decision classification; routing record; review requirements.

Function 4 — Evaluate and Decide

Apply context, architectural intelligence, principles, stakeholder concerns, evidence, and judgment.

Typical outputs: Decision assessment; alternatives; rationale; authorization; conditions.

Function 5 — Coordinate Implementation and Assure

Align parties, dependencies, implementation conditions, and assurance.

Typical outputs: Coordination agreements; commitments; assurance records; exception decisions.

Function 6 — Evaluate Outcomes and Adapt

Examine decision consequences, governance effectiveness, changing conditions, and improvement opportunities.

Typical outputs: Outcome assessment; learning record; revised controls or decision rights.

These functions are recursive, not a waterfall. Matters may be reclassified; assurance may reveal missing authority; outcomes may require redesign.

CGF-02 — Adaptive Operating Logic: Governance functions shall support iteration, reassessment, and appropriate escalation rather than rigid sequencing.

PART VI — DECISION ROUTING AND DISTRIBUTED AUTHORITY

Pathway A — Delegated Decision

Routine or bounded decisions within established authority, risk tolerances, and architectural constraints.

Emphasis: Speed, clarity, accountability, monitoring.

Pathway B — Domain Decision

Material consequences within a business, technology, information, security, or operational domain.

Emphasis: Domain expertise, applicable policies, affected-party coordination.

Pathway C — Enterprise Decision

Material cross-domain implications, shared capabilities, enterprise dependencies, or conflicting priorities.

Emphasis: Enterprise coherence, alternatives, trade-offs, coordinated accountability.

Pathway D — Executive or Special Assurance

Exceptional consequences, critical safety/security, major financial or legal exposure, significant reputational risk, or other matters requiring elevated authority.

Emphasis: Explicit authority, heightened evidence, independent challenge where appropriate.

9. Routing Criteria

- Enterprise value and impact; affected domains.
- Financial and resource consequences; architectural dependencies.
- Risk, safety, security, privacy, and regulatory implications.
- Reversibility, uncertainty, urgency, and operational criticality.
- Existing authority, consultation, and independent assurance requirements.

Quantitative thresholds may be tailored and validated locally; none are universal canonical thresholds.

CGF-03 — Contextual Routing: Material decisions shall be routed through legitimate authority using proportionate criteria.

CGF-04 — Accountable Delegation: Delegation shall preserve explicit accountability and appropriate escalation conditions.

PART VII — NINE GOVERNANCE INFORMATION PRODUCTS

10.1 Governance Context Profile

Objectives, obligations, environment, stakeholders, constraints.

10.2 Governance Operating Model

Bodies, capabilities, relationships, responsibilities, mechanisms.

10.3 Decision Rights Matrix

Authorities, consultation, implementation ownership, assurance.

10.4 Governance Interface and Dependency Map

Relationships among bodies, domains, decisions, and responsibilities.

10.5 Decision Classification and Routing Record

Significance, criteria, pathway, decision authority.

10.6 Governance Decision Record

Concern, alternatives, evidence, rationale, authority, conditions, consequences.

10.7 Exception and Escalation Register

Deviations, waivers, conflicts, escalation, compensating controls.

10.8 Governance Assurance and Outcome Register

Implementation, compliance, fitness, accountability, risks, results.

10.9 Governance Learning and Improvement Record

Lessons, bottlenecks, improvements, changed arrangements.

These are logical information products; they may be linked records, models, dashboards, catalogs, or existing documentation.

CGF-05 — Decision Traceability: Governance information shall connect material concerns, authority, rationale, implementation, and outcomes.

PART VIII — RELATIONSHIP TO INTEGRALE ARCHITECTURE™

CGF supports the parent Canon's commitment to enterprise coherence, contextual judgment, coordinated action, and worthwhile outcomes. It contributes to Strategic Value through governance of direction, investments, capabilities, and priorities; and to Operational Value through distributed decisions, implementation, assurance, and operational consequences.

CGF and VEI™

Supports assessment of Valuable, Executable, and Impactful choices, with Level of Effort and Will to Proceed; CGF provides the governance context and authority for VEI-informed recommendations.

CGF and CAIL™

Provides the eight-stage adaptive intelligence mechanism: Sense → Contextualize → Interpret → Evaluate → Decide → Act → Learn → Adapt. CGF provides complementary accountable decision and coordination arrangements.

CGF and TIA™

Architects intelligence for enterprise evolution; CGF governs authorization, coordination, and assurance of consequential evolution decisions.

CGF and Autonomy Architecture™

Defines bounded autonomous action; CGF situates delegation within authority, accountability, oversight, and escalation.

CGF and Confitism™

Contributes a lens on justified confidence, commitment, and readiness under uncertainty.

CGF and SABOK

Supports Solution Architecture professional knowledge and participation in governance.

CGF-06 — Governance Integration: CGF shall complement legitimate existing governance and architecture methods without unnecessary duplication or displacement of authority.

PART IX — APPLYING CGF WITH TOGAF

12. Governance Beyond the Architecture Review Board

CGF addresses relationships among architecture governance and corporate, executive, strategic, investment, portfolio, product, operations, data, technology, security, risk, compliance, and AI governance. The aim is not to subordinate them to an Architecture Review Board but to architect their relationships for coherence and accountability.

Preliminary Phase

Establish governance context, architecture authority, decision rights, interfaces, and tailoring.

Phase A — Architecture Vision

Clarify sponsorship, stakeholders, decision requirements, and authority.

Phases B, C, and D

Develop architecture views and cross-domain trade-offs concurrently and iteratively as needed.

Phases E and F

Govern solution alternatives, transitions, dependencies, investments, and VEI-supported evaluations.

Phase G

Provide proportionate implementation assurance, exception management, and accountability beyond isolated compliance reviews.

Phase H and Requirements Management

Monitor changing conditions and adapt governance and architecture decisions.

CGF functions are not restricted to individual ADM phases.

PART X — GOVERNANCE MATURITY

Level 1 — Fragmented

Reactive, isolated, inconsistent, or informal governance; cross-domain decisions difficult to coordinate.

Level 2 — Defined

Documented responsibilities, rights, procedures, and policies; limited integration.

Level 3 — Coordinated

Connected mechanisms; coherent routing, consultation, escalation, and accountability.

Level 4 — Intelligence-Enabled

Systematic contextual evidence, architectural intelligence, records, monitoring, and feedback.

Level 5 — Cohistically Adaptive

Coherent, distributed, intelligence-enabled, accountable, continuously improving governance.

Assess enterprise coherence, rights and accountability, integration, contextual routing, evidence quality, coordination, assurance, risk, learning, and adaptation. A composite score must not conceal serious deficiencies. The maturity model remains provisional pending empirical validation.

PART XI — ASSURANCE AND MEASUREMENT

Decision Quality

Are alternatives, evidence, expertise, and rationale sufficient?

Decision Timeliness

Are decisions timely without sacrificing scrutiny?

Enterprise Coherence

Are conflicts, incompatible choices, and dependencies resolved?

Accountability

Are authority, implementation responsibility, and outcome ownership clear?

Governance Proportionality

Are routine decisions over-escalated or consequential ones under-reviewed?

Implementation Coordination

Are decisions translated into aligned commitments and action?

Governance Adaptability

Do observed outcomes lead to better arrangements?

Realized Value

Does governance contribute to worthwhile outcomes and reduced avoidable risk?

CGF-07 — Outcome-Based Assurance: Evaluate governance through decision, accountability, coordination, and outcome evidence, not procedural compliance alone.

PART XII — ILLUSTRATIVE ENTERPRISE SCENARIO

16. Governing Enterprise-Wide AI Adoption

A multinational enterprise's business units independently deploy AI assistants and agents. Technology establishes platforms, security develops controls, legal reviews obligations, business leaders seek speed, and architects identify duplicated capabilities and incompatible information arrangements. Each function has legitimate responsibilities, but cross-domain decisions lack coherence.

Establish Context

Identify strategic objectives, use cases, authority, obligations, risk tolerances, and dependencies.

Design Governance

Connect business, architecture, information, security, legal, risk, and AI oversight; assign rights by consequence.

Classify and Route

Delegate bounded low-risk assistants; route shared enterprise capabilities for enterprise review; escalate high-consequence autonomous systems.

Evaluate and Decide

Assess options with architectural intelligence, risk, stakeholder concerns, and VEI where appropriate.

Coordinate and Assure

Align implementation across business, data, technology, security, and operations; monitor compliance and fitness.

Learn and Adapt

Adjust slow, fragmented, overly permissive, or unnecessarily restrictive governance pathways based on evidence.

Intended result: Greater coherence without universal centralization. This is an illustrative scenario, not empirical validation.

PART XIII — CANONICAL CONFORMANCE

CGF-01 — Accountable Cognition

Intelligence and analysis preserve legitimate judgment and accountability.

CGF-02 — Adaptive Operating Logic

Governance functions support iteration and reassessment.

CGF-03 — Contextual Routing

Material decisions follow legitimate authority and proportionate criteria.

CGF-04 — Accountable Delegation

Delegation has clear boundaries, accountability, and escalation.

CGF-05 — Decision Traceability

Material decisions connect to concerns, authority, rationale, implementation, outcomes.

CGF-06 — Governance Integration

Complement existing legitimate arrangements.

CGF-07 — Outcome-Based Assurance

Evaluate effectiveness beyond procedural compliance.

CGF-08 — Enterprise Coherence

Identify and resolve material cross-domain conflicts.

CGF-09 — Ten Co Integrity

Recognize all ten Co attributes with Cognition as the central capability, not an eleventh Co.

CGF-10 — Continuous Improvement

Learn from outcomes and revise practices when warranted.

These requirements provide a conceptual basis for alignment assessments, not an externally accredited certification standard.

PART XIV — PRACTITIONER IMPLEMENTATION

Days 1–30 — Diagnose Governance Coherence

Identify bodies, authorities, interfaces, dependencies, recent decisions, unresolved conflicts, duplication, escalation, and accountability gaps; assess ten Co attributes and Cognition.

Deliverable: Governance Coherence Diagnostic.

Days 31–60 — Design and Test

Tailor operating model, rights, routing, interfaces; pilot consequential decisions and define assurance and outcome measures.

Deliverable: CGF Governance Operating Model and Pilot Decision Records.

Days 61–90 — Assure and Improve

Assess decision quality, timeliness, coordination, exceptions, feedback; refine routing and establish improvement cadence.

Deliverable: Governance Effectiveness Assessment and Improvement Roadmap.

CONCLUSION — COHERENCE WITHOUT COMPULSORY CENTRALIZATION

The modern enterprise requires distributed authority. Complexity, speed, specialized knowledge, and autonomous capabilities make universal centralization impractical and often undesirable. Yet distribution without coherence produces fragmentation, incompatible decisions, unmanaged dependencies, and unclear accountability.

Cohistic Governance™ recognizes ten complementary attributes: Coherency, Comprehensiveness, Consistency, Collaboration, Coordination, Collective, Contextual, Connected, Co-created, and Continuous. At their center is Cognition, the intelligence capability enabling understanding, judgment, and learning.

> **The ultimate purpose of Cohistic Governance is not to govern more. It is to govern more coherently, decide more intelligently, act more effectively, and achieve more worthwhile outcomes.**
>
> **Cohistic Governance™ — Coherence Without Compulsory Centralization.**

An Integrale Architecture™ Canonical Component | IntegraleArchitecture.com

Canonical status: Founder approved November 6, 2026. Five-level maturity model and illustrative routing thresholds are provisional pending field validation.