



JUSTIFICATION OF THE WQI CORE ORGANIZATION QUALITY INDICATORS

WHOLE QUALITY JUSTIFICATION WQI_OIJ1

Methodological Justification of the Six-Indicator Architecture of the
WQI Organization Quality Standard — Core

Article — September 2026

WHOLE QUALITY INSTITUTE

FOREWORD

The WQI Organization Quality framework determines the quality of an Organization through its realization of required functions and results.

The WQI Core Organization Quality Factors identify four necessary areas of determination: Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity. These Factors establish what must be examined at the Core level, but they do not by themselves provide the complete structure needed to make each Factor operational for quality determination.

Quality Indicators provide the next level of methodological resolution. They identify what must be examined within each Factor while preserving the Factor's distinct determination function.

This article examines the proposed six-Indicator architecture:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

The purpose is not to assume that six Indicators are correct because they fit the four-Factor architecture. Each Indicator must be derived from its governing Factor and tested for necessity, distinctness, placement, and contribution to determination capability. The architecture must also be examined for missing Indicators, unnecessary duplication, and applicability across different organizational contexts.

The analysis therefore addresses two questions:

1. Are all six proposed Indicators necessary and distinguishable at the Core Methodological Resolution?
2. Are additional Core Indicators required for the four Factors to perform their determination functions?

The analysis is conceptual and architectural. It does not constitute empirical or statistical validation. Its purpose is to determine whether the proposed Indicator architecture provides a coherent and presently sufficient Core structure for Organization Quality determination.

The resulting architecture is intended to support the WQI Organization Quality Standard — Core while leaving context-specific measures, Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence requirements, and detailed application methods to the appropriate levels of WQI methodology and application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE.....	7
1.1 Purpose of This Article.....	7
1.2 What Is Being Justified	7
1.3 Scope of the Justification	8
2. BASIS FOR THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY INDICATOR ARCHITECTURE	9
2.1 Organization as the Quality Object	9
2.2 Organization Intended Function.....	9
2.3 Organization Intended Result	9
2.4 Organization Function Realization	10
2.5 The Four Core Organization Quality Factors	10
2.6 Role of Indicators in Organization Quality Determination	11
3. THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY INDICATOR PROBLEM	11
3.1 Why Core Quality Factors Require Indicators	11
3.2 Required Methodological Resolution	11
3.3 Risk of Too Few Indicators	12
3.4 Risk of Excessive Indicator Detail.....	12
3.5 Boundary Between Core Indicators and Application Detail	12
4. METHOD FOR DERIVING AND TESTING THE CORE QUALITY INDICATORS	13
4.1 Derivation from the Governing Quality Factor	13
4.2 Determination Function Test.....	13
4.3 Necessity and Removal Test.....	14
4.4 Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test	14
4.5 Absorption and Combination Test	14
4.6 Missing-Indicator Test.....	15
4.7 Cross-Factor Consistency Test	15
4.8 Cross-Context Applicability Test.....	16
4.9 Collective Architecture Test	16
5. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	16
5.1 Determination Function of Performance	16
5.2 Derivation of Function.....	17
5.3 Derivation of Result	17

5.4 Necessity of Function and Result	18
5.5 Distinctness Between Function and Result	18
5.6 Sufficiency of the Performance Indicator Set.....	18
5.7 Performance Indicator Finding.....	19
6. CAPABILITY INDICATOR	19
6.1 Determination Function of Capability	19
6.2 Derivation of Sufficiency	20
6.3 Necessity of Sufficiency.....	20
6.4 Scope of Sufficiency	20
6.5 Why Additional Core Capability Indicators Are Not Presently Required	21
6.6 Capability Indicator Finding	21
7. INTEGRATION INDICATOR	22
7.1 Determination Function of Integration.....	22
7.2 Derivation of Relationships	22
7.3 Necessity of Relationships.....	22
7.4 Scope of Relationships	23
7.5 Why Additional Core Integration Indicators Are Not Presently Required.....	23
7.6 Integration Indicator Finding	24
8. CONTINUITY INDICATORS	24
8.1 Determination Function of Continuity.....	24
8.2 Derivation of Function.....	25
8.3 Derivation of Result	25
8.4 Necessity of Function and Result	25
8.5 Distinctness Between Function and Result	26
8.6 Sufficiency of the Continuity Indicator Set	26
8.7 Continuity Indicator Finding	27
9. HORIZONTAL TESTING ACROSS THE SIX INDICATORS	27
9.1 Purpose of Horizontal Testing	27
9.2 Performance Function and Performance Result.....	27
9.3 Performance and Capability Indicators.....	28
9.4 Performance and Integration Indicators.....	28
9.5 Performance and Continuity Indicators.....	29
9.6 Capability and Integration Indicators	29
9.7 Capability and Continuity Indicators	30

9.8 Integration and Continuity Indicators	30
9.9 Indicator Placement and Non-Redundancy	30
9.10 Horizontal Testing Finding	31
10. MISSING-INDICATOR TEST	32
10.1 Purpose of the Missing-Indicator Test	32
10.2 Requirements	32
10.3 Resources and Organizational Means.....	33
10.4 Competence and Organizational Capacity	33
10.5 Interfaces and Dependencies	33
10.6 Coordination and Communication	34
10.7 Change and Adaptability.....	34
10.8 Resilience and Recovery	35
10.9 Improvement and Efficiency	35
10.10 Other Candidate Determination Functions	35
10.11 Missing-Indicator Finding.....	36
11. CROSS-CONTEXT STRESS TESTING	36
11.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing.....	36
11.2 Different Types of Organizations	37
11.3 Different Required Functions and Results	37
11.4 Different Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects	38
11.5 Different Boundaries and Interfaces	38
11.6 Different Contexts and Applicable Conditions	39
11.7 Different Temporal Bases and Conditions of Change	39
11.8 Cross-Context Finding	39
12. WHY SIX — AND NOT FEWER OR MORE	40
12.1 Why Fewer Indicators Would Reduce Determination Capability	40
12.2 Why Additional Indicators Are Not Presently Required	41
12.3 Why Six Is the Presently Supported Core Resolution	41
13. STABILITY AND CONDITIONS FOR CONTROLLED REVISION	42
13.1 Need for Core Stability.....	42
13.2 Conditions That Could Justify Revision	42
13.3 Controlled Revision Principles	42
13.4 Stability Finding	43
14. CONCLUSION	44

COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE	45
--------------------------------	----

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

1.1 Purpose of This Article

The purpose of this article is to justify the proposed Core Organization Quality Indicator architecture of the Whole Quality Institute (WQI).

The four Core Organization Quality Factors establish the principal areas through which Organization Quality is determined:

- Performance;
- Capability;
- Integration; and
- Continuity.

The Indicators provide the next level of methodological resolution within these Factors. They identify what must be examined so that each Factor can perform its determination function without introducing unnecessary Core-level detail.

This article examines whether the following six Indicators are necessary, distinct, correctly placed, and collectively sufficient at the Core Methodological Resolution:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

The purpose is therefore not only to explain the proposed Indicators, but to determine whether this six-Indicator architecture is presently supported as the Core structure for Organization Quality determination.

1.2 What Is Being Justified

This article justifies the proposed six-Indicator architecture beneath the four Core Organization Quality Factors.

The proposed architecture is:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

The justification addresses three levels.

First, each proposed Indicator is examined to determine whether it performs a necessary determination function within its governing Factor.

Second, the Indicators are examined for distinctness, overlap, placement, and whether any proposed Indicator can be removed, combined, or absorbed without reducing determination capability.

Third, the architecture is examined as a whole to determine whether a necessary Core-level determination function is missing.

The subject being justified is therefore the architecture itself: why these Indicators are required, why they are located beneath these Factors, and why six Indicators constitute the presently supported Core Methodological Resolution.

1.3 Scope of the Justification

This article is limited to the methodological justification of the Core Organization Quality Indicators and their architecture.

It examines:

- whether each proposed Indicator is necessary for its governing Factor;
- whether the Indicators are sufficiently distinct at the Core Methodological Resolution;
- whether each Indicator is correctly placed beneath its governing Factor;
- whether Indicators can be removed, combined, or absorbed without reducing determination capability;
- whether a necessary Core Indicator is missing; and
- whether the six-Indicator architecture remains applicable across different organizational contexts.

The article does not establish context-specific measures, metrics, Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence requirements, scoring methods, or application procedures. These belong to other levels of WQI methodology or to specific applications.

The analysis is conceptual and architectural. It does not constitute empirical or statistical validation.

Accordingly, the scope is limited to determining whether the proposed six-Indicator architecture is presently sufficient to support the four Core Organization Quality Factors at the Core Methodological Resolution.

2. BASIS FOR THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY INDICATOR ARCHITECTURE

2.1 Organization as the Quality Object

For this article, the Organization is the Quality Object whose quality is being determined.

An Organization may contain or depend on many constituent and contributing Quality Objects, including people, Management Systems, processes, facilities, technologies, information, products, services, and external parties or systems.

These Quality Objects may have their own Intended Functions, Intended Results, and Quality States. Their quality can affect Organization Quality, but their individual Quality States do not by themselves determine the Quality State of the Organization.

Organization Quality concerns the Organization as an organizational whole.

The Indicator architecture must therefore support determination of whether the Organization realizes its own Intended Function and Intended Result, rather than merely describe the quality of its individual parts.

This distinction establishes the Quality Object to which the six Core Organization Quality Indicators apply.

2.2 Organization Intended Function

The Organization Intended Function provides the primary functional basis for deriving the Organization Quality Indicators.

For the WQI Organization Quality framework, the Organization Intended Function is:

“To operate as an organizational whole so that the required results are produced within the applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis of the Organization.”

This formulation focuses the quality determination on the Organization as a whole.

The Core Indicators must therefore provide sufficient determination visibility into whether the Organization performs its required functions, has sufficient capability, realizes the relationships necessary for operation as a whole, and maintains required realization through the applicable temporal basis.

The Intended Function does not itself establish the Indicators. It provides the functional basis from which their necessity and placement are derived and tested.

2.3 Organization Intended Result

The Organization Intended Result provides the result-based counterpart to the Organization Intended Function.

For the WQI Organization Quality framework, the Organization Intended Result is:

“The Organization realizes its required functions and produces the required results within its applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.”

This formulation makes both required functions and required results visible in Organization Quality determination.

The distinction is important. An Organization may perform required functions without fully producing the required results, or a required result may occur even when the required functions are not realized as required.

The Indicator architecture must therefore preserve determination visibility for both Function and Result where that distinction is necessary.

The Intended Result does not predetermine the Indicator architecture. It provides a second basis against which the proposed Indicators are derived and tested.

2.4 Organization Function Realization

Organization Function Realization is the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result within the applicable conditions.

It provides the functional link between the Organization as the Quality Object and the determination of its quality.

Function Realization cannot be determined only by observing whether a required result occurred. The determination must also preserve visibility into whether required functions are being performed, whether sufficient capability exists, whether necessary relationships operate as required, and whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis.

The Core Organization Quality Factors provide these principal areas of determination.

The Core Indicators provide the next methodological resolution within those Factors.

The Indicator architecture must therefore make Organization Function Realization sufficiently visible for quality determination without introducing detail that belongs to context-specific application.

2.5 The Four Core Organization Quality Factors

The proposed Indicator architecture is organized beneath four Core Organization Quality Factors:

- Performance;
- Capability;
- Integration; and
- Continuity.

Each Factor has a distinct determination function.

Performance examines actual realization of required functions and results.

Capability examines whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

Integration examines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The Indicators must preserve these distinctions. An Indicator should therefore be placed beneath the Factor whose determination function it directly supports.

The four-Factor architecture provides the governing structure for deriving and testing the Core Organization Quality Indicators.

2.6 Role of Indicators in Organization Quality Determination

Core Quality Indicators provide the next level of determination beneath the Core Quality Factors.

A Factor identifies a principal area that must be examined. An Indicator identifies what must be examined within that Factor so that its determination function can be performed.

An Indicator is not itself a metric, observed value, Quality Object Characteristic, Evidence, finding, Quality State, or Quality Claim.

Instead, it provides a stable point of determination under which context-specific Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and findings can be organized and interpreted.

The Indicator architecture must therefore be detailed enough to preserve necessary determination visibility, but not so detailed that application-specific characteristics are elevated into the Core architecture.

For Organization Quality, the proposed six Indicators provide this intermediate methodological structure between the four Core Factors and context-specific quality determination.

3. THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY INDICATOR PROBLEM

3.1 Why Core Quality Factors Require Indicators

The four Core Organization Quality Factors identify the principal areas necessary for Organization Quality determination. However, a Factor alone may be too broad to show what must remain separately visible within that area.

Indicators provide this additional determination resolution.

For example, Performance must preserve visibility into both the realization of required functions and the production of required results. Without this distinction, different aspects of actual realization could be combined within a single broad determination.

The same methodological question must be examined for each Factor: what must remain separately visible for that Factor to perform its determination function?

Core Indicators are therefore required where a Factor needs further internal resolution to support a meaningful and traceable quality determination.

The challenge is to establish only the Indicators that are necessary at the Core level, without introducing detail that properly belongs to context-specific application.

3.2 Required Methodological Resolution

The Core Indicator architecture must operate at a level of resolution between the Core Quality Factors and context-specific application detail.

If the resolution is too broad, necessary differences within a Factor may disappear. The resulting determination may not show what aspect of Organization Function Realization is satisfactory, deficient, or unresolved.

If the resolution is too detailed, characteristics specific to particular organizations, sectors, technologies, or applications may be incorrectly treated as universal Core Indicators.

The required methodological resolution is therefore the minimum stable set of Indicators necessary for each Factor to perform its determination function while preserving distinctions that materially affect Organization Quality determination.

At this resolution, an Indicator must be broadly applicable across organizational contexts and sufficiently distinct to justify separate determination visibility.

This principle provides the basis for deciding both whether a proposed Indicator belongs in the Core architecture and whether an additional Indicator is necessary.

3.3 Risk of Too Few Indicators

Too few Core Indicators can reduce the determination capability of a Factor.

If distinct determination functions are combined within one Indicator, an important difference may become insufficiently visible. A favorable finding in one area could then obscure a deficiency or unresolved condition in another.

For example, combining Function and Result without testing their distinctness could conceal whether required functions are being performed even when a required result is observed, or whether required results are being produced even when required functions are performed.

The same risk applies across the Factor architecture. An Indicator set that is too limited may leave a necessary aspect of Capability, Integration, Performance, or Continuity without adequate determination visibility.

The Core architecture must therefore contain enough Indicators to preserve every necessary distinction within each Factor.

3.4 Risk of Excessive Indicator Detail

Too many Core Indicators can create a different problem.

Detailed characteristics may be important in a particular Organization or application without being necessary as universal Core Indicators. If such detail is elevated into the Core architecture, the framework can become unnecessarily complex and less applicable across different organizational contexts.

For example, specific resources, competencies, technologies, communication methods, or coordination mechanisms may be essential to a particular Organization. Their importance does not by itself justify establishing each as a separate Core Indicator.

Such characteristics should be examined through the applicable Core Indicator and expressed through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics where appropriate.

The Core Indicator architecture should therefore include only the minimum detail necessary to preserve distinct and necessary determination functions.

3.5 Boundary Between Core Indicators and Application Detail

Core Indicators define what must remain visible in Organization Quality determination across different organizational contexts.

Application detail defines how an Indicator is examined for a particular Organization, function, result, or context.

This distinction is necessary because the same Core Indicator may require very different Quality Object Characteristics, measures, Evidence, and methods in different applications.

For example, Capability — Sufficiency may involve people, competence, resources, information, technology, facilities, or other organizational means. These subjects may be essential to a particular determination, but they do not automatically become separate Core Indicators.

Similarly, Integration — Relationships may be examined through specific Interfaces, dependencies, coordination arrangements, information flows, or other relationships relevant to the Organization.

The Core architecture therefore identifies the necessary determination structure without prescribing application-specific detail.

A characteristic belongs at the Core Indicator level only when removing it would leave a necessary determination function insufficiently visible across the intended range of organizational contexts.

4. METHOD FOR DERIVING AND TESTING THE CORE QUALITY INDICATORS

4.1 Derivation from the Governing Quality Factor

Each Core Organization Quality Indicator must be derived from the determination function of its governing Factor.

The derivation begins by asking what must remain separately visible for that Factor to perform its determination function.

For Performance, the analysis asks what must be visible to determine actual realization.

For Capability, it asks what must be visible to determine whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

For Integration, it asks what must be visible to determine whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

For Continuity, it asks what must be visible to determine whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

A proposed Indicator is supported only when it provides necessary determination visibility within its governing Factor.

The derivation therefore proceeds from Factor determination function to Indicator, rather than from available measures, organizational practices, or application-specific characteristics.

4.2 Determination Function Test

The Determination Function Test examines whether a proposed Indicator performs a necessary role in the determination function of its governing Factor.

For each proposed Indicator, the test asks:

- What does this Indicator make visible?
- Is that visibility necessary for the Factor to perform its determination function?
- Would that determination function remain sufficiently visible without the Indicator?

An Indicator is supported when it makes a necessary aspect of the governing Factor separately visible for quality determination.

An Indicator is not supported merely because its subject is important to an Organization. Its subject must perform a necessary determination function at the Core Methodological Resolution.

This test establishes the primary methodological basis for retaining or rejecting each proposed Core Indicator.

4.3 Necessity and Removal Test

The Necessity and Removal Test examines what happens if a proposed Indicator is removed from its governing Factor.

For each Indicator, the test asks:

- Can the Factor still perform its determination function without this Indicator?
- Would a necessary aspect of the Factor become insufficiently visible?
- Could the same determination function be preserved through another Indicator without reducing determination visibility?

Removal is acceptable only when the Indicator contributes no necessary determination function beyond that already preserved elsewhere in the architecture.

If removal causes a necessary aspect of the Factor to disappear, become obscured, or be improperly absorbed into another Indicator, the Indicator is necessary at the Core Methodological Resolution.

This test helps distinguish necessary Core Indicators from useful but application-specific detail.

4.4 Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test

The Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test examines whether each proposed Indicator provides determination visibility that is sufficiently different from the other Indicators.

For each Indicator, the test asks:

- What specific aspect of the governing Factor does the Indicator make visible?
- Is that aspect already fully represented by another Indicator?
- Would combining the Indicators conceal a necessary distinction?

Some relationship between Indicators is expected because they contribute to determination of the same Organization. Relationship, however, does not mean duplication.

Two Indicators remain distinct when each preserves a necessary determination function that cannot be fully represented by the other.

Where two proposed Indicators provide the same determination visibility at the Core Methodological Resolution, separate Indicators are not justified.

This test therefore protects the architecture from both unnecessary duplication and loss of necessary distinctions.

4.5 Absorption and Combination Test

The Absorption and Combination Test examines whether a proposed Indicator can be absorbed into another Indicator, or combined with another Indicator, without reducing determination capability.

For each proposed combination, the test asks:

- Would the necessary determination functions of both Indicators remain visible?
- Would combining them create ambiguity about what is being determined?
- Could a deficiency or unresolved condition in one area become obscured by a finding in the other?

Combination is supported only when the separate Indicators do not preserve necessary distinctions at the Core Methodological Resolution.

If absorption or combination would reduce determination visibility, the Indicators should remain separate.

This test helps establish the minimum number of Indicators required without sacrificing necessary determination capability.

4.6 Missing-Indicator Test

The Missing-Indicator Test examines whether the proposed Indicator architecture leaves a necessary determination function unrepresented.

The test asks:

- Is there a necessary aspect of a Factor that is not sufficiently visible through its proposed Indicator or Indicators?
- Does determination of Organization Quality require another distinction at the Core Methodological Resolution?
- Is an apparently missing subject actually application detail that can be examined through an existing Indicator?

A new Core Indicator is justified only when a necessary determination function cannot be adequately represented through the existing Indicator architecture.

The importance of a subject alone is not sufficient. The subject must require separate and stable determination visibility across the intended range of organizational contexts.

This test therefore examines the architecture for omission without expanding it merely because additional organizational characteristics can be identified.

4.7 Cross-Factor Consistency Test

The Cross-Factor Consistency Test examines whether each proposed Indicator is correctly located beneath its governing Factor and remains consistent with the functions of the other Factors.

For each Indicator, the test asks:

- Does the Indicator directly support the determination function of its governing Factor?
- Would placing it beneath another Factor change or weaken its determination meaning?
- Does the Indicator duplicate a determination function already assigned to another Factor?

The test is particularly important where related subjects appear across Factors. Function and Result, for example, appear beneath both Performance and Continuity, but they serve different determination functions: Performance examines actual realization, while Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

An Indicator is correctly placed when its meaning is governed by the determination function of its Factor and does not improperly absorb the function of another Factor.

This test preserves consistency between the four-Factor architecture and the six-Indicator architecture.

4.8 Cross-Context Applicability Test

The Cross-Context Applicability Test examines whether each proposed Indicator remains applicable across different types of Organizations and operating contexts.

The test asks:

- Does the Indicator remain relevant when the Organization's required functions and results differ?
- Can the Indicator apply across different Boundaries, Interfaces, Contexts, and temporal bases?
- Does its Core meaning remain stable even when the characteristics used to examine it change?

A Core Indicator should not depend on one organizational structure, sector, technology, management approach, or operating condition.

For example, the specific characteristics used to determine Capability — Sufficiency may differ substantially between Organizations, while the need to determine whether capability is sufficient remains.

Similarly, the relationships examined under Integration may differ, while the need to determine whether necessary relationships are realized as required remains.

An Indicator is supported at the Core Methodological Resolution when its determination function remains applicable while allowing context-specific characteristics and Evidence to vary.

4.9 Collective Architecture Test

The Collective Architecture Test examines whether the proposed six Indicators operate together as a coherent Core determination structure.

The test asks:

- Does every Indicator perform a necessary determination function?
- Are the necessary determination functions of all four Factors sufficiently represented?
- Does the architecture preserve necessary distinctions without unnecessary duplication?
- Does any Indicator improperly absorb the determination function of another Indicator or Factor?
- Does a necessary Core-level determination function remain missing?

The architecture must be assessed as a whole because an Indicator that appears sufficient when examined independently may create a gap, overlap, or ambiguity when combined with the other Indicators.

The proposed architecture is supported only if the six Indicators collectively provide the necessary determination visibility beneath Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity at the Core Methodological Resolution.

This test provides the final architecture-level check before the individual Indicators and their placement are examined in detail.

5. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

5.1 Determination Function of Performance

Performance examines the actual realization of the Organization's required functions and results.

Its determination function is therefore concerned with what the Organization actually does and what it actually produces, rather than whether the Organization has the capability, relationships, or continuity conditions that support realization.

For Performance to perform this determination function, two aspects must remain visible:

- whether required functions are realized; and
- whether required results are produced.

These aspects are related but not identical. Function concerns actual realization of what the Organization is required to do. Result concerns what that realization is required to produce.

The proposed Performance Indicators are therefore:

- Function; and
- Result.

The following analysis examines whether both are necessary, distinct, and collectively sufficient for Performance at the Core Methodological Resolution.

5.2 Derivation of Function

The Function Indicator is derived from the Performance determination function and the Organization Intended Function.

Performance must determine whether the Organization actually performs the functions required of it.

A result alone cannot provide complete visibility into this question. A required result may occur even when a required organizational function is not performed as required, including where the result depends on temporary, external, or otherwise non-representative conditions.

Function therefore preserves direct determination visibility into actual realization of required organizational functions.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, the Indicator does not prescribe which functions must be examined or how their realization must be measured. Those characteristics depend on the applicable Organization, its requirements, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and other applicable conditions.

The Core determination question remains:

Are the Organization's required functions realized as required?

Function is therefore proposed as a distinct Core Indicator of Performance.

5.3 Derivation of Result

The Result Indicator is derived from the Performance determination function and the Organization Intended Result.

Performance must determine not only whether required functions are realized, but whether the Organization actually produces the required results.

Function realization does not by itself establish Result realization. Required functions may be performed while the required result is incomplete, deficient, delayed, or otherwise not realized as required.

Result therefore preserves separate determination visibility into what the Organization is required to produce.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, the Indicator does not prescribe particular results or measures. These are established through the applicable requirements and context-specific Quality Object Characteristics.

The Core determination question remains:

Does the Organization produce its required results as required?

Result is therefore proposed as a distinct Core Indicator of Performance.

5.4 Necessity of Function and Result

Both Function and Result are necessary for Performance determination.

If Function were removed, Performance could show whether required results were produced but would not preserve separate visibility into whether the Organization performed its required functions as required.

If Result were removed, Performance could show whether required functions were realized but would not preserve separate visibility into whether those functions produced the required results.

Neither determination can fully substitute for the other.

A favorable Function finding does not necessarily establish a favorable Result finding. Similarly, a favorable Result finding does not necessarily establish that the required Function was realized as required.

Removing either Indicator would therefore reduce the determination capability of Performance.

Function and Result are both necessary at the Core Methodological Resolution.

5.5 Distinctness Between Function and Result

Function and Result are closely related, but they preserve different determination visibility within Performance.

Function examines whether the Organization realizes what it is required to do.

Result examines whether the required outcome of that performance is produced as required.

The distinction becomes important when Function and Result do not align. Required functions may be performed without producing the required result. A required result may also occur without establishing that the required functions were performed as required.

Combining Function and Result into one Core Indicator could conceal these differences and reduce the clarity of the Performance determination.

Their relationship therefore does not constitute duplication.

Function and Result remain distinct because each answers a different necessary Performance determination question at the Core Methodological Resolution.

5.6 Sufficiency of the Performance Indicator Set

The next question is whether Function and Result are sufficient to support the determination function of Performance at the Core Methodological Resolution.

Performance concerns actual realization. Function makes actual realization of required functions visible, while Result makes production of required results visible.

Other subjects may affect Performance, including resources, competence, coordination, technology, management, and external conditions. Their importance does not require additional Performance Indicators where their determination functions are addressed through other Factors or through context-specific application detail.

Capability addresses whether sufficient capability exists for required realization. Integration addresses the necessary relationships. Continuity addresses maintenance of required realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Within Performance itself, the analysis does not identify another necessary Core-level determination function beyond actual Function and Result realization.

Function and Result are therefore presently sufficient as the Core Performance Indicator set.

5.7 Performance Indicator Finding

The analysis supports Function and Result as the two Core Indicators of Performance.

Function is necessary to determine whether the Organization realizes its required functions as required.

Result is necessary to determine whether the Organization produces its required results as required.

The two Indicators are related but distinct. Neither can be removed, absorbed into the other, or combined with the other without reducing necessary determination visibility.

The analysis does not identify an additional determination function that requires a separate Performance Indicator at the Core Methodological Resolution.

The presently supported Performance Indicator architecture is therefore:

Performance

- Function
- Result

6. CAPABILITY INDICATOR

6.1 Determination Function of Capability

Capability examines whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

Its determination function is different from Performance. Performance examines actual Function and Result realization. Capability examines whether the Organization has what is necessary to support that realization as required.

The relevant organizational means may differ substantially by Organization and Context. They may include people, competence, resources, information, technology, facilities, authority, capacity, or other means necessary for required realization.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, these different means do not need to become separate Indicators merely because they are important. The common determination question is whether they are sufficient for the required realization.

The proposed Core Capability Indicator is therefore:

— Sufficiency.

The following analysis examines whether Sufficiency provides the necessary determination visibility for Capability and whether any additional Core Capability Indicator is required.

6.2 Derivation of Sufficiency

Sufficiency is derived directly from the determination function of Capability.

Capability is relevant to Organization Quality because required realization depends on the Organization having sufficient means to support it.

The particular means required vary by Organization and Context. What remains common is the determination of whether those means are sufficient for the required Function and Result realization.

Sufficiency therefore provides a common Core determination point without prescribing a universal set of organizational means.

It does not require every organizational characteristic to be favorable or maximized. It asks whether the applicable capability is sufficient for what the Organization is required to realize.

The Core determination question is:

Does the Organization have sufficient capability for the required realization?

Sufficiency is therefore proposed as the Core Indicator of Capability.

6.3 Necessity of Sufficiency

Sufficiency is necessary for Capability determination because actual Performance alone does not establish whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

An Organization may presently realize required functions and results while depending on capability that is insufficient for the applicable requirements, conditions, or demands.

Without Sufficiency, this distinction would not remain separately visible. Capability could become inferred from observed Performance rather than determined in its own right.

Removing Sufficiency would therefore eliminate the Core determination question that distinguishes Capability from the other Factors:

Does the Organization have sufficient capability for the required realization?

Sufficiency is therefore necessary as a Core Capability Indicator.

6.4 Scope of Sufficiency

Sufficiency provides the Core determination point for the organizational means necessary to support required realization.

Depending on the Organization and Context, the determination may involve:

- people and competence;
- resources and capacity;
- information and knowledge;
- technology and facilities;
- authority and other organizational means; and

— other capability characteristics necessary for required realization.

These subjects may require separate Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and findings in a specific application. Their application-level separation does not require each to become a separate Core Indicator.

Sufficiency provides the common determination question under which the applicable capability characteristics can be examined:

Are the necessary organizational means sufficient for the required realization?

The scope of Sufficiency is therefore broad, but not unlimited. It is confined to characteristics that contribute to the Organization's capability for required realization. Subjects governed by Performance, Integration, or Continuity remain within their respective Factors.

6.5 Why Additional Core Capability Indicators Are Not Presently Required

The Capability Factor can contain many important subjects, but their importance does not by itself justify separate Core Indicators.

People, competence, resources, capacity, information, technology, facilities, authority, and other organizational means may each be necessary in a particular application. Their relevance depends on what capability is required for the Organization's Function and Result realization.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, these subjects share the same determination function: whether the applicable organizational means are sufficient for required realization.

Separating them into universal Core Indicators would introduce application detail into the Core architecture without adding a distinct Core-level determination function.

The analysis therefore does not identify an additional Capability Indicator that must remain separately visible from Sufficiency across organizational contexts.

More detailed capability characteristics can be established beneath Sufficiency through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics and supporting Evidence.

Sufficiency is therefore presently supported as the single Core Indicator of Capability.

6.6 Capability Indicator Finding

The analysis supports Sufficiency as the Core Indicator of Capability.

Sufficiency is necessary to determine whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization. Removing it would eliminate the distinct determination function of Capability from the Indicator architecture.

The organizational means examined through Sufficiency may vary by Organization and Context. Their variation does not require separate Core Indicators unless a distinct and necessary determination function is identified.

The analysis does not identify an additional Core-level determination function within Capability that must remain separately visible from Sufficiency.

The presently supported Capability Indicator architecture is therefore:

Capability

— Sufficiency

7. INTEGRATION INDICATOR

7.1 Determination Function of Integration

Integration examines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

An Organization consists of multiple constituent and contributing Quality Objects whose functions and results may depend on one another. Organization Quality therefore cannot be determined only by examining these Quality Objects separately.

Integration provides determination visibility into the relationships through which their contributions operate together at the Organization level.

These relationships may involve Interfaces, dependencies, coordination, communication, information flows, responsibilities, or other connections necessary for required realization.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, these different forms of relationship do not need to become separate Indicators merely because they differ in form or application. The common determination question is whether the necessary relationships are realized as required.

The proposed Core Integration Indicator is therefore:

— Relationships.

The following analysis examines whether Relationships provides the necessary determination visibility for Integration and whether any additional Core Integration Indicator is required.

7.2 Derivation of Relationships

Relationships is derived directly from the determination function of Integration.

For an Organization to operate as an organizational whole, its constituent and contributing Quality Objects cannot be considered only as separate elements. Where required realization depends on their interaction, the necessary relationships between them must also be realized as required.

The particular relationships vary by Organization and Context. They may include Interfaces, dependencies, coordination, communication, information flows, responsibilities, or other connections necessary for required realization.

Relationships provides a common Core determination point for these different forms without prescribing a universal organizational structure or method of interaction.

The Core determination question is:

Are the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole realized as required?

Relationships is therefore proposed as the Core Indicator of Integration.

7.3 Necessity of Relationships

Relationships is necessary for Integration determination because the quality of separate organizational elements does not establish whether they operate together as required.

An Organization may have capable people, processes, technologies, and other contributing Quality Objects while the relationships between them are deficient, incomplete, or otherwise not realized as required.

Without Relationships, these conditions could remain insufficiently visible in Organization Quality determination.

Removing Relationships would therefore eliminate the Core determination question that distinguishes Integration:

Are the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole realized as required?

Relationships is therefore necessary as a Core Integration Indicator.

7.4 Scope of Relationships

Relationships provides the Core determination point for the connections necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

Depending on the Organization and Context, the determination may involve:

- Interfaces;
- dependencies;
- coordination;
- communication;
- information flows;
- allocation and interaction of responsibilities; and
- other relationships necessary for required realization.

These subjects may require separate Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and findings in a specific application. Their application-level separation does not require each to become a separate Core Indicator.

Relationships provides the common determination question under which the applicable relationship characteristics can be examined:

Are the necessary relationships realized as required?

The scope of Relationships is therefore limited to relationships necessary for Organization Function and Result realization. Capability of the contributing elements, their actual Performance, and Continuity of realization remain within their respective Factors.

7.5 Why Additional Core Integration Indicators Are Not Presently Required

Integration can involve many different forms of organizational relationship, but their importance does not by itself justify separate Core Indicators.

Interfaces, dependencies, coordination, communication, information flows, responsibilities, and other connections may each require detailed examination in a particular application.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, these subjects share the same determination function: whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

Separating them into universal Core Indicators would introduce application detail without establishing additional distinct Core-level determination functions.

The analysis therefore does not identify an additional Integration Indicator that must remain separately visible from Relationships across organizational contexts.

More detailed relationship characteristics can be established beneath Relationships through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics and supporting Evidence.

Relationships is therefore presently supported as the single Core Indicator of Integration.

7.6 Integration Indicator Finding

The analysis supports Relationships as the Core Indicator of Integration.

Relationships is necessary to determine whether the connections required for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

The specific relationships examined may vary by Organization and Context. Their variation does not require separate Core Indicators unless a distinct and necessary determination function is identified.

Removing Relationships would leave the Integration determination function without sufficient visibility. At the same time, the analysis does not identify an additional Core-level determination function within Integration that must remain separately visible from Relationships.

The presently supported Integration Indicator architecture is therefore:

Integration

- Relationships

8. CONTINUITY INDICATORS

8.1 Determination Function of Continuity

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Its determination function is distinct from Performance. Performance examines actual Function and Result realization. Continuity examines whether that required realization is maintained as required over the applicable temporal basis.

For Continuity to perform this determination function, two aspects must remain visible:

- whether required Function realization is maintained; and
- whether required Result realization is maintained.

These aspects are related but not identical. An Organization may maintain performance of required functions while required results are not maintained, or required results may remain temporarily observable while the required functions necessary for their continued realization are not maintained.

The proposed Continuity Indicators are therefore:

- Function; and
- Result.

The following analysis examines whether both are necessary, distinct, and collectively sufficient for Continuity at the Core Methodological Resolution.

8.2 Derivation of Function

The Function Indicator is derived from the determination function of Continuity.

Continuity must determine whether the Organization maintains realization of its required functions through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Actual Function realization at one point in time does not establish that the required Function realization is maintained. Conditions affecting realization may change, and the applicable requirement may extend across time.

Function therefore preserves determination visibility into whether required organizational functions continue to be realized as required.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, the Indicator does not prescribe the applicable time period, conditions of change, or specific continuity characteristics. These depend on the Organization, its requirements, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.

The Core determination question is:

Is realization of the Organization's required functions maintained as required through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?

Function is therefore proposed as a distinct Core Indicator of Continuity.

8.3 Derivation of Result

The Result Indicator is derived from the determination function of Continuity.

Continuity must determine whether the Organization maintains production of its required results through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

A required Result realized at one point in time does not establish that Result realization is maintained as required. The applicable requirement may extend across time or changing conditions.

Result therefore preserves determination visibility into whether the Organization continues to produce its required results as required.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, the Indicator does not prescribe the applicable time period, conditions of change, or specific result characteristics. These depend on the Organization, its requirements, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.

The Core determination question is:

Is production of the Organization's required results maintained as required through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?

Result is therefore proposed as a distinct Core Indicator of Continuity.

8.4 Necessity of Function and Result

Both Function and Result are necessary for Continuity determination.

If Function were removed, Continuity could show whether required results are maintained but would not preserve separate visibility into whether the Organization maintains realization of its required functions.

If Result were removed, Continuity could show whether required functions are maintained but would not preserve separate visibility into whether the required results continue to be produced as required.

Neither determination can fully substitute for the other.

Maintained Function realization does not necessarily establish maintained Result realization. Similarly, maintained Result realization does not necessarily establish that the required Function realization is maintained as required.

Removing either Indicator would therefore reduce the determination capability of Continuity.

Function and Result are both necessary at the Core Methodological Resolution.

8.5 Distinctness Between Function and Result

Function and Result are closely related within Continuity, but they preserve different determination visibility.

Function examines whether realization of the Organization's required functions is maintained as required.

Result examines whether production of the Organization's required results is maintained as required.

The distinction becomes important when their continuity differs. Required Function realization may be maintained while required Result realization is not. Required results may also remain temporarily observable while the Function realization necessary for their continued production is not maintained.

Combining Function and Result into one Continuity Indicator could conceal these differences and reduce determination clarity.

Their relationship therefore does not constitute duplication.

Function and Result remain distinct because each preserves a different necessary aspect of Continuity at the Core Methodological Resolution.

8.6 Sufficiency of the Continuity Indicator Set

The next question is whether Function and Result are sufficient to support the determination function of Continuity at the Core Methodological Resolution.

Continuity concerns maintenance of required realization. Function makes maintenance of required Function realization visible, while Result makes maintenance of required Result realization visible.

Other subjects may be important to continuity, including change, adaptability, resilience, recovery, resources, dependencies, and external conditions. Their importance does not by itself require additional Continuity Indicators.

Where such subjects affect whether required Function or Result realization is maintained, they can be examined through the applicable Continuity Indicator and context-specific Quality Object Characteristics. Where they concern Capability or Integration, they remain within those respective Factors.

Where recovery after interruption is itself required, realization of that recovery requirement is examined through the applicable Factors rather than assumed to constitute a separate Core Continuity Indicator.

The analysis does not identify another necessary Core-level determination function within Continuity beyond maintenance of Function and Result realization.

Function and Result are therefore presently sufficient as the Core Continuity Indicator set.

8.7 Continuity Indicator Finding

The analysis supports Function and Result as the two Core Indicators of Continuity.

Function is necessary to determine whether realization of the Organization's required functions is maintained as required through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Result is necessary to determine whether production of the Organization's required results is maintained as required through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The two Indicators are related but distinct. Neither can be removed, absorbed into the other, or combined with the other without reducing necessary determination visibility.

The analysis does not identify an additional determination function that requires a separate Continuity Indicator at the Core Methodological Resolution.

The presently supported Continuity Indicator architecture is therefore:

Continuity

- Function
- Result

9. HORIZONTAL TESTING ACROSS THE SIX INDICATORS

9.1 Purpose of Horizontal Testing

The preceding sections examined the proposed Indicators within their governing Factors. Horizontal testing examines the six Indicators across the complete architecture.

Its purpose is to determine whether Indicators that are individually supported remain distinct and correctly placed when considered in relation to one another.

The test examines:

- whether two Indicators provide the same determination visibility;
- whether one Indicator can absorb another without loss of necessary visibility;
- whether related Indicators remain distinct because they answer different determination questions;
- whether an Indicator is more appropriately located beneath another Factor; and
- whether the complete arrangement creates a gap, overlap, or unnecessary duplication.

This analysis is particularly important because Function and Result appear beneath both Performance and Continuity, while Sufficiency and Relationships address conditions closely connected with Function and Result realization.

Horizontal testing therefore examines the six-Indicator architecture as an integrated determination structure rather than as four separate Factor-level sets.

9.2 Performance Function and Performance Result

Performance — Function and Performance — Result are horizontally related because both concern actual realization.

The test asks whether one can absorb the other or whether they must remain separately visible.

Performance — Function determines whether the Organization actually realizes its required functions.

Performance — Result determines whether the Organization actually produces its required results.

These determinations can differ. Required functions may be realized while required results are not produced as required. Required results may also occur without establishing that the required functions were realized as required.

Neither Indicator therefore provides the complete determination visibility of the other.

Combining them would reduce the ability to distinguish Function realization from Result realization.

Performance — Function and Performance — Result are therefore horizontally distinct and should remain separate Core Indicators.

9.3 Performance and Capability Indicators

Performance and Capability are closely related because actual realization depends in part on the Organization's capability.

The test asks whether Performance — Function or Performance — Result can absorb Capability — Sufficiency, or whether Sufficiency must remain separately visible.

Performance — Function and Performance — Result determine actual realization.

Capability — Sufficiency determines whether the Organization has sufficient capability for the required realization.

Actual realization does not by itself establish sufficient capability. Similarly, sufficient capability does not establish that required functions and results are actually realized.

The Indicators therefore answer different determination questions.

Sufficiency cannot be absorbed into Performance without losing separate visibility into Capability. Function and Result cannot be absorbed into Sufficiency without losing visibility into actual realization.

Performance — Function, Performance — Result, and Capability — Sufficiency are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.4 Performance and Integration Indicators

Performance and Integration are related because actual realization may depend on relationships among the Organization's constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

The test asks whether Integration — Relationships can be absorbed into Performance — Function or Performance — Result.

Performance — Function and Performance — Result determine actual realization.

Integration — Relationships determines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

These determinations are distinct. Required functions or results may be realized while necessary relationships are deficient, incomplete, or otherwise not realized as required. Conversely, necessary relationships may be realized as required without establishing that required functions and results are actually realized.

Relationships therefore cannot be absorbed into Performance without losing separate visibility into Integration. Function and Result cannot be absorbed into Relationships without losing visibility into actual realization.

Performance — Function, Performance — Result, and Integration — Relationships are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.5 Performance and Continuity Indicators

Performance and Continuity are closely related because both examine Function and Result realization.

The distinction is their determination basis.

Performance — Function and Performance — Result determine whether required functions and results are actually realized.

Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result determine whether that required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Actual realization at a particular point or period does not by itself establish that realization is maintained as required. Conversely, Continuity cannot be determined without reference to the Function or Result whose realization must be maintained.

The repeated use of Function and Result therefore does not constitute duplication. Their determination meaning is governed by their respective Factors.

Performance and Continuity Indicators cannot be combined without losing the distinction between actual realization and maintenance of realization.

They are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.6 Capability and Integration Indicators

Capability and Integration are related because the Organization's capability and its relationships can both contribute to required realization.

The test asks whether Capability — Sufficiency and Integration — Relationships perform distinct determination functions.

Capability — Sufficiency determines whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

Integration — Relationships determines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

These determinations cannot substitute for one another. An Organization may have sufficient capability while necessary relationships are deficient. Necessary relationships may also be realized as required while capability remains insufficient.

Sufficiency therefore cannot absorb Relationships, and Relationships cannot absorb Sufficiency without reducing determination visibility.

Capability — Sufficiency and Integration — Relationships are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.7 Capability and Continuity Indicators

Capability and Continuity are related because maintaining required realization may depend on sufficient organizational capability.

The test asks whether Capability — Sufficiency can be absorbed into Continuity — Function or Continuity — Result, or whether the determinations must remain separate.

Capability — Sufficiency determines whether the Organization has sufficient capability for required realization.

Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result determine whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

These determinations are distinct. Sufficient capability does not establish that required realization is maintained. Similarly, maintained realization does not by itself establish that the Organization's capability is sufficient.

Sufficiency therefore cannot be absorbed into Continuity, and the Continuity Indicators cannot be absorbed into Sufficiency without reducing determination visibility.

Capability — Sufficiency, Continuity — Function, and Continuity — Result are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.8 Integration and Continuity Indicators

Integration and Continuity are related because maintaining required realization may depend on relationships within and across the Organization.

The test asks whether Integration — Relationships can absorb Continuity — Function or Continuity — Result, or whether these Indicators must remain separately visible.

Integration — Relationships determines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result determine whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

These determinations are distinct. Necessary relationships may be realized as required while Function or Result realization is not maintained. Similarly, required realization may be maintained while particular relationship conditions require separate examination under Integration.

Relationships therefore cannot absorb the Continuity Indicators, and the Continuity Indicators cannot absorb Relationships without reducing determination visibility.

Integration — Relationships, Continuity — Function, and Continuity — Result are therefore horizontally distinct and correctly placed beneath their respective Factors.

9.9 Indicator Placement and Non-Redundancy

The horizontal tests show that each of the six proposed Indicators performs a distinct determination function within its governing Factor.

Performance — Function and Result preserve visibility into actual realization.

Capability — Sufficiency preserves visibility into whether sufficient capability exists for required realization.

Integration — Relationships preserves visibility into whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole are realized as required.

Continuity — Function and Result preserve visibility into whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The relationships among these Indicators do not constitute redundancy. Each answers a determination question that cannot be fully answered by another Indicator.

Moving, combining, or absorbing the Indicators would reduce necessary determination visibility or weaken the distinction between the four governing Factors.

The six Indicators are therefore presently supported as distinct and correctly placed within the Organization Quality architecture.

9.10 Horizontal Testing Finding

Horizontal testing supports the proposed six-Indicator architecture.

Each Indicator provides necessary determination visibility that is not fully provided by another Indicator.

The analysis does not identify unnecessary duplication among:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

The repeated use of Function and Result beneath Performance and Continuity does not create redundancy because the governing Factors establish different determination functions: actual realization under Performance and maintenance of realization under Continuity.

Sufficiency and Relationships also remain distinct from Function and Result and from each other.

No Indicator can presently be removed, combined, absorbed, or relocated without reducing necessary determination visibility or weakening the four-Factor architecture.

The six Indicators therefore survive horizontal testing at the Core Methodological Resolution.

10. MISSING-INDICATOR TEST

10.1 Purpose of the Missing-Indicator Test

The preceding analysis examined whether the six proposed Indicators are necessary, distinct, and correctly placed. The Missing-Indicator Test examines the opposite question: whether a necessary Core Indicator is absent.

The test considers subjects that may appear important to Organization Quality and asks whether they require separate determination visibility at the Core Methodological Resolution.

A subject does not require a separate Core Indicator merely because it can affect Organization Quality. A new Indicator is justified only when it performs a necessary determination function that cannot be adequately represented through the existing six Indicators.

The test therefore asks:

- Does the subject introduce a distinct determination function?
- Can that function be adequately examined through an existing Indicator?
- Is the subject instead a context-specific Quality Object Characteristic or other application detail?
- Would omission of a separate Indicator leave a necessary aspect of Organization Quality insufficiently visible?

The purpose is to identify any genuine gap in the six-Indicator architecture without expanding the Core architecture unnecessarily.

10.2 Requirements

Requirements are fundamental to Organization Quality determination because they establish what the Organization is required to realize.

The question is whether Requirements require a separate Core Indicator.

Requirements do not perform an independent determination function within the six-Indicator architecture. Instead, they provide the applicable basis against which the existing Indicators are examined.

Performance determines whether required Function and Result realization occurs.

Capability determines whether capability is sufficient for the required realization.

Integration determines whether the necessary Relationships are realized as required.

Continuity determines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained as required.

Requirements therefore govern what is required under the applicable Indicators rather than constitute a separate Indicator themselves.

Where specific requirements must be examined, they can be represented through the applicable Quality Object Characteristics and their substantive basis.

A separate Requirements Indicator is therefore not presently required at the Core Methodological Resolution.

10.3 Resources and Organizational Means

Resources and organizational means can be necessary for the Organization to realize its required functions and results.

The question is whether they require a separate Core Indicator.

The types of resources and means required vary substantially by Organization and Context. They may include people, facilities, technology, information, financial resources, equipment, capacity, authority, or other means.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, their common determination function is already represented by Capability — Sufficiency.

The relevant question is not whether particular resources exist in isolation, but whether the applicable organizational means are sufficient for the required realization.

Where specific resources or means require separate examination, they can be represented through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics beneath Sufficiency.

Resources and organizational means therefore do not presently require an additional Core Indicator.

10.4 Competence and Organizational Capacity

Competence and organizational capacity can be necessary for required realization.

The question is whether either requires a separate Core Indicator.

Competence concerns whether the applicable knowledge, skills, abilities, or other human capabilities are sufficient for what the Organization is required to realize.

Organizational capacity concerns whether the Organization has sufficient ability or means to meet the applicable demands of required realization.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, both questions are already represented by Capability — Sufficiency.

Their specific characteristics may require separate examination in a particular application, but this can be performed through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics beneath Sufficiency.

Neither competence nor organizational capacity introduces a distinct Core-level determination function beyond whether capability is sufficient for required realization.

Competence and organizational capacity therefore do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.5 Interfaces and Dependencies

Interfaces and dependencies can be essential to the Organization's required realization.

The question is whether they require separate Core Indicators.

Interfaces identify points at which organizational elements or external parties interact. Dependencies identify relationships in which required realization depends on another function, result, Quality Object, or condition.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, both are forms of relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

Their common determination function is therefore already represented by Integration — Relationships.

Specific Interfaces and dependencies may require separate Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and findings in a particular application. Their application-level importance does not establish a need for separate Core Indicators.

Interfaces and dependencies therefore do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.6 Coordination and Communication

Coordination and communication can be necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

The question is whether they require separate Core Indicators.

Coordination concerns relationships through which activities and contributions are aligned where required. Communication concerns relationships through which necessary information is exchanged.

At the Core Methodological Resolution, both are forms of relationships necessary for required realization.

Their common determination function is therefore already represented by Integration — Relationships.

The specific coordination and communication arrangements required vary by Organization and Context and can be examined through context-specific Quality Object Characteristics beneath Relationships.

Neither coordination nor communication introduces a distinct Core-level determination function beyond whether the necessary relationships are realized as required.

Coordination and communication therefore do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.7 Change and Adaptability

Change and adaptability can affect the Organization's ability to realize its required functions and results.

The question is whether they require separate Core Indicators.

Change is a condition under which Organization Quality may need to be determined. Adaptability concerns characteristics that may enable the Organization to respond to relevant change.

Neither establishes a separate Core determination function.

Where adaptability concerns whether the Organization has sufficient capability to respond to applicable change, it can be examined through Capability — Sufficiency.

Where change affects whether required Function or Result realization is maintained, it can be examined through Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result.

Specific forms of change and adaptability may require context-specific Quality Object Characteristics and Evidence.

Change and adaptability therefore do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.8 Resilience and Recovery

Resilience and recovery can be important where the Organization is exposed to disruption or interruption.

The question is whether they require separate Core Indicators.

Resilience may involve capability to withstand, adapt to, or respond to disruption. Where this capability is required, its sufficiency can be examined through Capability — Sufficiency.

Recovery concerns restoration after interruption. Where recovery is itself required, realization of that requirement is examined through the applicable Factors and Indicators.

Continuity does not automatically mean recovery. Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result determine whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change. If interruption and recovery are part of the applicable requirements, they are reflected in that determination as appropriate.

Resilience and recovery therefore do not introduce a distinct Core-level determination function that requires another Indicator.

They do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.9 Improvement and Efficiency

Improvement and efficiency can contribute to the Organization's ability to realize its required functions and results.

The question is whether they require separate Core Indicators.

Improvement concerns change intended to achieve a more favorable state or result. It is not universally required unless improvement itself forms part of the applicable requirements.

Efficiency concerns the relationship between realization and the resources, time, or other means used. It is relevant where an applicable requirement establishes efficiency as a required characteristic.

Where improvement or efficiency is required, its realization can be examined through the applicable existing Factors and Indicators and context-specific Quality Object Characteristics.

Neither improvement nor efficiency therefore establishes an independent determination function that must always remain visible in Organization Quality determination.

Improvement and efficiency do not presently require additional Core Indicators.

10.10 Other Candidate Determination Functions

The Missing-Indicator Test must also consider whether another necessary Core determination function exists beyond the candidate subjects already examined.

Potential subjects can arise from different organizational contexts, including governance, control, responsibility, authority, decision-making, learning, innovation, sustainability, and other organizational characteristics.

These subjects may be important and, in some contexts, essential to required realization. Their importance alone, however, does not establish a separate Core Indicator.

A separate Indicator would require a determination function that:

- is necessary for Organization Quality determination;

- is not adequately represented by the existing six Indicators;
- must remain separately visible at the Core Methodological Resolution; and
- remains applicable across the intended range of organizational contexts.

The analysis does not presently identify another candidate that satisfies these conditions.

Where such subjects are required, they can be examined through the applicable existing Indicator and context-specific Quality Object Characteristics.

No other candidate determination function therefore presently requires an additional Core Organization Quality Indicator.

10.11 Missing-Indicator Finding

The Missing-Indicator Test does not identify a necessary Core determination function that is absent from the proposed six-Indicator architecture.

Requirements provide the applicable basis for determination rather than a separate Indicator.

Resources, organizational means, competence, and organizational capacity can be examined through Capability — Sufficiency.

Interfaces, dependencies, coordination, and communication can be examined through Integration — Relationships.

Change, adaptability, resilience, recovery, improvement, and efficiency can be examined through the applicable existing Indicators where they are relevant to required realization.

Other candidate subjects examined do not presently establish a distinct determination function that must remain separately visible at the Core Methodological Resolution.

The Missing-Indicator Test therefore supports the present six-Indicator architecture without addition of another Core Indicator:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

11. CROSS-CONTEXT STRESS TESTING

11.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing

The preceding analysis examined the six Indicators for necessity, distinctness, placement, and completeness.

Cross-context testing examines whether the architecture remains applicable when the characteristics of the Organization change.

A Core Indicator should not depend on one type of Organization, sector, structure, technology, operating model, or set of requirements.

The test therefore examines whether the six Indicators remain applicable across differences in:

- types of Organizations;
- required functions and results;
- constituent and contributing Quality Objects;
- Boundaries and Interfaces;
- Context and applicable conditions; and
- temporal bases and conditions of change.

The purpose is not to prove universal applicability through empirical testing. It is to determine whether changes in organizational context reveal a structural gap, unnecessary Indicator, or need to alter the Core architecture.

The six-Indicator architecture is supported only if its determination functions remain stable while context-specific Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and methods are allowed to vary.

11.2 Different Types of Organizations

Organizations may differ substantially in required functions and results, size, structure, sector, ownership, operating model, and complexity.

These differences change the specific functions, results, capabilities, relationships, and continuity conditions that must be examined. They do not necessarily change the Core determination functions.

Across different types of Organizations, the same six questions remain applicable:

- Are required functions realized?
- Are required results produced?
- Is capability sufficient for required realization?
- Are necessary relationships realized as required?
- Is required Function realization maintained?
- Is required Result realization maintained?

The Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and methods used to answer these questions may differ substantially between Organizations.

Within the types of Organizations examined conceptually, the six Core Indicators remain applicable without requiring a change in the Core architecture.

11.3 Different Required Functions and Results

Organizations differ in the functions they are required to perform and the results they are required to produce.

These differences affect the content of the quality determination but do not change the Core Indicator structure.

Performance — Function and Performance — Result apply to the actual realization required of the particular Organization.

Capability — Sufficiency applies to the capability necessary for that realization.

Integration — Relationships applies to the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

Continuity — Function and Continuity — Result apply to maintenance of the required realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The specific Quality Object Characteristics and Evidence therefore change with the required functions and results, while the determination functions of the six Indicators remain stable.

The differences examined do not reveal a need to add, remove, or restructure a Core Indicator.

11.4 Different Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects

Organizations may contain or depend on different constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

These may include people, Management Systems, processes, facilities, technologies, information, products, services, and external parties or systems.

The number, type, and importance of these Quality Objects may vary substantially between Organizations.

These differences affect what must be examined beneath the Core Indicators, but they do not change the Indicator determination functions.

Performance examines the Organization's actual Function and Result realization.

Capability — Sufficiency examines whether the applicable contributing capabilities are sufficient for required realization.

Integration — Relationships examines whether the necessary relationships among constituent and contributing Quality Objects are realized as required.

Continuity examines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained.

The specific Quality Objects and their characteristics therefore vary by application while the six-Indicator architecture remains stable.

The differences examined do not reveal a need to add, remove, or restructure a Core Indicator.

11.5 Different Boundaries and Interfaces

Organizations may operate within different Boundaries and through different Interfaces.

Boundaries determine what is included within the Organization Quality determination and what remains outside it.

Interfaces identify relevant points of interaction across or within those Boundaries.

Changes in Boundaries and Interfaces may change the functions, results, capabilities, and relationships that must be examined. They may also change the Evidence required for the determination.

These differences do not change the determination functions of the six Core Indicators.

The Indicators remain applicable to the Organization as defined within its applicable Boundaries and Interfaces.

Different Boundaries and Interfaces therefore change the application of the Indicator architecture. Within the conditions examined, they do not reveal a need to add, remove, or restructure a Core Indicator.

11.6 Different Contexts and Applicable Conditions

Organizations operate within different Contexts and applicable conditions.

These may include legal, regulatory, technical, economic, environmental, social, operational, and other conditions relevant to required realization.

Such differences may change what is required of the Organization and how the six Indicators must be examined.

They may affect the applicable Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and interpretation of findings, but they do not change the Core determination functions.

Performance still examines actual Function and Result realization. Capability examines Sufficiency. Integration examines Relationships. Continuity examines maintenance of Function and Result realization.

Different Contexts and applicable conditions therefore change the application of the Indicators. Within the conditions examined, they do not require a change in the six-Indicator Core architecture.

11.7 Different Temporal Bases and Conditions of Change

Organizations may be subject to different temporal bases and different conditions of change.

Required realization may apply continuously, periodically, for a defined duration, at specified times, or under particular changing conditions.

The nature and significance of change may also differ between Organizations and Contexts.

These differences affect how Continuity is examined, but they do not change its Core determination function.

Continuity — Function determines whether required Function realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Continuity — Result determines whether required Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Where change also affects Capability, Integration, or actual Performance, those effects are examined through the applicable Indicators of those Factors.

Different temporal bases and conditions of change therefore alter the application of the six Indicators. Within the conditions examined, they do not require a change in the Core architecture.

11.8 Cross-Context Finding

Cross-context testing supports the proposed six-Indicator architecture.

The Indicators remain applicable across differences in Organization type, required functions and results, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, applicable conditions, and temporal basis.

These differences can substantially change the Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and methods required for a particular determination. They do not change the Core determination functions represented by the six Indicators.

Within the organizational contexts examined, the testing does not identify a case in which a proposed Indicator becomes unnecessary or a necessary Core determination function becomes absent.

The six-Indicator architecture therefore remains presently supported across the organizational contexts examined:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

12. WHY SIX — AND NOT FEWER OR MORE

12.1 Why Fewer Indicators Would Reduce Determination Capability

The preceding tests show that each of the six proposed Indicators preserves necessary determination visibility.

Reducing the number would require removing or combining at least one of these determination functions.

Removing either Performance — Function or Performance — Result would reduce visibility into actual realization.

Removing Capability — Sufficiency would eliminate separate visibility into whether capability is sufficient for required realization.

Removing Integration — Relationships would eliminate separate visibility into whether the necessary relationships are realized as required.

Removing either Continuity — Function or Continuity — Result would reduce visibility into whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Combining these Indicators would create the same problem where a necessary distinction becomes obscured.

Fewer than six Indicators would therefore reduce the determination capability of the Core Organization Quality architecture.

12.2 Why Additional Indicators Are Not Presently Required

The analysis must also determine whether more than six Core Indicators are necessary.

The Missing-Indicator Test examined Requirements, resources and organizational means, competence and organizational capacity, Interfaces and dependencies, coordination and communication, change and adaptability, resilience and recovery, improvement and efficiency, and other candidate determination functions.

These subjects may be important to Organization Quality, but the analysis did not identify a distinct Core-level determination function that requires an additional Indicator.

Where applicable, these subjects can be examined through the existing Indicators and context-specific Quality Object Characteristics.

Adding separate Core Indicators for them would therefore increase architectural detail without increasing necessary Core determination capability.

The analysis does not presently support an additional Core Organization Quality Indicator beyond the proposed six.

12.3 Why Six Is the Presently Supported Core Resolution

The preceding analysis supports six Indicators as the presently appropriate Core Methodological Resolution.

Each Indicator preserves a necessary determination function that cannot be removed or combined without reducing determination capability.

At the same time, the analysis does not identify an additional determination function that requires separate visibility at the Core Indicator level.

The six Indicators therefore provide the minimum presently supported structure necessary to make the four Core Organization Quality Factors operational for quality determination:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

This conclusion does not mean that six Indicators must remain permanently unchanged. It means that, based on the present methodological analysis, fewer Indicators would reduce necessary determination visibility, while additional Indicators are not presently justified at the Core Methodological Resolution.

Six is therefore the presently supported Core resolution for the WQI Organization Quality Indicator architecture.

13. STABILITY AND CONDITIONS FOR CONTROLLED REVISION

13.1 Need for Core Stability

A Core Indicator architecture must remain sufficiently stable to support consistent Organization Quality determination across applications and over time.

If Core Indicators are changed whenever a new organizational characteristic, method, technology, or application is encountered, the distinction between Core architecture and application detail would be weakened.

Stability does not mean that the architecture is permanently fixed. It means that revision should require a demonstrated methodological need rather than preference for additional detail.

The six Core Indicators should therefore remain stable unless further analysis shows that:

- a necessary Core determination function is missing;
- an existing Indicator does not perform a necessary determination function;
- two or more Indicators cannot be meaningfully distinguished; or
- the architecture fails under a relevant organizational context.

Core stability therefore protects both consistency of quality determination and the methodological distinction between universal Core Indicators and context-specific application detail.

13.2 Conditions That Could Justify Revision

Revision of the Core Indicator architecture should require a demonstrated methodological need.

Revision may be justified if further analysis or application demonstrates that:

- a necessary determination function is not represented by the existing Indicators;
- an existing Indicator does not preserve the determination visibility for which it was established;
- two or more Indicators cannot be maintained as distinct at the Core Methodological Resolution;
- an Indicator is incorrectly placed beneath its governing Factor;
- a relevant organizational context reveals a structural gap in the architecture; or
- a change in the governing WQI Organization Quality architecture requires corresponding revision of the Indicators.

The appearance of new technologies, organizational practices, measures, or application-specific characteristics does not by itself justify revision.

Revision should occur only when the Core determination architecture itself is shown to require change.

13.3 Controlled Revision Principles

Where revision is justified, it should be controlled so that the integrity of the Core architecture is preserved.

A proposed revision should be examined using the same methodological principles applied in the original derivation.

The revision should establish:

- the determination function affected;
- why the existing architecture is insufficient;
- whether the proposed change is necessary at the Core Methodological Resolution;
- whether the change creates overlap or redundancy;
- whether the revised architecture remains consistent with the four Core Organization Quality Factors; and
- whether it remains applicable across different organizational contexts.

Application-specific needs should not be resolved by changing the Core architecture when they can be addressed through Quality Object Characteristics or other application detail.

Any revision should therefore be traceable to a demonstrated methodological need and supported by documented analysis.

13.4 Stability Finding

The analysis supports stability of the proposed six-Indicator architecture.

Each Indicator performs a necessary and distinct determination function within its governing Factor. Horizontal testing does not identify unnecessary duplication, and the Missing-Indicator Test does not identify an additional Core determination function that is presently required.

Cross-context testing also does not reveal a structural need to change the architecture.

The presently supported Core Organization Quality Indicator architecture is therefore:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

This architecture should remain stable unless further analysis or application demonstrates a methodological need for controlled revision.

Core stability does not prevent context-specific development beneath the Indicators. It preserves the common determination structure within which such development can occur.

14. CONCLUSION

This article examined whether the proposed six-Indicator architecture provides a necessary, distinct, and presently sufficient Core structure for Organization Quality determination.

The analysis supports the following architecture:

Performance

- Function
- Result

Capability

- Sufficiency

Integration

- Relationships

Continuity

- Function
- Result

Each Indicator was derived from the determination function of its governing Factor and examined for necessity, distinctness, placement, possible absorption or combination, and contribution to the Collective Architecture Test.

Horizontal testing did not identify unnecessary duplication. The Missing-Indicator Test did not identify an additional determination function requiring a separate Core Indicator. Cross-context testing did not reveal a structural gap in the architecture.

The analysis therefore supports six Indicators as the presently sufficient Core Methodological Resolution beneath the four Core Organization Quality Factors.

This conclusion is conceptual and architectural. It does not constitute empirical or statistical validation.

The six-Indicator architecture provides the methodological basis for establishing the Indicator structure of the WQI Organization Quality Standard — Core, while context-specific Quality Object Characteristics, Evidence, and application methods remain at the appropriate levels beneath the Core architecture.

COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE

© 2026 Whole Quality Institute (WQI). All rights reserved.

This article is part of the methodological work of the Whole Quality Institute.

The concepts, terminology, architecture, classifications, and methodological structures presented in this article may be referenced for research, education, professional discussion, and standards-development purposes with appropriate attribution to the Whole Quality Institute and this article.

Reproduction, modification, publication, or incorporation of substantial portions of this article into another standard, methodology, commercial product, or derivative work requires authorization from the Whole Quality Institute.

Reference:

Whole Quality Institute (WQI).

Justification of the WQI Core Organization Quality Indicators.

WHOLE QUALITY JUSTIFICATION WQI_OIJ1.

Article — September 2026.