FROM THE RESEARCH BENCH

One intangible-assets system, two useful views

Voluntary reporting of intangible assets decays without a decision owner. Build one evidence system, then produce two views only when two readers differ.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED 15 August 2026
UPDATED 20 August 2026
READING TIME 7 min
WORDS 1,503

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/one-intangible-assets-system-two-useful-views/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Reporting frameworks promise to make knowledge, people, and customer relationships visible. But when companies build standalone reports for external readers, the disclosure decays: in Denmark's national trial, 69% of firms abandoned public intellectual-capital statements once government support ended. Yet internal steering benefits persisted. German implementations show the same split: non-financial data endures when embedded in management and operational routines. The design rule is not to publish an internal dashboard externally or maintain two tracking databases. Build one evidence system around decision owners, and extract an external view only when an outside counterparty requires comparable evidence.

Keywords: Intangible assets · Intellectual capital reporting · Wissensbilanz · Operating metrics · Information architecture

Every few years, corporate leadership is invited to make its intangible assets visible. The promise is always compelling: customer relationships, technical know-how, and organizational culture drive enterprise value, yet financial accounting leaves them off the balance sheet. Frameworks arrive promising to quantify what standard bookkeeping omits: through knowledge balance sheets, integrated reports, or multidimensional scorecards. Every growth budget quietly maintains such stocks anyway: the accounts simply have no field for them.

Before commissioning another reporting project, an operator should ask a blunt question: what happened to the companies that built these statements?

The empirical record offers a clear answer. When organizations produce standalone reports aimed at outside readers without a statutory or transactional mandate, the reporting decays. But where the same underlying evidence is built around internal operational decisions, it survives. The problem was never that intangible assets cannot be measured; it was that organizations mistook a disclosure artifact for an operating evidence system.

What happened when the German national intellectual capital initiative scaled?

The most comprehensive national test of voluntary intellectual capital reporting took place in Denmark. Under the Danish Guideline Project (1998–2002), the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation facilitated the creation and publication of Intellectual Capital Statements across more than one hundred organizations.

In their longitudinal empirical post-mortem, Christian Nielsen, Robin Roslender, and Stefan Schaper reconstructed the trajectory of the 102 participating organizations and interviewed 64 key participants. Their findings document an unmistakable split.

Externally, the initiative collapsed once government co-funding ended. Sixty-nine percent of participating companies ceased producing Intellectual Capital Statements after the project terminated in late 2002. Fourteen of the original companies never completed the process of publishing even a single statement. As the interviewees explained, without regulatory compulsion, companies saw little business value in publicly exposing granular, proprietary details about their human capital and operating processes. Outside capital markets and customers simply did not integrate the voluntary statements into their own pricing or procurement decisions.

Yet internally, the experience was fundamentally different. On balance, respondents reported lasting benefits for internal management, organizational overview, and employee engagement. Where intellectual capital activities survived, they survived almost exclusively as internal steering mechanisms.

The Danish experience established a vital boundary: external reporting traction and internal steering utility diverge sharply in practice.

Why do embedded internal routines outlive glossy standalone reports?

Germany pursued a parallel path with its Wissensbilanz – Made in Germany framework, standardized and published under the Federal Ministry of Economics (BMWi, 2013). The guide divides intellectual capital the same way: it “ist in drei Kapitalarten unterteilt”, and defines each, so “Beziehungskapital ist der Oberbegriff für alle Beziehungen zu organisationsexternen Gruppen und Personen”. How many organisations have applied it is not established by anything this piece cites, so no count is given.

Intangible asset management yielded durable organizational value only when embedded directly into management routines, process optimization, and strategic decision-making. Deployed as an isolated, standalone public disclosure exercise, it generated administrative fatigue and was abandoned. As the official German guideline ("Leitfaden 2.0") itself noted, internal management requires "more and different detail" than external communication.

This divergence reflects a foundational insight from the accounting literature. As Gloria Liu and Eric Wang (2012) demonstrated in their analysis of intellectual capital accounting, no universal technique fits all organizational purposes. The design of an accounting approach must align strictly with its primary motive: internal steering (decision support and operational control) versus external reporting (valuation, comparability, and compliance).

What occurs when external reporting requirements replace internal operational decisions?

There is one setting where external non-financial reporting does not decay: when an institutional counterparty possesses direct statutory authority and ties resource allocation to the report.

In Austria, public universities are required by federal statute (§ 13 Abs. 6 Universitätsgesetz 2002) to prepare an annual Wissensbilanz detailing human, structural, and relational capital. Standardized by ministerial ordinance (WBV 2016), this document does not sit on a shelf. It serves as the formal reporting basis for negotiating the triennial Leistungsvereinbarung (performance agreement) with the federal government, directly governing state budget allocations.

The Austrian counterexample proves the rule. External reporting functions as a living accountability system only when an outside reader has an explicit, recurring decision that consumes the verified numbers. In a private commercial setting, where no such statutory counterparty exists, an unmandated public report is an artifact denominated in nobody's decision: especially when critical relational assets can walk out the door without appearing in any public statement.

Table 1 The Two Views of Intangible Assets

Dimension	The Operating View (Steering)	The External View (Transaction / Diligence)
Primary Reader	Process Owner, Commercial Executive	External Counterparty (Buyer, Lender, Auditor)
Core Question	What operational action do we take next?	What is the verifiable quality and risk of this asset?
Granularity	Process-level, driver-specific, identifiable	Aggregate, comparable, standardized
Controllability	High (direct operational levers)	Low to Medium (outcome valuation & risk bounds)
Cadence	Weekly, monthly, continuous	Deal-episodic, annual
Standard	Predictive utility & operational validity	Materiality, auditability, documentation
Failure Mode	Vanity scorecard without a decision owner	Unread narrative denominated in no consuming process

Design synthesis based on Liu & Wang (2012) and empirical findings in Nielsen et al. (2017), BMWi (2013), and § 13 UG 2002. The operational framework is the author's own.

How should organizations structure one evidence base with two distinct views?

The practical lesson for an operator is not to build two parallel measurement bureaucracies. Nor is it to publish an internal operational dashboard to the outside world.

The correct information architecture builds one underlying evidence system, and extracts two distinct views only when two readers have different decisions to make:

1. The Operating View (Internal Steering): Designed exclusively for internal operators. It tracks granular, controllable drivers tied to specific business processes: cohort churn rates, pipeline velocity, lead conversion drop-offs, developer onboarding time. It carries a named decision owner and a defined threshold that triggers operational intervention. It never leaves the company.
2. The External View (Counterparty Diligence): Designed exclusively for an outside reader assessing value or risk: such as an acquirer, a lender, or an auditor. It extracts aggregated, comparable, and verifiable records from the same operational base: historical contract retention, customer concentration curves, verified intellectual property registries, and institutionalized playbooks. As this site noted in how customer bases get priced, this view is denominated in the counterparty's categories.

Neither view is a shortened or redacted summary of the other. They serve structurally incompatible decisions.

Which four gating questions test whether intangible assets actually drive decisions?

Before approving any proposed intangible-asset framework, KPI dashboard, or non-financial reporting initiative, a commercial leader should run four gating questions:

1. Whose decision changes when this number moves? If the metric does not have a named human decision owner with the budget and operational authority to act, kill the metric immediately. It is decorative overhead.
2. What underlying business process generates this asset stock? If an indicator cannot be traced to a specific operating workflow, it cannot be managed.
3. Is this indicator directly controllable, or is it a lagging valuation proxy? Controllable drivers belong strictly in the weekly Operating View. Lagging outcome proxies belong in the periodic External View.
4. If this is for an external audience: what specific transaction or statutory decision does it inform? If no external counterparty is actively demanding the data under an enforceable evaluation process, do not publish it. Keep the evidence inside the operating system where it creates value.

Intangibles do not suffer from being invisible on the balance sheet; they suffer when leaders mistake a public reporting brochure for an operating steering system. Build the evidence system for the person running the process on Monday morning: and extract the disclosure only when a counterparty sits across the table.

Where are the empirical boundaries of intellectual capital accounting?

Boundary. The two-view system separates evidence owners, not mandatory disclosure or valuation rules. Use it as a governance worksheet and test it against a real diligence or reporting decision.

Evidence base. The analytical frame also draws on these additional sources: Bundesgesetz über die Organisation der Universitäten und ihre Studien 2002. The links identify the exact works; they support the mechanisms and boundary conditions discussed here, not every claim in isolation.

Bundesgesetz über die Organisation der Universitäten und ihre Studien (Universitätsgesetz 2002 – UG), § 13 (Leistungsvereinbarung). BGBl. I Nr. 120/2002 idgF. https://ris.bka.gv.at/eli/bgbl/i/2002/120/P13/NOR40269920

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie (BMWi). (2013). Wissensbilanz – Made in Germany: Leitfaden 2.0 zur Erstellung einer Wissensbilanz. https://wissensmanagement.ipk.fraunhofer.de/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Leitfaden_2.0_Wissensbilanz_Stand_Nov2013-1.pdf

Liu, G. H. W., & Wang, E. T. G. (2012). Intellectual capital accounting: an alignment between the motive and the accounting approach. Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting, 16(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/14013381211272635

Nielsen, C., Roslender, R., & Schaper, S. (2017). Explaining the demise of the intellectual capital statement in Denmark. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 30(1), 38–64. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-04-2014-1671

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, August 15). One intangible-assets system, two useful views. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/one-intangible-assets-system-two-useful-views/

KEEP READING

From the research bench

Business case control is a living decision loop

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/business-case-control-is-a-living-decision-loop/

From the research bench

Foreign-market selection should compare mode-specific fit

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/foreign-market-selection-should-compare-mode-specific-fit/

From the research bench

Competitive intelligence begins with incomplete information

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/competitive-intelligence-begins-with-incomplete-information/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/one-intangible-assets-system-two-useful-views/