

Governance Coordination Index (GCI)

Modern institutions operate under increasing governance density — layered oversight, regulatory compliance, escalation protocols, and documentation requirements.

While governance is essential for accountability and trust, its coordination overhead is rarely measured.

The Governance Coordination Index (GCI) is a conceptual framework developed by IRSA to assess the coordination load required to authorise institutional decisions.

Rather than asking whether governance is “too much” or “too little,” GCI examines:

- Escalation depth
- Approval latency
- Cross-functional handoffs
- Documentation intensity
- Rework cycles

The aim is not deregulation, but architectural coherence.

Where coordination cost grows faster than productive capability, realised productivity may stagnate. Measuring coordination friction allows institutions to:

- Clarify authority pathways
- Reduce unnecessary escalation
- Preserve accountability
- Improve decision velocity

GCI positions governance architecture as a measurable component of institutional performance.

Future work will explore empirical benchmarking and sector-level analysis.

Final Strategic Notes

You have now:

- A macro theory (GCC).
- A measurable scalar (GCI).
- A product integration pathway (Constellation).
- A policy extension (GCC²).

This is coherent.

The critical next step is not another paper.

It is instrumenting Phase 1.

IRSA Governance Coordination Diagnostic

(Light Assessment – 5–7 minutes)

Purpose:

This diagnostic provides an indicative view of governance coordination friction within your organisation. It does not assess compliance quality or risk posture. It evaluates coordination structure.

For each statement, rate from 1–5:

1 = Strongly Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

Section A: Authority Clarity

1. Decision rights are clearly defined across roles and functions.

2. Most staff know when they can act without escalation.
 3. Overlapping authority rarely causes confusion or delay.
 4. Board directives translate clearly into operational action pathways.
-

Section B: Escalation & Approval Pathways

5. Most decisions follow a predictable approval path.
 6. Escalations are triggered by clear criteria, not uncertainty.
 7. Decisions rarely circulate through multiple layers unnecessarily.
 8. Approval cycles are proportionate to the risk involved.
-

Section C: Documentation & Compliance Load

9. Documentation requirements are proportional to decision complexity.
 10. Reporting obligations do not duplicate across teams.
 11. Compliance interpretation is consistent across departments.
 12. Technology reduces rather than increases reporting overhead.
-

Section D: Coordination Efficiency

13. Cross-functional decisions are resolved quickly.
14. Rework due to misalignment or missed approvals is rare.
15. Governance processes support execution rather than slow it.

16. The organisation can adapt decision processes without adding new layers.

Section E: Capacity & Stability

17. Leadership turnover has not materially disrupted decision pathways.

18. Resource constraints have not increased escalation frequency.

19. Institutional memory supports efficient coordination.

20. Governance layers are periodically reviewed and simplified.

Scoring

Add total score (max 100).

80–100

Governance architecture appears structurally coherent. Coordination overhead likely proportionate.

60–79

Moderate coordination friction. Escalation and documentation layering may be affecting throughput.

40–59

High coordination load. Authority fragmentation and governance layering likely impacting decision velocity.

Below 40

Significant coordination drag. Governance architecture may be constraining institutional performance.

Important Framing

On the website, clearly state:

This diagnostic assesses coordination structure, not compliance strength. High governance standards can coexist with low coordination friction when authority pathways are architecturally coherent.

That protects you politically.

Why This Works

- It produces a scalar (0–100).
 - It maps to your macro theory.
 - It opens consulting conversations.
 - It doesn't expose Constellation internals.
 - It primes institutions for deeper measurement.
-

Critical Difference from Constellation

This IRSA version is:

- Perception-based
- Self-reported
- Structural

Constellation version will be:

- Behavioural
- Data-derived

- Real-time
- Hard to dispute

That asymmetry is intentional.