INTERFACE STEWARDSHIP IN FEDERATED ALLIANCE GOVERNANCE

Coordination Without Control in NATO's Agency Architecture

Author: Anthony J. Veltri

Affiliation: Independent Enterprise Architect and Earth Observation Practitioner

Revision Note (April 2026): This is the archive version of a manuscript submitted to Parameters in March 2026. Following peer review, four targeted revisions were made before archive publication:

- The methodological note acknowledging the limits of the author's internal NATO familiarity was moved from the conclusion to the introduction.
- A theoretical footnote was added positioning the interface stewardship framework relative to principal-agent, constructivist, and leadership-driven schools.
- The characterization of MOUs was qualified to acknowledge their legitimate function alongside their limitations as operational instruments.
- The treatment of personality and leadership in Section VI was expanded to acknowledge their positive role before arguing for architectural resilience.

The core argument is otherwise unchanged from the submitted version.

Interface Stewardship in Federated Alliance Governance:

Coordination Without Control in NATO's Agency Architecture

Anthony J. Veltri

ABSTRACT: The article addresses coordination architecture for federated defense organizations where command authority is absent. As NATO establishes new coordination bodies and modernizes its technology stack, the luxury of slow governance cycles has vanished, making this an urgent operational challenge. NATO's agency structure serves as the primary case study, analyzed through publicly available governance documentation and comparative institutional analysis. The methodological approach represents practitioner knowledge systematization. Over twenty years of coordination experience across US Department of Homeland Security enterprise architecture (296,000+ users, 22 components, 200+ sovereign partner organizations), wildland fire multi-agency operations, and coalition environments produced the recurring patterns documented here. The article identifies three predictable failure modes (governance theatre, decision latency, and interface drift) and proposes an interface-based coordination model with actionable implementation guidance. It argues that coordination legitimacy in federated systems derives from reducing friction for autonomous actors, not from expanding central control. The

conclusion draws direct implications for NATO's coordination architecture and flags future research questions suited to systematic validation.

INTRODUCTION

How do you coordinate entities you cannot control? NATO faces this structural challenge acutely. The alliance must achieve strategic alignment across a federated landscape of autonomous agencies (each retaining independent governance, distinct budgets, and sovereign decision authority) without the mandate to override agency boards.[1]

Most coordination failures occur not at execution but at commitment. Offices accept coordination responsibilities without corresponding authority, which creates accountability sinks that erode trust. Effective coordination in federated systems requires explicit ownership of organizational interfaces (the structured exchanges between autonomous entities) rather than territorial authority. Coordination legitimacy derives from reducing friction for autonomous actors, not from expanding central control.

[1] NATO agencies operate under distinct governance frameworks established by their founding documents and supervised by independent boards or committees. See North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 'Agency Oversight and Governance', NATO Official Documentation, <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52091.htm>, accessed 3 March 2026.

While existing scholarship thoroughly documents NATO's formal decision-making structures,[2] and frameworks such as Federated Mission Networking (FMN) explicitly acknowledge the necessity of joining sovereign networks, formal documentation often stops at the structural design. Existing charters for entities like the NATO Communications and Information Organization (NCIO) clearly define formal supervisory board structures, but less attention addresses how coordination mechanisms actually balance standardization pressures with member sovereignty in daily practice.[3] Similarly, while Allied Joint Doctrine (AJP) establishes operational baselines, research on inter-organizational coordination focuses primarily on temporary crisis response rather than sustained coordination across permanent entities.[4]

This article bridges that gap through the lens of federation architecture. The methodological approach represents practitioner knowledge systematization. Over twenty years of coordination practice across US Department of Homeland Security

---

[2] For representative scholarship, see William Wallace and Anthony Forster, 'NATO: The Organization of Alliance', in John Baylis et al., Strategy in the Contemporary World, Fourth edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 237–54; Ryan C Hendrickson, Diplomacy and War at NATO: The Secretary General and Military Action After the Cold War (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006).

[3] Alexandra Gheciu's analysis of NATO institutional evolution demonstrates the tension between alliance coherence and national autonomy, but does not examine operational coordination office design. See Alexandra Gheciu, Securing Civilisation? The EU, NATO and the OSCE in the Post-9/11 World (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 67–94.

[4] On inter-organizational coordination in federal contexts, see H Brinton Milward and Keith G Provan, 'Managing the Hollow State: Coordination and Contracting', Public Management Review 5, no. 1 (2003): pp. 1–18; Donald Kettl, 'Managing Boundaries in American Administration: The Collaboration Imperative', Public Administration Review 66, supplement s1 (2006): pp. 10–19.

enterprise architecture, wildland fire multi-agency operations, and coalition environments, recurring patterns emerged. Specific interface failures appeared predictably, and coordination legitimacy consistently derived from service delivery rather than formal mandate.

NATO coordination architecture is treated here as a case study of federated coordination challenges, analyzed through publicly available governance documentation, academic literature on alliance coordination, and comparative institutional analysis rather than internal operational knowledge. The framework's applicability derives from structural patterns common across federated systems (federal agencies, coalition operations, and multi-national organizations) where coordination must occur without hierarchical mandate.

A methodological note is warranted before proceeding. This framework derives from direct operational experience in federated coordination across US federal agencies, wildland fire multi-agency operations, disaster response systems, and coalition environments. The author has not held internal NATO coordination roles. Claims about NATO’s coordination architecture draw from publicly available governance documentation, academic literature, and observable structural patterns in federated defense organizations. The framework is offered not as prescription from insider knowledge but as structural pattern analysis: the failure modes and coordination principles identified here appear consistently wherever federated systems must achieve coherence without hierarchical mandate. NATO’s

agency architecture represents a particularly clear instance of that structure. Readers with internal NATO experience will find confirmations, and gaps. Identifying those gaps is part of the value this framework is intended to generate.

This framework synthesizes those patterns into generalizable principles. Section II establishes the theoretical framework of interface stewardship. Section III analyzes three predictable coordination failure modes. Section IV presents the interface-based coordination model. Section V examines minimum viable governance, and Section VI addresses institutional continuity. The conclusion discusses implications for NATO's architectural design.

SECTION II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Federation Architecture and Interface Stewardship

Most coordination offices fail because they start with the wrong question. They ask how to force alignment rather than asking what breaks when alignment is mandated. NATO's agency structure, as documented in official governance frameworks, makes this choice explicit. Multiple agencies operate under independent boards with sovereign decision authority. They have distinct budgets,

separate governance cycles, and specific technical mandates. You cannot integrate them into a unified platform without fundamentally restructuring the alliance.

The architectural choice is already made. This is a federation problem, not an integration problem. To be clear, this refers to governance integration (unified authority, consolidated budgets, and standardized processes), not technical toolchain integration.[5]

Federation vs. Integration as Decision Endpoints

Federation and integration are not destinations you work toward. They are decision endpoints you choose based on who owns what and whether you can compel change.[6]

Integration works when:

- You control the budget.
- You can mandate compliance.

---

[5] Anthony Veltri, 'Doctrine 01: Federation vs Integration in Mission Networks', Author's Professional Archive blog, 2025, < https://anthonyveltri.com/guide/federation-vs-integration-in-mission-networks/>, accessed 3 March 2026. The framework derives from operational experience coordinating federal enterprise architecture and coalition environments.

[6] Ibid

- Standardization creates more value than autonomy.
- One system serves everyone adequately.
- Failure to align carries enforceable consequences.

Federation works when:

- Autonomous entities retain decision authority.
- You cannot compel without breaking trust.
- Diversity serves operational requirements.
- Forcing uniformity triggers resistance or workarounds.
- Alignment must be negotiated, not mandated.

NATO agency coordination sits firmly in federation territory. Structurally, coordination bodies in this space operate without the direct budget authority to compel agency compliance or override executive boards. They must rely on influence, not a directive mandate. Any coordination approach that ignores this reality will hit resistance immediately and create shadow processes within months. Federation architecture scales better than integration when sovereignty matters. Integration creates tight coupling. Changes propagate, outages propagate, and the center becomes the bottleneck. Federation preserves resilience by keeping failures local and decisions distributed.[7]

[7] The federation architecture described here aligns with Karl E Weick's concept of loose coupling in organizational systems, where elements retain substantial identity and autonomy while remaining responsive to each other. Weick's framework explains why forcing integration in federated environments creates brittleness: tight coupling propagates failures while loose coupling

The tradeoff is explicit. Federation requires more coordination effort up front. You cannot just issue a standard and enforce compliance. You have to negotiate interfaces, maintain translation layers, and respect different governance rhythms. But when you operate in an environment where compulsion would trigger political resistance or operational defection, federation is not the second-best option. It is the only viable option. Forcing integration triggers political resistance or operational defection, a dynamic historically demonstrated by sovereign member responses to alliance doctrine.[8]

Stewardship vs. Control: Why Legitimacy Follows Usefulness

If federation is the architectural choice, then interfaces become the critical design element. An interface is a structured, repeatable exchange with expectations on both sides. Interface stewardship means owning the seam, not the territory. The coordination office does not own NATO HQ, and it does not own agency boards. It owns the structured exchanges between them.

---

contains them. See Karl E Weick, 'Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems', Administrative Science Quarterly 21, no. 1 (1976): pp. 1–19.

[8] Sten Rynning's analysis of alliance coordination challenges demonstrates that forcing uniformity across sovereign members creates political resistance. Effective alliance governance preserves operational diversity while achieving strategic coherence, precisely the federation model proposed here. See Sten Rynning, 'Shaping Military Doctrine in France', Security Studies 11, no. 2 (2001): pp. 85–116.

Here is the operational principle most coordination offices miss: authority follows usefulness, not mandate.[9] A coordination office with formal authority but no value delivery becomes governance theatre within months (the illusion of control through excessive administrative reporting rather than actual alignment). This failure mode is explored fully in Section 3.

Stewardship places the burden on the steward, not the parties. The coordination office absorbs complexity so boards do not have to. It translates between NATO HQ strategic language and agency operational language. It flags dependencies before they become crises. Control tries to make everyone conform to the same process. Stewardship makes coordination safe enough that participation feels worth the effort.

The distinction shows up in daily practice:

Control says: 'All agencies will submit quarterly reports using this template by this deadline.'

---

[9] The framework developed here operates at a different level of analysis than established theoretical approaches to organizational coordination. Principal-agent theory and two-level game frameworks explain how actors exploit informational asymmetries between principals and agents, generating behaviors that resist engineering solutions. Constructivist frameworks account for institutional norms that shape daily operations regardless of formal interface specifications. Leadership and personality-driven accounts identify attributes that no coordination architecture fully replicates. These schools are not bypassed as irrelevant; they illuminate why organizations behave as they do under constrained authority. The interface stewardship framework addresses a different question: given that these dynamics exist and cannot be eliminated, what should a coordination office design to function effectively within them? The two levels of analysis are complementary, not competing. For representative treatments, see Graham T Allison and Philip Zelikow, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second edition (New York: Longman, 1999); Alexander Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Stewardship says: ‘What information do boards need to make better decisions, and when do they need it?’

Control says: ‘Coordination approval is required before this moves forward.’

Stewardship says: ‘Here are the enterprise dependencies this decision affects. Who needs to know before you finalize?’

Control says: ‘We need to standardize this process across all agencies.’

Stewardship says: ‘Where does divergence create risk, and where does it just offend our preference for uniformity?’

Control expands coordination office authority. Stewardship expands coordination value. In federated systems where you cannot compel, value is the only sustainable path to influence.

SECTION III: COORDINATION FAILURE MODES

Governance Theatre, Decision Latency, and Interface Drift

Coordination offices fail in predictable ways across NATO, federal agencies, and multi-national organizations. Three failure modes dominate: governance theatre, decision latency, and interface drift. They share a common origin. They occur when coordination offices expand activity without improving decision quality.

Governance Theatre: Activity Without Outcome

Governance theatre occurs when coordination produces documents and meetings without improving decision speed. Stakeholders are busy coordinating, but nothing gets better. The diagnostic signal is straightforward: activity increases while outcome stays flat. This dynamic was clearly observed during enterprise coordination within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), specifically during the multi-year deployment of the Integrated Common Analytical Viewer (iCAV) system.[10] Coordination meetings multiplied from quarterly to monthly. Meanwhile, system interoperability remained stuck because coordination focused on reporting compliance rather than resolving technical blockers.[11] The escape path requires discipline. You must cancel meetings that do not feed specific decisions.

Decision Latency: Misaligned Rhythms Creating Bottlenecks

Decision latency occurs when board governance cycles and operational urgency fall out of sync. NATO agency boards typically meet quarterly, while

---

[10] Department of Homeland Security iCAV system was initiated post-Hurricane Katrina (2005) as a response to the absence of a common operating picture but languished until 2008 when systematic direction was established. The system evolved into GII/OneView, serving 296,000+ users across 22 components and remains in production today. Initial attempts to mandate common platforms triggered component resistance. Success came from preserving local autonomy while coordinating at data and service interfaces. Author's operational experience as Enterprise Architect, DHS, 2008 to 2010.

[11] Department of Homeland Security enterprise architecture initiatives 2008–2010 produced extensive alignment documentation while core interoperability challenges remained unresolved. Coordination meetings increased from quarterly to monthly without corresponding improvement in cross-component capability delivery. Author's operational experience as Enterprise Architect, DHS, 2008–2010.

strategic priorities shift on crisis timelines. When rhythms misalign, decisions either bypass boards entirely or arrive too late to matter. The diagnostic signal is decisions routinely occurring outside formal coordination mechanisms.

Wildland fire incident commanders operating on twelve-hour cycles routinely bypass agency administrators on daily approval rhythms. Ambiguity in interface ownership during multi-jurisdiction incidents predictably produces command confusion and operational friction.[12] When coordination cannot bridge this gap, shadow processes develop.[13] The solution requires delegation frameworks specifying which decisions boards must own versus which can be handled through expedited processes.[14]

---

[12] National Wildfire Coordinating Group Incident Command System explicitly assigns interface ownership at organizational boundaries. Ambiguity in 'agency representative' roles during multi-jurisdiction incidents regularly produces command confusion. See NWCG, 'Incident Response Pocket Guide', PMS 461 (2023).

[13] Stephanie C Hofmann's analysis of institutional bypass mechanisms explains why organizations create parallel coordination channels when formal mechanisms create excessive latency. The pattern observed in NATO agency coordination mirrors broader tendencies in multi-national organizations. See Stephanie C Hofmann, 'Why Institutional Bypass?' International Security 35, no. 3 (2011): pp. 85–119.

[14] National Wildfire Coordinating Group incident command doctrine explicitly addresses tempo mismatch between incident operations and agency administrative cycles through delegation of authority frameworks and Type classifications. See NWCG, 'Interagency Incident Business Management Handbook', PMS 902 (2022), Chapter 3.

Interface Drift: Unclear Ownership Accumulating as Crisis

Interface drift occurs when roles and escalation paths at boundaries are unclear, allowing risk to accumulate quietly. The diagnostic signal is surprise at senior levels about issues that should have surfaced earlier.

Hurricane Katrina demonstrated this at the federal-state interface.[15] Neither side validated assumptions about resource requests, and neither recognized the gaps as coordination failures requiring escalation.[16] The gaps surfaced days later as operational crisis. Interface drift is resolved through explicit protocols: documented exchange expectations, defined escalation criteria, and clear authority boundaries.

SECTION IV: THE INTERFACE-BASED COORDINATION MODEL

Owning the Seam, Not the Territory

The interface-based coordination model starts from a simple premise. The coordination office does not own NATO HQ, and it does not own agency boards. It owns the structured exchanges between them.

---

[15] Hurricane Katrina response demonstrated both patterns. Successful regional coordination (Rhode Island Urban Search & Rescue) reduced friction through shared situational awareness infrastructure. Failed coordination (FEMA regional-national interface) attempted control without mandate, triggering state-level workarounds. Author's operational experience, Hurricane Katrina deployment 2005; Hurricane Florence deployment 2018.

[16] US House of Representatives, 'A Failure of Initiative: Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina' (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2006), pp. 141–58. Interface ownership ambiguity at federal-state boundaries delayed resource deployment.

Most coordination offices fail by trying to expand territorial authority when their actual job is maintaining interface health. Territory is visible and familiar. Interfaces are harder to see and unfamiliar to most organizational leaders who are used to owning nodes instead of links. But in federated systems, the links are where failure happens. Nodes function adequately within their own boundaries. Breakdowns occur at the seams where different governance rhythms, decision authorities, and information formats collide. If the coordination office does not explicitly own those seams, no one does.

What an Interface Is (And Is Not)

An interface is not a relationship. Relationships are informal, personality-dependent, and difficult to transfer when people change roles. Interfaces are structured, repeatable exchanges with explicit expectations on both sides that persist across personnel transitions.

Many organizations treat coordination as relationship management. Stating that NATO HQ will ‘work closely’ with agencies sounds collaborative, but it is vague to the point of meaninglessness. Work closely how? Ensure alignment on what? By when? In what format? Who confirms success?

When those questions go unanswered, coordination degrades predictably. An interface specification answers six questions:

1. What gets exchanged? (Information, decisions, approvals, feedback)

2. In what format? (Board memo, briefing, written guidance, data feed)
3. By when? (Deadline, frequency, trigger conditions)
4. Who sends? (Specific role, not 'NATO HQ' generically)
5. Who receives? (Specific role, not 'the agency' generically)
6. How is receipt confirmed? (Acknowledgement, action taken, feedback provided)

These are the minimum specifications required for repeatable coordination. Without them, every exchange becomes negotiation. Negotiation creates friction. Friction creates bypass.

The Three Core Interface Types

Within this stewardship framework, NATO coordination must operate at three distinct interfaces.[17]

Strategic Guidance Interface (HQ to Agencies): This translates NATO strategic intent into board-actionable inputs. Strategic guidance arrives in the language of alliance-wide priorities. Agency boards operate in the language of budgets and quarterly milestones. The coordination office must own the translation layer,

[17] The three interface types correspond to different forms of organizational interdependence identified by Thompson. Strategic guidance interfaces manage sequential interdependence (HQ outputs become agency inputs), governance decision interfaces address reciprocal interdependence (mutual adjustment between coordination office and boards), and operational feedback interfaces enable pooled resource coordination (multiple agencies contributing to shared situational awareness). See James D Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 54–65.

ensuring guidance arrives in board-consumable form with clear decision points. It does not decide what strategic priorities matter, and it does not dictate how agencies implement them.

Consider this translation layer applied to a strategic mandate for accelerated cloud adoption or zero-trust architecture. Strategic guidance from NATO HQ arrives in the language of alliance-wide threat vectors and immediate resilience priorities. However, the supervisory board of the NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA), or the NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA), operates in the language of multi-year procurement cycles, distinct agency budgets, and quarterly milestones. If HQ simply mandates compliance, it creates an unfunded requirement that hits immediate structural resistance.

Instead, the coordination office must own the translation layer. It ensures the strategic mandate arrives not as a generic directive, but as a board-consumable decision memo highlighting specific budget dependencies, technical sequencing, and enterprise impacts. The coordination office does not decide what cyber priorities matter, and it does not dictate the technical architecture NCIA uses to implement them; it makes the alignment actionable within the agency's sovereign governance rhythm.

Governance Decision Interface (Coordination Office to Agency Boards): This supports boards in making timely decisions with full awareness of enterprise impact. Agency boards must balance agency-specific priorities against alliance-

wide coordination. The coordination office makes enterprise impact visible by surfacing dependencies, flagging timing conflicts, and providing comparative context. It owns providing decision context, but boards retain full authority over the decision itself.

Operational Feedback Interface (Agencies to HQ): This surfaces what is happening at the implementation level before it becomes a boardroom surprise. Most coordination offices miss this upward flow. The coordination office monitors implementation signals, identifies patterns across agencies, and escalates emerging issues. It acts as a pattern detector across agencies to surface ground truth early.

Interface Ownership: What the Coordination Office Controls

Clarity on ownership boundaries prevents the territorial expansion that triggers resistance. The coordination office owns specific, bounded responsibilities. Under this framework, the coordination office assumes ownership of:

- Interface specifications: Defining what gets exchanged, in what format, by when, and between whom.
- Interface health monitoring: Detecting when exchanges fail, when timing misaligns, or when information arrives in unusable formats.
- Translation between contexts: Converting strategic language to board language and operational reality to strategic awareness.

- Pattern recognition across agencies: Identifying when the same issue surfaces in multiple organizations.
- Escalation protocols: Defining what triggers escalation, to whom, and under what timeline.

The coordination office does not own:

- Strategic priorities: HQ sets these.
- Board decisions: Agency boards decide.
- Agency execution: Agencies implement within their mandates.
- Budget authority: Agencies control their own budgets.
- Governance structures: Existing boards and committees remain intact. The office operates through them, not around them.

Exchange Protocols: Making Interfaces Predictable

Interfaces work when they are predictable. Predictability requires protocols. Minimum viable protocol specification requires documenting:

- Exchange trigger: What causes information to flow? (Scheduled, event-driven, or request-based.)
- Content specification: What gets included? (Templates, required fields, supporting documentation.)
- Delivery timeline: How much lead time is required?
- Recipient confirmation: How is receipt acknowledged?

- Failure escalation: What happens if the exchange does not occur?

Example protocol for the Strategic Guidance Interface:[18]

(Note: The specific intervals outlined below are purely illustrative; operational timelines must be calibrated to the established battle rhythm and legal constraints of the respective agency.)

- Trigger: HQ releases updated strategic priorities (typically quarterly).
- Content: 2-page board decision memo (not full strategic document), specific questions requiring board decision (3-5 maximum), cross-agency dependencies identified by coordination office, timeline for board response, and point of contact for clarification.
- Delivery timeline: Coordination office receives HQ guidance Day 0. Translation to board format complete by Day 5. Board papers distributed Day 10 (minimum 10 days before board meeting). Board decides at next scheduled meeting.
- Recipient confirmation: Board secretariat confirms receipt Day 10. Coordination office confirms inclusion in board agenda Day 15. Board decision communicated to coordination office within 5 days of meeting.

[18] Exchange protocols implement both coordination by plan (scheduled exchanges, predefined formats) and coordination by feedback (adjustment based on operational signals). March and Simon distinguish these as alternative coordination mechanisms; effective federated coordination requires both. See James G March and Herbert A Simon, Organizations, Second edition (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993), pp. 158–69.

- Failure escalation: If no receipt confirmation by Day 12, coordination office contacts secretariat. If not on agenda Day 15, coordination office engages Chair. If decision not communicated within 5 days, coordination office follows up directly.

This level of specification feels excessive initially. However, it eliminates much of the recurring coordination friction once established. Secretariats know when to expect inputs. Boards know what format to receive. The coordination office knows when to escalate. No one is surprised by timing. No one negotiates delivery expectations quarterly.

Why This Model Prevents the Three Failure Modes

Active stewardship requires regular interface health checks, proactive bottleneck detection, pattern-based intervention, and escalation discipline. This framework directly prevents the three primary failure modes.

Governance theatre fails when interfaces are owned explicitly. Meetings without decision linkage become visible immediately. If a coordination briefing does not feed one of the three interfaces, the briefing should not exist. Interface ownership creates decision discipline.

Decision latency fails when exchange protocols are specified. Board cycles and operational tempo are documented explicitly. When timing misaligns,

protocols define delegation boundaries and escalation triggers. Decisions flow through designed pathways rather than ad-hoc workarounds.

Interface drift fails when ownership is assigned clearly. The coordination office owns interface health monitoring. When agency responses do not arrive, when strategic guidance is not acted on, or when ground truth does not reach HQ, the coordination office detects the gap and escalates according to protocol. There is no ambiguity about whose responsibility it is to notice.

SECTION V: MINIMUM VIABLE GOVERNANCE

Adaptive Mechanisms Over Template Compliance

Most coordination offices over-engineer governance from the start. They design comprehensive frameworks before understanding what coordination requires. The result is bureaucratic infrastructure built for hypothetical problems while real coordination gaps go unaddressed.

The alternative is minimum viable governance. This means enough structure to coordinate effectively, but not enough to become coordination overhead. This requires treating governance as adaptive rather than static. Mechanisms must evolve based on operational feedback, not templates applied uniformly regardless of context.

Governance Evolves With Evidence, Not Templates

Template-based coordination assumes problems are known in advance and solutions are reusable across contexts. Most established coordination frameworks and templates assume an underlying integrated architecture where the central authority holds the power to compel compliance. Applying those templates to a federated system, where sovereign entities retain independent decision authority, represents a structural mismatch. It is an application of the wrong tool for the environment, resulting in compliance theatre rather than true coordination.

Bureaucracies frequently confuse legal documentation with operational authority. A signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) can provide durable guidance and shared intent through multiple unforeseen contingencies, and that function has genuine value. The problem arises when an MOU is treated as a substitute for operational interface design rather than as its complement. An MOU outlines shared intentions and high-level agreements; it does not execute the daily, repeatable mechanics of how two sovereign agencies will actually exchange data, escalate conflicts, or finalize decisions. Relying on an MOU as proof of coordination authority, without accompanying interface specifications, is a primary driver of governance theatre. Attempts to embed daily interactive mechanics into a static MOU inevitably produce over-engineered, brittle templates that optimize for legal compliance rather than operational agility.

Neither assumption holds in federated systems where agencies have distinct mandates, different technical architectures, and varying governance maturity. What works for coordinating research and development agencies does not work for logistics agencies. Coordination mechanisms appropriate for agencies with monthly board cycles fail when applied to agencies meeting quarterly. Templates force uniformity where diversity serves operational requirements.

Minimum viable governance starts with questions, not answers:

- What coordination gaps exist? (Not what might exist hypothetically.)
- What evidence indicates coordination is failing? (Not what theory predicts.)
- What is the lightest intervention that resolves the gap? (Not the most comprehensive solution.)
- How will we know if the intervention worked? (Not assume it worked because we implemented it.)

This is probabilistic governance. Coordination offices make decisions under uncertainty about what mechanisms will prove effective. The discipline is updating those decisions as evidence accumulates, not defending initial choices regardless of outcome.[19]

---

[19] Bayesian decision-making under uncertainty requires updating beliefs as evidence accumulates rather than defending initial assumptions. This principle applies to coordination mechanism design: initial governance choices are hypotheses about what will work, not permanent solutions. See Anthony Veltri, 'Doctrine 22: When "It Depends" Is the Right Answer', Author's Professional Archive blog, 2025, <https://anthonyveltri.com/guide/doctrine-22-when-it-depends-

DHS enterprise coordination demonstrated this pattern during the 2008 to 2010 window.[20] Early coordination mechanisms assumed all components needed identical governance oversight. Implementation revealed this was false. Operational components like the Secret Service and Coast Guard required different coordination rhythms than administrative components like the Management Directorate. Attempting to force uniform governance created compliance theatre in some areas while under-coordinating others. Adaptive governance recognized this, adjusted mechanisms based on component feedback, and improved coordination effectiveness without adding bureaucratic overhead.

What Minimum Viable Governance Includes

Not every coordination office needs the same mechanisms. But certain patterns recur across effective coordination:

- Explicit decision rights: Documented clarity on who decides what. Not consensus, not 'we'll figure it out,' but named roles with defined authority boundaries. When decision authority is ambiguous, coordination defaults

---

is-the-right-answer-how-to-think-in-probabilities-under-uncertainty/>, accessed 3 March 2026. This framework discusses probabilistic thinking in organizational design.

[20] Department of Homeland Security enterprise coordination 2008–2010 evolved from uniform governance applied to all 22 components to differentiated coordination mechanisms based on component operational tempo and governance maturity. Components with high operational tempo (Secret Service, Coast Guard) required streamlined coordination with rapid escalation paths. Administrative components (Management Directorate) operated effectively with standard quarterly governance cycles. Attempting to force uniform coordination on both categories created friction in high-tempo organizations while under-serving coordination needs in administrative functions. Author's operational experience as Enterprise Architect, DHS.

to the lowest common denominator (which is usually no decision) or informal channels (which bypass governance entirely).

- Bounded escalation protocols: Criteria specifying what triggers escalation, to whom, within what timeline. Escalation without criteria becomes political negotiation. Escalation with criteria becomes operational discipline. The coordination office should escalate when criteria trigger, not when comfortable or politically convenient.
- Feedback loops that close: Mechanisms ensuring operational reality reaches strategic awareness before becoming a crisis. Most coordination offices focus exclusively on downward information flow (strategic guidance to agencies). Upward flow (ground truth to HQ) requires deliberate design or it does not occur systematically.
- Light documentation: Enough to persist across personnel transitions, but not enough to become a document production exercise. This is the test: Can a new coordination office staff member execute core coordination functions using existing documentation within two weeks? If yes, documentation is adequate. If no, either documentation is insufficient or coordination has become too complex.
- Metrics that measure outcome, not activity: Track decision velocity (how fast decisions move through governance), alignment without rework (how often decisions require revision due to coordination gaps), and early risk

visibility (whether issues surface at board level or crisis level). Do not track meeting attendance, documents produced, or stakeholders briefed. Those measure coordination volume, not coordination value.

When to Add Governance Mechanisms

The temptation is to add coordination mechanisms when problems surface. This creates governance accretion. Each problem gets a new process, and soon the coordination office is managing dozens of overlapping mechanisms that no one can remember the purpose of.

Add mechanisms only when:

- Pattern appears across multiple agencies: If the same coordination gap appears in three agencies independently, that signals a systemic issue requiring mechanism design.
- Informal workarounds become common: When stakeholders consistently route around formal coordination, the formal mechanism is broken. Either fix it or eliminate it.
- Existing mechanisms cannot scale: Coordination office staff manually intervening in every exchange signals the mechanism needs redesign. If the office is working harder quarter over quarter to maintain the same coordination level, the governance architecture is wrong.

When to Remove Governance Mechanisms

Coordination offices rarely remove mechanisms. Once established, governance processes persist even after their original purpose disappears. This creates drag. Coordination becomes slower and more complex without corresponding improvement in decision quality.

Remove mechanisms when:

- No one can explain what problem it solves: If staff cannot articulate what coordination gap a mechanism addresses, cancel it.
- The mechanism produces activity without decision linkage: Briefings that do not feed decisions, reports no one reads, and meetings where nothing gets decided are all candidates for elimination.
- Stakeholders comply minimally but do not engage: When participation feels like a bureaucratic tax, the mechanism has lost legitimacy. Either redesign or eliminate.

The discipline is continuous. Review coordination mechanisms quarterly, ask what value each provides, and eliminate those that fail the test. Most coordination offices accumulate mechanisms. Effective coordination offices prune mechanisms as operational needs change.

Governance That Adapts Survives

Coordination requirements shift as strategic priorities change, agencies mature, and external conditions evolve. Governance mechanisms designed for today's environment will not serve tomorrow's environment without adaptation. The question is not what governance framework should be implemented. The question is what governance mechanisms do current coordination gaps require, and how will we know when those mechanisms need revision.

Governance as fixed architecture gets designed once and applied permanently. Governance as adaptive infrastructure gets designed deliberately and revised systematically based on operational feedback.

Template-based coordination optimizes for initial completeness. Adaptive coordination optimizes for long-term effectiveness. In federated systems where conditions change and stakeholder needs evolve, adaptive governance is the only sustainable approach.

SECTION VI: KNOWLEDGE STEWARDSHIP AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTINUITY

Coordination That Survives Personnel Transitions

Coordination offices fail when they become personality-dependent. To be precise about the claim: strong leadership and trusted personal relationships are genuine coordination assets. A Director who knows counterparts, understands institutional history, and maintains informal channels across agencies can

accomplish things that no protocol specifies. The problem is not the asset; it is the fragility. When coordination effectiveness depends on a specific individual's relationships and reputation, it is not portable. When that person leaves, coordination collapses until the next Director rebuilds those relationships from scratch. This is coordination by heroic individual, not coordination architecture. The goal is not to eliminate personality from coordination. It is to ensure that coordination can function when personality changes.

Institutional continuity requires knowledge stewardship. This means the deliberate preservation of coordination patterns, interface specifications, and decision precedents so coordination effectiveness persists across personnel transitions.

Golden Datasets: Authoritative Reference Without Exclusive Ownership

The coordination office maintains authoritative reference information that enables distributed decision-making. This provides shared ground truth without centralized control.[21]

What qualifies as a golden dataset for coordination:

- Interface specifications: Documented exchange protocols, escalation criteria, and decision rights. These must not be locked in the Director's

[21] Anthony Veltri, 'Doctrine 20: Golden Datasets', Author's Professional Archive blog, 2025, < https://anthonyveltri.com/guide/golden-datasets-putting-truth-in-one-place-without-pretending-everything-is-perfect/>, accessed 3 March 2026.

memory. They must be documented, accessible, and maintained as operational reality changes.

- Agency governance calendars: Board meeting schedules, decision cycles, and key milestones. Coordination depends on timing alignment. When calendars exist only in email threads and personal calendars, coordination timing fails predictably.
- Decision precedents: Records of how similar coordination challenges were resolved previously. This is not to force identical solutions, but to inform current decision-makers what worked, what failed, and why. It prevents rediscovering solutions already validated or repeating mistakes already documented.
- Cross-agency dependencies: Known technical, operational, or governance connections between agencies. When these exist only in the current staff's mental models, transitions lose coordination context.
- Role and authority mapping: An actively maintained index of which specific billet (not just the individual's name) holds decision authority for specific interfaces. When a crisis hits or a fast-moving decision is required, the coordination office must know exactly who is authorized to speak for an agency, rather than relying on outdated distribution lists or institutional memory.

The discipline is maintenance. Golden datasets that are not updated become misleading datasets. The coordination office owns keeping authoritative information current, not accumulating legacy documentation that no longer reflects operational reality.

Preventing Legacy Schema Debt

Legacy Schema Debt occurs when institutional knowledge degrades across personnel transitions.[22] Each new coordination office staff member learns partial context, implements based on incomplete understanding, and creates patterns that future staff must maintain without knowing the original intent.

Prevention requires documentation discipline. You must capture not just what coordination mechanisms exist, but why they exist, what problem they solve, and what conditions would make them obsolete. Future staff can then evaluate whether mechanisms still serve their original purpose or have become coordination theatre persisting beyond relevance.

---

[22] Legacy Schema Debt is the accumulated cost of institutional knowledge loss across personnel transitions. Each transition loses context, creating decision patterns based on incomplete understanding. Over time, organizations maintain processes whose original purpose no one remembers. Prevention requires systematic knowledge capture documenting not just procedures but intent. See Anthony J. Veltri, 'Doctrine 03 Companion: Constraints: bidirectional translation: Compression vs Construction', The Practitioner Archive, <https://anthonyveltri.com>, 22 February 2026.

This is stewardship. It makes the coordination office stronger than any individual who temporarily leads it.

CONCLUSION

Coordination Architecture for Federated Systems

The coordination challenge in federated systems is structural. It requires achieving coherence without authority. NATO's coordination initiatives operate in this constraint space. There are multiple autonomous agencies, no mandate to compel compliance, and strategic alignment requirements that cannot be satisfied through hierarchical integration.

The interface-based model counters coordination failures through explicit ownership of organizational seams. Interface stewardship replaces territorial control. Minimum viable governance replaces comprehensive standardization. Legitimacy derives from usefulness, not formal mandate.

Implications for NATO Coordination

NATO's emerging coordination architecture operates in an environment that closely matches the federated coordination challenges this framework addresses. The architectural choice is already determined by organizational reality. It is a federation, not an integration.

The practical question is whether the coordination office will own interfaces explicitly or drift into territorial expansion until resistance hardens. Evidence from comparable systems indicates that coordination effectiveness correlates with clarity of interface ownership, not breadth of coordination authority.

Implementation requires discipline. The coordination office must refuse governance theatre by cancelling meetings without decision linkage. It must maintain escalation protocols by escalating when criteria trigger rather than when comfortable. It must prune coordination mechanisms as operational needs change. These are operational choices made daily, not strategic decisions made once.

Limitations

Several limitations warrant acknowledgement. While the framework derives from direct operational experience in federated coordination across US federal agencies (DHS 2008 to 2010), wildland fire multi-agency operations, disaster response systems, and coalition environments, the author has not held internal NATO coordination roles. Claims about NATO's coordination architecture draw from publicly available governance documentation, academic literature, and

observable patterns in federated defense organizations. Informal coordination mechanisms or recent organizational changes within NATO may not be fully captured in this analysis.

The analysis represents a practitioner's perspective systematised from participant observation. The three failure modes and interface-based model are grounded in observable patterns, but these patterns have not been tested through formal comparative research across multiple coordination offices. The framework proposes what should work, functioning best as practitioner guidance requiring systematic validation rather than established theory.

Broader Applicability

While this analysis focuses on NATO coordination challenges, the framework applies broadly to federated governance structures where autonomy and alignment must coexist. This includes coalition operations requiring cross-national coordination, federal systems managing distributed authorities, and multi-national organizations balancing sovereign decision-making with collective objectives.

The patterns identified here recur predictably. Coordination offices that attempt control trigger resistance. Offices that reduce friction gain influence. Interfaces unclear in specification degrade into ad-hoc escalation. Governance mechanisms designed once and applied permanently become coordination overhead as contexts shift.

The framework provides current and future coordination practitioners with diagnostic tools for failure mode recognition, design principles favoring interface ownership over territorial authority, and operational guidance focusing on minimum viable governance, adaptive mechanisms, and knowledge stewardship.

Future Research

The framework proposed here raises practical questions for coordination office design that systematic research could resolve:

- Layered architecture integration: Federation versus integration is a layer-by-layer architectural choice. Which layers can sustain integration when external coordination demands federation elsewhere? Can NATO extend shared authentication or data access protocols while preserving agency IT sovereignty? Understanding which architectural layers enable coordination without forcing infrastructure adoption would clarify where integration serves federation versus where it triggers resistance.
- Capacity thresholds and external coordination load: At what ratio of compellable-to-non-compellable entities does external federation coordination force you to loosen internal coupling even where you have authority to integrate? Identifying these capacity thresholds would help determine when tight internal coupling becomes operationally untenable regardless of formal authority.

- Failure mode early detection: Can governance theatre, decision latency, and interface drift be detected before they compound? What specific metrics distinguish healthy coordination variation from failure mode onset? Developing diagnostic indicators would enable course correction before legitimacy erosion occurs.
- Cultural adaptation boundaries: Would this framework transfer to organizations with deeper cultural heterogeneity, such as multi-national peacekeeping operations? Understanding where cultural distance breaks coordination mechanisms would clarify framework generalizability and identify required adaptations.[23]

The coordination challenge in federated systems is not solved. It is managed through deliberate architecture, continuous adaptation, and operational discipline. This framework offers practitioners tested patterns for that management. The work remains theirs to execute.

USE OF AI

The author used AI assistance (Google Gemini 1.5) for formatting and editorial cleanup during manuscript preparation. The author reviewed and takes full responsibility for all content.

---

[23] Ulrich Petersohn, 'The Effectiveness of Peacekeeping: Coordination, Learning, and Local Ownership', International Peacekeeping 24, no. 4 (2017): pp. 523–45.