

Architecture Principles

Introduction to Architecture



Author: Danilo Assmann

Status: in work

Version: 1.0.3 (build 4)

Date: 2026-10-07

Copyright: © 2026. This work is openly licensed via [CC 4.0 BY SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



OrgIQ Manifest: Passion for People builds Systems for Success

OrgIQ—Organizational Intelligence (Quotient)—is a framework that redefines how we see organizations. At its heart lies a simple but profound shift: to think from the perspective of the individual. Every person experiences their own reality, shaped by their network of relationships. Each perspective is unique. There is no single right or wrong.

An organization is the superposition of all these *Networks*. This is complexity. We can never fully model or control it—but we can give it direction and purpose. Intelligent organizations embrace this complexity rather than ignore or oversimplify it.

When we focus on human complexity, the range of possible solutions expands dramatically. Business practices and structures can be brought into harmony with the natural dynamics of human relationships, psychology, and social interaction.

Our manifesto is rooted in lived experience. We have seen the transformative power of genuine connection, individuality, and purpose-driven leadership. OrgIQ helps create environments where empathy, understanding, and mutual respect thrive—where people feel seen, heard, and valued. This sense of emotional safety is the foundation on which individuals and groups reach their full potential.

We believe in value over control. Control breaks perspective, creates overhead, and breeds mistrust. Relationships and trust, on the other hand, unleash extraordinary productivity and fulfillment. Purpose is not measured by words, but by results.

Join us in redefining organizational excellence. Let's build intelligent systems, embrace complexity, and make space for purpose and joy. **Welcome to OrgIQ—where the true potential of your people becomes the strength of your organization.**

Content

Architecture principles and their origins.....	4
Conway and actual communication paths.....	4
Ashby and sufficient response options.....	4
Conant and Ashby and decisions grounded in reality.....	4
Goodhart and reliable metrics.....	4
Parnas and changeable components.....	4
Little and manageable work inventories.....	4
Ostrom and shared resources.....	5
OrgIQ and the Law of Best Intentions.....	5
Connection to the templates.....	5

Architecture principles and their origins

This appendix explains the background to the method. You do not need to complete it to use the templates. The sources include different kinds of claims: mathematical results with assumptions, observations and design principles. Their organizational applications are OrgIQ adaptations, not universal proofs about organizations.

Conway and actual communication paths

Conway describes how the communication structure of a design organization shapes the structure of the systems it designs. Application: connect relevant perspectives during design and provide actual communication paths for necessary connections. Check information, changes, feedback and conflict resolution, including time, access and authority. An arrow in the model is insufficient.

Source: [Conway 1968 How Do Committees Invent.](#)

Ashby and sufficient response options

The law of requisite variety describes limits on regulation imposed by available response variety. Application: relevant differences in situations require suitable perception, competence, resources and decision rights. Distributed patches alone are insufficient when nobody can act. Avoidable demand variety may be reduced; relevant reality must not disappear from the model.

Source: [Ashby An Introduction to Cybernetics Chapter 11.](#)

Conant and Ashby and decisions grounded in reality

Under its assumptions, the Good Regulator Theorem describes the simplest optimal regulator as a corresponding mapping of the regulated system. Application: relevant relationships must be understood and open to correction where decisions are made. This does not require a complete central model. Different perspectives can be connected, and feedback can update models.

Source: [Conant and Ashby 1970.](#)

Goodhart and reliable metrics

Overoptimising a proxy can weaken its relationship with the actual goal or produce harmful consequences. Application: examine use, actual effects and side effects, including incentives created by the metric. Ask how a number could improve while benefit deteriorates. A percentage of purpose fulfilment needs defined conditions and prompts a review, not automatic restructuring.

Source: [Manheim and Garra-brant Categorizing Variants of Goodhart's Law.](#)

Parnas and changeable components

Parnas compares decomposition by processing steps with modularization around encapsulated design decisions. Application: refining purpose explains necessary contributions but does not alone determine the best organizational boundaries. Examine patterns of change, stable service commitments and unnecessary dependencies. Internal changes should have a limited impact where possible. Encapsulation does not justify opaque criteria, burdens or risks.

Source: [Parnas 1972 On the Criteria To Be Used in Decomposing Systems into Modules.](#)

Little and manageable work inventories

Under suitable observation conditions, Little's Law relates average inventory in a system, throughput and time in the system: $L = \lambda W$. Application: make work in progress and waiting work visible. At equal throughput, higher inventory implies longer average lead time. The relationship alone proves neither a cause nor the effect of every proposed WIP limit.

Source: [Little 2011 Little's Law as Viewed on Its 50th Anniversary](#).

Ostrom and shared resources

Ostrom investigates durable self-organization around shared resources, highlighting context-sensitive rules, participation and monitoring. Application: shared IT, knowledge or infrastructure need agreements on use, maintenance, cost allocation and conflict resolution. Autonomous Solutions must not invisibly transfer their shared resource demands to others.

Source: [Ostrom 2009 Prize Lecture Slides](#).

OrgIQ and the Law of Best Intentions

This is an OrgIQ working principle: good intentions do not establish beneficial effects. Examine whether support enables necessary benefit and agency or creates recurring dependence. Leadership and gateways therefore need feedback on their consequences. Independence does not mean abandoning necessary mutual help.

Connection to the templates

For a relevant property, record only: **required effect or quality condition** → **enabling mechanism** → **evidence** → **remaining limitation**. Use a real case. The appendix adds neither a mandatory score nor a generic rating of organizations.

Continue with the [Organisation Guide](#) and [Solution Template](#).