

# **Shared Intelligence: *Foundations and architectures of Human–AI Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystems for project-based organizations*<sup>1</sup>**

*Based on the INSPIRE PM framework and Project Management Evolutive (PME)*

**By Antonio Bassi**

*Knowledge is not what is preserved, but what is made to circulate in the act of deciding.*

— adapted from I. Nonaka & H. Takeuchi

*An ecosystem is not the place where parts coexist; it is the logic that makes them interdependent.*

— conceptual reworking by the author

## **Preface: A necessary paradigm shift**

We live in an age in which projects generate oceans of data. Schedules, risk registers, conversations, forecasts, sustainability metrics, approvals, escalations: every phase of every project leaves digital traces in unprecedented quantities. Yet many organizations find themselves, paradoxically, richer in information and poorer in judgment.

This text arises from a precise conviction: the central problem of contemporary project management is not access to tools, nor the availability of data. It is the ability to transform fragmented information into reliable, traceable, and actionable knowledge; and to do so within socio-technical architectures in which human beings and artificial intelligence systems collaborate under explicit governance rules.

The concept at the heart of these pages is the Human–AI Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystem, or HA-HKE. It is neither a product nor a methodology. It is a way of understanding the project organization as an ecology of knowledge: a system in which what matters is not only what is known, but how knowledge is produced, by whom it is validated, where it moves, and to which decisions it is connected.

***The challenge is not to adopt AI. It is to design the ecosystem in which AI and human beings can collaborate responsibly.***

---

<sup>1</sup> How to cite this paper: Bassi, A. (2026). Shared Intelligence: Foundations and architectures of Human–AI Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystems for project-based organizations; *PM World Journal*, Vol. XV, Issue VI, June.

The ideas developed in these pages are rooted in the INSPIRE PM framework and in the broader conceptual foundation of Project Management Evolutive (PME). INSPIRE PM is not a rigid methodology: it is a flexible architecture that integrates innovation, sustainability, analytics, responsiveness, and efficiency. PME, in turn, frames projects as adaptive ecosystems in which learning, adaptability, and data-informed decisions are foundational elements.

The text is organized into ten chapters, following a path that moves from diagnosing the problem, to building the concept, to the architecture of hybrid ecosystems, and finally to practical governance tools and criteria for measuring value. Each chapter is conceived as a step forward in the same argument: the sustainability of project management depends on the quality of the knowledge ecosystem that supports it.

## **I. The fragility of knowledge in contemporary projects**

There is a widespread illusion in the world of project-based organizations: confusing the availability of information with the availability of knowledge. The two concepts are not equivalent. Information exists in systems, databases, and project management platforms. Knowledge requires something more: interpretation, context, validation, and connection to real decisions.

In organizations that live through projects, formal knowledge is visible in plans, schedules, budgets, change logs, and progress reports. Informal knowledge—the knowledge that truly guides decisions—lives in team experience, in the situational judgment of project managers, in the tacit expectations of stakeholders, and in organizational memory that has never been written down anywhere.

### **The asymmetry between knowledge production and knowledge governance**

For decades, the response to the problem of project knowledge has been the creation of repositories. Systems have been built to archive what was produced: lessons learned at closure, standardized templates, project documents. This approach has its own logic, but it is insufficient. It treats knowledge as something to be preserved, rather than as something that is continuously produced, questioned, and transformed throughout the project lifecycle.

The spread of GenAI has made this asymmetry even more acute. Today organizations can generate summaries, reports, recommendations, and classifications at scale. But the speed of output production does not automatically correspond to an increase in knowledge quality. In the absence of adequate governance mechanisms, AI can accelerate ambiguity, produce plausible but poorly grounded recommendations, obscure the provenance of information, and dilute accountability.

*What appears to be intelligent support can easily turn into a new layer of opacity if organizations do not define who validates what, how outputs are traced, and where human responsibility remains non-transferable.*

### **The paradox of information richness**

Project teams often have access to more information than in the past, but not necessarily to greater judgment, stronger alignment, or better decisions. This is the paradox of information richness: the proliferation of data without a knowledge architecture produces, at best, noise; at worst, false security.

The epistemic question is therefore central. How can reliable knowledge be distinguished from merely plausible knowledge within a project ecosystem? How can one ensure that an AI-generated output truly reflects the state of the project, and not merely a statistical synthesis of previous patterns? How can the traceability of the reasoning that led to a decision be preserved?

These questions do not have technological answers. They have answers in organizational design. And this is where the concept of a hybrid knowledge ecosystem becomes not only useful, but necessary.

## **II. Anatomy of a Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystem**

A Human–AI Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystem is not software, a platform, or a process. It is a socio-technical configuration: an arrangement in which knowledge assets are created, curated, circulated, validated, and applied through structured interactions among human actors, AI systems, project artifacts, governance rules, and sustainability criteria.

The word “ecosystem” is not metaphorical. It refers to a precise logic: interdependence. In an ecosystem, what matters is not the individual components, but the relationships among them. A predictive forecasting system, on its own, does not create decision intelligence. An updated risk register, on its own, does not guarantee the quality of risk management. Knowledge emerges from the structure of relationships among assets, actors, decisions, and controls.

### **The five categories of knowledge assets**

In a hybrid project ecosystem, at least five broad categories of knowledge assets can be distinguished, each with a specific function and with different degrees of visibility and traceability.

- Structured project artifacts — schedules, requirements, work packages, budgets, change logs, risk registers. They constitute the traditional backbone of coordination and control. They are the most visible, but not the most strategic.

- Decision evidence — explicit assumptions, trade-off rationales, approvals, exceptions, escalation records. These are often the least developed in practice, yet they are essential for accountability, learning, and auditability.
- Contextual and tacit knowledge — expert interpretation, stakeholder expectations, organizational memory, situational judgment. It can never be fully formalized, but it can be partially made explicit through elicitation practices and reflective documentation.
- ESG-relevant knowledge — environmental indicators, compliance constraints, social impact considerations, sustainability targets. Too often relegated to ex post reporting, it must instead be integrated into everyday decision flows.
- AI-generated artifacts — summaries, forecasts, recommendations, classifications. A new category that requires its own rules for validation, provenance, and integration.

### **Knowledge flows across the lifecycle**

The critical issue is not only the existence of these assets, but the way they move through the project lifecycle. Each phase has its own knowledge ecology.

At initiation, knowledge is mainly strategic: business rationale, stakeholder expectations, sustainability commitments, and problem framing dominate. This is the phase in which assumptions are established—often implicitly—and in which AI can support horizon scanning, pattern analysis from similar cases, and the synthesis of strategic documentation.

In planning, the ecosystem structures requirements, scenarios, success criteria, and governance choices. AI can assist with scenario comparison, requirements classification, and the drafting of structured documentation. But this is also the phase in which assumptions must become explicit, because everything that is planned rests on them.

In execution and monitoring, the emphasis shifts to operational signals, variance analysis, escalation, predictive warnings, exception handling, and real-time adaptation. AI can detect anomalies, generate alerts, and summarize large volumes of communication. But the value of these interventions depends on the organization's ability to absorb them: a predictive signal becomes useful only if it is connected to decision rights, human validation, and feedback loops.

At closure, the ecosystem consolidates realized outcomes, assesses whether sustainability targets have been achieved, documents decision rationales, and captures reusable learning. AI can accelerate the synthesis of evidence and lessons learned. But if a culture of traceability does not exist during execution, closure can produce only a partial retrospective.

*An AI output becomes useful only when it is connected to provenance, validation, decision rights, and feedback loops. Without these elements, it is merely noise with a sophisticated interface.*

### III. INSPIRE PM as an organizational architecture

The INSPIRE PM framework was born as a response to a real fragmentation in project management practice: the habit of treating separately dimensions that, in real projects, are deeply intertwined. Innovation and sustainability. Predictive analytics and responsiveness. Efficiency and learning. Technology and governance.

In the context of hybrid knowledge ecosystems, INSPIRE PM performs at least three distinct functions, each with its own relevance for building an HA-HKE.

#### **First function: organizing multidimensionality**

The first function is to provide a vocabulary for organizing the multiple dimensions that shape knowledge in hybrid contexts. Technology, sustainability, analytics, adaptability, efficiency, and innovation are not independent variables: they influence one another and appear together in the daily work of projects. INSPIRE PM offers a map for navigating this complexity without artificially reducing it.

#### **Second function: enabling ecosystem design**

The second function is to support the transition from fragmented tool adoption to ecosystem design. This is the most difficult transition, and the most important one. Many organizations invest in AI platforms, analytics dashboards, and knowledge management tools without ever asking themselves: how should knowledge be produced, validated, and governed throughout the entire project lifecycle?

The wrong question is: “Which AI application should we use?” The right question is: “How do we want the project to learn, and who is responsible for that learning?” INSPIRE PM helps formulate the second question and find coherent answers.

#### **Third function: connecting the operational to the systemic**

The third function is to connect operational project decisions to broader organizational objectives, including ESG commitments, resilience, and learning capacity. Too often sustainability appears in corporate reports but not in project meetings. INSPIRE PM is designed to reverse this logic: sustainability is not a reporting add-on, but an integrated dimension of everyday decision-making practice.

This principle is also critical for understanding the role of AI within the INSPIRE architecture. AI is not an autonomous solution: it is a participant in a system. Its value depends on the quality of the system around it.

*AI can accelerate option generation, pattern detection, and predictive support. But human beings remain responsible for problem framing, weighing sustainability trade-offs, and taking accountable decisions. This is not a residual role: it is the condition that makes hybrid intelligence organizationally legitimate.*

## IV. Governance as a condition of trust

A hybrid knowledge ecosystem produces value only if it is trusted. And it can be trusted only if its governance is explicit. This is not an abstract statement: it is an empirical observation that anyone who has observed the real life of project-based organizations will immediately recognize.

Organizations that introduce AI systems without explicit governance tend to develop two symmetrical pathologies. The first is blind trust: AI outputs are accepted without adequate critical validation, and responsibility spreads out until it becomes invisible. The second is paralyzing mistrust: teams resist the use of intelligent systems because they do not understand how they work and do not know who is responsible for what is produced.

### Four fundamental governance mechanisms

Effective governance of hybrid knowledge ecosystems is articulated through at least four interconnected mechanisms.

#### 1. Roles and decision rights

The first mechanism concerns the explicit definition of who owns each category of knowledge asset, who validates AI-generated content, which outputs remain purely advisory, and which decisions require mandatory human sign-off.

If these boundaries are not defined, what may be called pseudo-automation emerges: AI-produced content silently acquires authority without corresponding accountability. Responsibility is diluted until it becomes indistinguishable. The use of AI in project contexts should instead be bounded by role definitions that make human responsibility visible rather than diffuse.

#### 2. Provenance and traceability

The second mechanism concerns provenance. In project work, decisions often need to be justified ex post, for governance, compliance, stakeholder challenge, or organizational learning purposes. When AI contributes to reports, forecasts, or recommendations, actors must be able to identify the origin of the underlying information, the nature of the model's contribution, and the extent to which human interpretation shaped the final output.

Provenance is not simply a technical issue. It is a condition of organizational trust. A system that cannot be “explained”—in the sense that it does not allow one to trace why a recommendation was made—cannot be responsibly integrated into a decision-making process with real consequences.

### **3. Privacy and ethical safeguards**

The third mechanism concerns privacy and ethical safeguards. This dimension is particularly important when project knowledge includes stakeholder data, sensitive commercial information, or ESG indicators with reputational and regulatory implications.

Responsible governance requires organizations to distinguish clearly between permitted and non-permitted uses of data, define review thresholds for sensitive outputs, and maintain explicit safeguards against automation bias and opaque decision-making. The risk of bias is not only technical: it is institutional. A system that systematically amplifies certain types of patterns at the expense of others can produce structurally distorted project decisions.

### **4. Human-in-the-loop review as an epistemic act**

The fourth mechanism is human review in the loop, but understood in a rigorous sense. “Human-in-the-loop” does not mean that a person receives an AI output. It means that a human actor has both the authority and the capability to evaluate the relevance, credibility, and implications of that output before it influences accountable decisions.

This includes the possibility of rejecting, revising, or reframing the AI suggestion. In other words, the human role must remain epistemically substantive, not residual or merely ritual. A project manager who automatically approves every output of a forecasting system is not exercising human-in-the-loop review: he or she is merely signing.

*The governance of hybrid knowledge ecosystems should be light enough to remain usable, but explicit enough to remain meaningful. Excessive bureaucracy discourages adoption; insufficient governance undermines trust.*

## **V. Three artifacts for operationalizing the ecosystem**

Conceptualizing a hybrid knowledge ecosystem is the first step. The second, more difficult step is to translate it into tools that organizations can actually use. Three artifacts are particularly useful in this direction.

### **The Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystem Blueprint**

The first artifact is a blueprint: a visual and structured representation of the ecosystem architecture. Its function is to make visible what normally remains implicit: what

knowledge exists in the organization, where it is produced, how it circulates across project phases, which actors validate it, where and how AI can intervene, and which governance controls apply to each node.

The value of the blueprint is not descriptive but prescriptive. It is not about mapping what happens today, but about designing what should happen. This passage—from description to prescription—is precisely what separates awareness of the problem from its solution.

In practice, a blueprint helps PMOs and project leaders move beyond vague digital ambitions toward a structured operating model for project knowledge. It helps answer concrete questions: who owns ESG knowledge during planning? How is an AI-generated recommendation traced to the decision it influenced? Who validates forecasts before they become inputs for portfolio decisions?

### **The Decision Intelligence Loop**

The second artifact is a loop: a cyclical structure that connects predictive analytics, human judgment, decision logging, and feedback. Its purpose is to ensure that AI-supported pattern recognition and forecasting do not remain disconnected from real managerial learning.

Prediction alone does not create intelligence. Intelligence emerges when predictive signals are interpreted, linked to explicit criteria, translated into accountable decisions, and then compared with realized outcomes. The loop transforms project decision-making into a more traceable and learning-oriented process.

In operational terms, the loop implies that every significant decision in a project context is accompanied by: the source of the information signal that triggered it; the evaluation criterion applied by the human actor; the rationale for the decision taken; and the link to the outcomes recorded at closure or in retrospectives. This is not about adding documentation for documentation's sake: it is about building the organizational memory that makes systemic learning possible.

### **The Lightweight Governance Checklist**

The third artifact is the simplest, and perhaps the most practical: a lightweight checklist for the responsible use of GenAI in project contexts. Its function is not to add bureaucratic complexity, but to embed into everyday behavior some fundamental questions that would otherwise be omitted.

A well-designed checklist for hybrid knowledge ecosystems should include, at a minimum, checks on the provenance of AI outputs, the adequacy of human review, respect for privacy constraints, awareness of possible biases, decision traceability, and alignment with sustainability criteria. The value of this artifact lies precisely in its simplicity: many

organizations do not fail because they lack sophisticated governance theory, but because they lack operationally usable controls.

## **VI. Measuring ecosystem value**

If hybrid knowledge ecosystems are to be taken seriously as an organizational capability, their value must be measured. But it must be measured in ways that go beyond generic claims of efficiency. The ecosystem produces value at at least three distinct levels.

### **Project performance**

At the level of project performance, the most relevant indicators do not concern the speed of output generation, but the quality of the decision-making process. Decision cycle time, the volume of rework caused by poor information quality, speed of issue resolution, forecast reliability, and the quality of cross-functional coordination: these are the signals that indicate whether the ecosystem truly improves the practice of project work, or merely increases the volume of digital activity.

### **Organizational resilience**

At the level of resilience, value must be assessed in terms of the ecosystem's ability to sustain decision quality under uncertainty, adapt when assumptions change, preserve continuity when people or systems change, and transfer learning from one project context to another.

Resilience is particularly relevant in project-based organizations because uncertainty is not episodic but structural. A hybrid ecosystem should therefore not only improve routine execution, but also strengthen adaptive capacity. A system that works only under normal conditions is not a mature ecosystem: it is a procedure.

### **ESG outcomes**

At the level of ESG outcomes, the most important measure is not the completeness of final reporting, but the depth of sustainability integration within the decision-making process. An ecosystem that incorporates ESG criteria into planning, trade-off analysis, exception management, and closure assessment produces operational sustainability, not merely rhetorical sustainability.

INSPIRE PM is particularly useful in this respect, because it explicitly positions sustainability as an integrated dimension of project practice. The ESG test of a hybrid ecosystem is simple: when a project manager faces a difficult trade-off, do sustainability criteria appear in the deliberation, or are they added only in ex post documentation?

*The value of HA-HKEs cannot be reduced to cost reduction or speed. It must be measured in a more balanced way: reliability, learning, traceability, adaptability, and alignment with sustainability.*

## VII. The human role in hybrid intelligence

Every discussion of Human–AI ecosystems must confront a fundamental question: what remains essentially human? This is not a rhetorical question. It is an operational question, with direct consequences for ecosystem architecture, role definition, and the design of governance mechanisms.

The answer emerging from the framework developed in these pages is articulated. AI can support forecasting, classification, synthesis, pattern recognition, and option generation. These are computational capabilities that AI exercises with greater efficiency and scalability than humans. But problem framing, context interpretation, the weighing of ethical and sustainability trade-offs, and the assumption of responsibility remain human prerogatives not for romantic reasons, but for managerial and institutional ones.

### Why contextual judgment cannot be delegated

Projects are intrinsically contextual and relational. They involve ambiguity, competing stakeholder interests, constraints that change over time, and outcomes that cannot always be reduced to formal optimization. An AI model is trained on past patterns: it can identify anomalies, generate plausible scenarios, and calculate probabilities. But it cannot assess the political weight of a decision, the reputational impact of an exception, or the substantive fairness of a trade-off involving real people.

For this reason, hybrid intelligence in project management should not be understood as a logic of substitution, but as a logic of augmentation under governance. The project manager working in a well-designed hybrid ecosystem is not less relevant than the one who worked without AI: he or she is more relevant, because the tools are better and responsibility is clearer and more explicit.

### The risk of judgment atrophy

There is, however, a real risk that poorly designed hybrid ecosystems carry with them: the atrophy of human judgment. When organizations progressively delegate decisions to AI without robust human-in-the-loop review mechanisms, critical judgment tends to yield to the convenience of algorithmic recommendation.

This risk is not theoretical. It appears every time an AI-generated forecast is accepted without criticism because “it comes from the system,” every time a risk rating is received without contextualization because “the model calculated it,” every time a compliance

checklist is automatically completed without substantive reflection. In all these cases, AI is not augmenting human judgment: it is eroding it.

*A well-designed hybrid ecosystem does not reduce the human role: it amplifies it. But a poorly designed ecosystem silently erodes the judgment capabilities it should support.*

## **VIII. Sustainability as an integrated dimension, not an addition**

One of the most important arguments emerging from the analysis of hybrid knowledge ecosystems concerns sustainability. Not sustainability as an object of reporting, but sustainability as a parameter integrated into the architecture of project knowledge.

Sustainable project management does not mean adding an ESG chapter to the closure report. It means incorporating environmental, social, and governance considerations directly into decision parameters, planning choices, execution trade-offs, and accountability structures. If sustainability is to significantly influence project outcomes, it must be present within the knowledge ecosystem itself.

### **From rhetorical sustainability to operational sustainability**

The distinction between rhetorical sustainability and operational sustainability is one of the most important for understanding the value of HA-HKEs. Rhetorical sustainability produces reports, certifications, and communications. Operational sustainability produces different decisions: procurement choices that weigh environmental impact, execution trade-offs that consider social impact, and success criteria that include ESG indicators alongside time, cost, and quality.

For sustainability to become operational, it must appear in the ecosystem Blueprint: in the criteria used to compare options, in the indicators that are monitored, in the trade-offs that are documented, and in the decision rationales that are preserved. It must be part of the Decision Intelligence Loop: present in deliberation, not added in documentation.

### **AI as an amplifier of sustainability criteria**

In a well-designed ecosystem, AI can play an important role in making sustainability trade-offs visible. It can identify environmental impact patterns in project time series, signal deviations from ESG targets, synthesize relevant regulatory literature, and compare planning scenarios according to their sustainability profiles.

But all this potential value is realized only if the ecosystem is designed to incorporate sustainability as an input, not only as an output. An AI system that lacks access to

structured ESG data, explicit evaluation criteria, and clear decision rights cannot contribute to operational sustainability: it can only generate content on the topic.

## **IX. Toward project management evolutive**

The Project Management Evolutive (PME) framework provides the broader conceptual foundation within which the concept of the hybrid knowledge ecosystem can be placed. PME frames projects not as controlled sequences of tasks, but as adaptive ecosystems in which learning, adaptability, data-informed decisions, and integrated sustainability are foundational elements.

This perspective has profound consequences for the way project knowledge is understood. If projects are adaptive ecosystems, knowledge cannot be reduced to documentation. It cannot be treated as something produced at the beginning and archived at the end of the project. It must be understood as a continuous process: produced, questioned, enriched, and transformed throughout the entire lifecycle.

### **The evolution of the PMO role**

Within a hybrid ecosystem logic, PMOs can no longer be understood only as custodians of templates, methods, or reporting cycles. They must evolve into stewards of knowledge architecture: responsible for designing how knowledge is structured, validated, circulated, and learned from across project portfolios.

This changes the required capability profile: in addition to the classic skills of planning and coordination, hybrid environments require evidence validation, AI literacy, model skepticism, knowledge traceability, and sustainability-aware decision framing. These are not future skills: they are already necessary today in any organization experimenting with the integration of AI into project processes.

### **Ecosystem maturity as a trajectory**

A hybrid knowledge ecosystem is not built in a day. It develops through a maturity trajectory that passes through progressive stages: awareness of the problem, architecture design, artifact experimentation, empirical validation, and institutionalization of practices.

Every organization moves along this trajectory at a different speed, shaped by contextual factors: digital maturity, regulatory exposure, sustainability priorities, and the quality of leadership commitment. There is no universal model. There are universal principles—provenance, accountability, traceability, ESG integration, human-in-the-loop review—and contextual configurations that embody them in different ways.

*The maturity of a hybrid knowledge ecosystem is measured not by the technological sophistication of its tools, but by the quality of the governance that governs them and by the reliability of the knowledge they produce.*

## **X. Conclusions: shared intelligence as an organizational choice**

At the end of this path, one central idea emerges clearly: building a Human–AI Hybrid Knowledge Ecosystem is not a technological choice. It is an organizational choice, a design choice, a governance choice, and a choice of values.

Organizations that choose this path commit to something deeper than the adoption of intelligent tools. They commit to rethinking the way knowledge is produced, validated, circulated, and applied. They commit to explicitly defining where AI’s contribution ends and where human responsibility begins. They commit to making sustainability an operational parameter, not merely a rhetorical one.

### **What makes a hybrid ecosystem sustainable over time**

A hybrid knowledge ecosystem is sustainable over time when it satisfies three simultaneous conditions. First: it produces reliable knowledge, meaning knowledge that is traceable, validated, and connected to accountable decisions. Second: it is capable of learning, meaning that it incorporates feedback loops that transform past experience into future improvement. Third: it is explicitly governed, meaning that the rules regulating its functioning are visible, understandable, and respected.

When one of these conditions fails, the ecosystem degrades: toward opacity, toward the repetition of errors, or toward decision-making anarchy. Governance is not a luxury: it is the load-bearing structure.

### **An invitation to design**

This text has proposed a framework, not a manual. It has indicated principles, not prescribed procedures. The reason is simple: hybrid knowledge ecosystems are intrinsically context-sensitive. Their form and value will vary according to organizational maturity, regulatory exposure, digital capabilities, and sustainability priorities.

What does not vary is the fundamental question: how do we want our organization to learn? How do we want the knowledge produced in our projects to be governed, shared, and applied? How do we want AI to contribute to this process without replacing human responsibility?

Answering these questions is an act of organizational design. It is the step on which, ultimately, the quality of project performance, the solidity of governance, and the credibility of the commitment to sustainability depend.

*Shared intelligence is not a future to aspire to. It is a present we choose to build.*

---

## **References and sources of conceptual inspiration**

- Bassi, A. (2024). *Discovering Project Management: essential lessons and concepts*. FrancoAngeli
- Bassi, A. (2025). *INSPIRE PM: Innovation and sustainability for the future of Project Management*. FrancoAngeli
- Bassi, A. (2025). *HPM: Hybrid Project Management – Inhabiting the tension*. PMWJ
- Davenport, T.H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*. Harvard Business School Press.
- ISO. (2020). *ISO 21502:2020 Project, Programme and Portfolio Management – Guidance on Project Management*. International Organization for Standardization.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- PMI. (2021). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) – Seventh Edition*. Project Management Institute.
- Schiama, G. (2011). *Managing Knowledge Assets and Business Value Creation in Organizations: Measures and Dynamics*. IGI Global.

## About the Author



### **Antonio Bassi**

Lugano, Switzerland



**Antonio Bassi** is an Electronic Engineer by training, certified Project Management Professional (PMP), member of the Steering Committee of the Project Management Institute – Northern-Italy Chapter (PMI-NIC) from 2004 to 2008, Lecturer in Project Management in academic settings, President of the Association Project Management Switzerland (APM-Switzerland), author of numerous books and articles on project management, former member of the UNI team for the definition of ISO21500 standards for Project Management, with 20 years of experience as Project/Program Manager on innovative projects across various market sectors.

Antonio can be contacted at [antonio.bassi60@gmail.com](mailto:antonio.bassi60@gmail.com)