INSIGHT SERIES · GOVERNANCE / RISK / HUMAN FACTORS · NO. 03

Information Is Not Intelligence

Why more data hasn't made better organisations.

Author: Emilio van Doorn · **Date:** February 11, 2024 · **Topic:** Governance / Risk / Human Factors

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Organisations have never had more information, and yet they continue to be surprised by the problems that information should have flagged. The reason is simple but easy to miss: information is not intelligence — one tells you what happened, the other helps you understand what it means, and only the second one improves decisions. Most organisations are not short on data; they are fragmented, with knowledge trapped inside functions that rarely talk to each other. The organisations that will thrive will not be the ones holding the most information, but the ones that build the most understanding from what they already have.

1. Introduction

Never before have organisations possessed so much information. Dashboards monitor performance in real time. Operational systems generate millions of data points a day. Artificial intelligence can find a pattern in seconds that would have taken a team weeks to notice. Reports arrive daily, emails arrive by the minute, meetings produce action lists, and risk registers keep growing no matter how often someone promises to cut them down.

And yet organisations continue to be surprised. Projects still exceed budget. Cyber incidents continue to happen. Customers still leave, after months receiving signals pointing towards an opportunity. Suppliers still fail in ways that, in hindsight, look obvious. Cultures still deteriorate long before anyone names it.

I find that combination strange every time I sit with it. If organisations have never had more information, why do they keep being surprised by things the information could have told them? The honest answer: information is not intelligence. We treat the two as roughly the same thing, and they are not.

> *Information tells you what happened.*
> *Intelligence helps you understand what it means.*

Information can sit in a system untouched for years. Intelligence only exists once someone has connected one piece to something else. That distinction has never mattered more than it does right now, mostly because we have become so good at producing the first one that it is easy to mistake it for the latter.

2. The Illusion of Knowing

Information creates confidence, and sometimes that confidence is earned. Often, though, it is not. There is a natural assumption running through most organisations that if enough reports get produced, enough meetings get held, and enough dashboards get watched, the organisation must understand what is happening. I do not think that follows. Understanding does not arrive through volume. It arrives through interpretation — and interpretation is a much slower, more deliberate, than simply generating more output.

I have worked with organisations that have extraordinary amounts of information yet surprisingly little shared understanding of what any of it adds up to. Finance understands financial performance. Operations understands operational performance. Technology understands its own systems. HR understands workforce trends. Risk understands risk, its own register, its own language. Each function does its part well — genuinely well, in most cases I have seen. The problem is not competence. It is that each of them is looking at a slice of the organisation and calling it the whole picture.

No single functional report can explain an entire organisation. The organisation only becomes visible once those reports start talking to each other — and in most places, they do not, because it is nobody's job to make them.

3. What Organisational Intelligence Actually Means

I would describe organisational intelligence as the collective capability to connect information, recognise the patterns sitting inside it, and let that improve the quality of decisions being made. It is not a reporting framework, and it is not something you can buy as a platform, however good the vendor's pitch. It is cultivated, slowly, in places where curiosity is allowed and knowledge is allowed to move sideways across a business rather than only upward through a hierarchy.

The simplest test to understand whether an organisation has any of this capability is a single question, and it is one worth asking in almost any meeting:

> *What can we understand together that none of us could understand alone?"*

If nobody in the room can answer that, the meeting has probably just exchanged information. If someone can, something closer to intelligence has actually happened.

4. The Cost of Fragmentation

Most organisations are not short on information. They are fragmented. Departments optimise for their own numbers. Projects close out and the knowledge that built them leaves with the project team, because nobody built a way to transfer it. Lessons stay local to whoever learned them. Data stays wherever the system that produced it happens to live. Governance committees review different reports on different cycles, often without anyone in the room whose job it is to notice how those reports relate to each other.

The consequence is silence, and that is exactly what makes it dangerous: information keeps increasing, and understanding does not keep pace with it. This is why organisations are so often blindsided by events they already had enough information and time to anticipate.

> **Key Point:** The knowledge existed somewhere in the building. The connections between the pieces of it did not.

5. Connecting the Picture

Picture an organisation where information does not stay locked inside the function that produced it. Finance's numbers actually inform how operations will plan its next quarter. Operations' reality informs strategy, rather than strategy being set somewhere upstream. Strategy informs which projects get greenlit. Projects, once finished, inform governance rather than just reporting to it. Governance informs leadership with something more than a status update. And leadership, if it is doing its job, uses all of that to encourage more curiosity rather than less.

None of this is a new process to install. It's closer to a different habit of mind — a willingness to treat information from one part of the business as relevant to a decision being made somewhere else, instead of assuming someone else has already thought of it. The organisations I would call strong on this front do not just collect information well. They go out of their way to connect it, often through nothing more sophisticated than the right people being in the same conversation at the right time.

6. Better Decisions, Not More Reports

Every governance activity, when you strip away the process around it, exists for one purpose: to improve the quality of decisions being made. Reports are not the objective. Policies are not the objective. Compliance is not the objective, and neither is a well-populated risk register. Those are the scaffolding. The actual objective is judgement that gets better over time — the organisational capability to turn connected understanding into confident, timely action, rather than into another document nobody quite acts on.

Conclusion

I suspect organisations are spending their time measuring the wrong things. Those numbers are not meaningless, but I do not think they are the ones that matter most:

- How many reports were produced?
- How many risks were reviewed?
- How many controls were tested?

Here is the question I would rather see asked at the end of every month: did the organisation understand something this month that it did not understand last month? If the answer is yes, organisational intelligence grew a little. If the answer is no, information was probably just accumulating — sitting in dashboards, being reported on, and not becoming anything more than that.

The future, I think, will not belong to the organisations that hold the most information. It will belong to the ones that build the most understanding out of the information they already have sitting in front of them. Information informs. Intelligence connects. That difference may end up deciding which organisations thrive in a world that is not getting any less uncertain.

__Disclaimer:__ This article is provided for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal, regulatory, or professional advice.