



THE TRI-ALLIANCE MANIFESTO 5.0

Governance for an Age of Increasing AI Capability

Restoring the Human Voice - Together

CONTENTS

I. The Moment Before Us	2
II. What We Believe	2
III. Authority Before Consequential Action	3
IV. Governance Above Technology	4
V. Human Dignity, Voice and Access	4
VI. Traceability, Evidence and Honest Claims	5
VII. Plural Participation Without Capture	5
VIII. Evaluation Without Self-Certification	6
IX. From Evaluation to Governmental Review	7
X. Different Regions, Shared Responsibility	7
XI. Restraint Is Part of Innovation	8
XII. Our Invitation	9
Relationship to the Founding Charter	10

I. The Moment Before Us

We are living through a period of extraordinary technological acceleration. Artificial intelligence can converse, reason, retrieve, organise, create and increasingly act through connected systems. Its capacity to support care, public service, professional work and human communication is expanding rapidly.

Yet increasing capability also creates a deeper question: who has authority, who remains responsible, and who is accountable when AI participates in consequential activity?

Technology should heal, not harden. It should restore voice, not replace it. Innovation should strengthen understanding, dignity and human agency rather than distance people from the decisions that affect them.

Where others see data points, we see lives. Where others measure success only by speed or scale, we also measure understanding, reassurance, accessibility and trust.

This is not innovation for its own sake. It is innovation with purpose.

II. What We Believe

The Tri-Alliance begins from a simple conviction: powerful technology can serve humanity best when capability is accompanied by clear governance, defined responsibility and evidence that actions occurred as represented.

We believe good governance grows from collaboration, different perspectives, open discussion and clearly understood responsibility. Participation should broaden judgment without transferring ownership or allowing any one participant to convert contribution into unchecked control.

The Tri-Alliance brings together three distinct but complementary institutional functions:

Global Integrated Care International (GIC) - the commercial founder, developer and operator.

The Research & Evaluation Consortium (CON2) - the independent research and evaluation function.

The Governmental Review Consortium (CON1) - the independent governmental review and determination function.

These functions are deliberately distinct. GIC retains its commercial and institutional independence, while CON1 and CON2 exercise their respective review and evaluation functions independently within the Tri-Alliance governance framework. Participation in CON1 or CON2 does not confer ownership or operational control of GIC.

Useful AI should remain understandable to the people who encounter it and accountable to the people and institutions that authorize its consequential use.

AI CAPABILITY IS NOT AI AUTHORITY.

Capability describes what a system can do. Authority determines what it is permitted to do, by whom, under what conditions, and with whose accountability.

III. Authority Before Consequential Action

Artificial intelligence may support, guide, retrieve, organise, prepare and communicate. Those capabilities do not, by themselves, confer authority to make a consequential decision, create a binding commitment, represent institutional approval, or declare that a real-world action succeeded.

Consequential authority must remain attributable to an identifiable person, institution or governed process capable of approving, refusing, correcting or revoking the action.

For that reason, the Tri-Alliance advances a practical chain of accountability:

CAPABILITY → AUTHORITY → RESPONSIBILITY → ACCOUNTABILITY

This is the institutional accountability chain: it addresses where authority resides and where responsibility and accountability follow. It is distinct from the operational-state integrity chain:

REQUESTED → AUTHORIZED → ATTEMPTED → CONFIRMED

which tracks whether a request was actually authorized, attempted, and independently confirmed to have occurred. Traceability should support both chains.

In connected systems, language must not create operational state. A request is not an authorization. An authorization is not an attempt. An attempt is not confirmation. A system should report success only when appropriate evidence confirms that the intended action actually occurred.

No AI model shall constitute the final authority for its own authorization, scope, monitoring, escalation or continued operation.

IV. Governance Above Technology

Models will change. Providers will change. Interfaces, voices, avatars, infrastructure and tools will change. The governance principles determining what systems may do, what evidence is required, and who remains accountable must endure beyond any particular technology.

No technology supplier acquires institutional authority merely by providing a model, cloud service, avatar, voice, tool or other technical component. Technical excellence matters, but it is not the same as governance standing, ownership, endorsement or authority.

This is why the Tri-Alliance supports replaceable technology boundaries and seeks to avoid irreversible dependence on any single model, provider, jurisdiction or technical architecture.

Technology may evolve. Governance remains above the technology.

V. Human Dignity, Voice and Access

The human purpose of governance is not to constrain useful innovation for its own sake. It is to make useful innovation worthy of trust.

AI-enabled systems should identify themselves honestly, respect privacy and consent, support accessibility, and avoid manipulative or exploitative design. Multilingual communication should widen access while preserving meaning, context and respect across languages and cultures.

Human oversight should remain available where consequence, uncertainty or professional responsibility requires it. AI may augment care and professional work, but it must not obscure the difference between assistance and human judgment.

We seek systems that listen before they speak, clarify before they assume, and escalate rather than improvise when uncertainty becomes consequential.

VI. Traceability, Evidence and Honest Claims

Trust cannot depend only on confident language. Where an AI-enabled system participates in consequential activity, appropriate evidence and traceability should make it possible to determine what was requested, what was authorized, what was attempted, what was confirmed, and who exercised authority.

Telemetry and audit records are not a substitute for safety, but they can provide evidence for oversight, review, correction and accountability.

The Tri-Alliance therefore rejects the idea that an AI system may simply declare that an external action occurred because it generated words describing success. Claims about operational outcomes should follow independently verifiable state wherever practical.

VII. Plural Participation Without Capture

The challenges created by increasingly capable AI cross borders, professions, sectors and institutional traditions. No single government, corporation, technology provider, university or jurisdiction can supply every perspective needed to govern them responsibly.

Plural participation is therefore built into the Tri-Alliance through distinct institutional routes.

Governmental participation takes place through CON1, the Governmental Review Consortium.

Research and evaluation participation takes place through CON2, the Research & Evaluation Consortium, which may include universities, research institutions, governmental research facilities, care organisations, appropriate companies, technology contributors, researchers and other qualified contributors consistent with its mandate.

GIC develops, commercializes and operates its service modules, subject to the Tri-Alliance governance framework and applicable jurisdictional requirements. Neither CON1 nor CON2 assumes ownership or operational control of GIC through participation.

Participation does not require identical views. It requires respectful engagement, disclosure of important conflicts, clarity of responsibility and a willingness to improve the work.

Independence should not mean isolation. Collaboration should not mean capture.

VIII. Evaluation Without Self-Certification

Evaluation is meaningful only when it can withstand disagreement and scrutiny. No participant should control an evaluation concerning itself, or an organisation in which it has a significant conflict of interest.

CON2 shall exercise its evaluation responsibilities independently and shall remain free to reach and record findings, conclusions and recommendations contrary to the position, expectations or commercial interests of GIC. No participant shall be penalized solely for legitimate independent findings, good-faith criticism or reasoned dissent.

CON2 may independently research, challenge, test and evaluate GIC-proposed service modules. Consistent with its mandate, CON2 may also evaluate other qualifying services, technologies or approaches; it is not restricted to GIC-originated work.

The purpose of evaluation is to illuminate how systems operate within defined governance boundaries and applicable requirements. It should not manufacture endorsement, obscure limitations, or transform participation into automatic certification.

Negative findings can be as valuable as positive ones when they reveal where safeguards, instructions, technology or institutional processes must improve.

Where an evaluation has matured sufficiently for governmental consideration, CON2 may submit the service module, evaluation, evidence, material dissent, contrary evidence and unresolved concerns for CON1 review.

CON2 submission is not endorsement.

GIC may present, explain, respond to findings and modify its work, but GIC does not determine the independent CON2 evaluation of its own service module.

IX. From Evaluation to Governmental Review

The Tri-Alliance follows a deliberate separation of institutional functions:

GIC → PRESENTS
CON2 → EVALUATES & SUBMITS
CON1 → REVIEWS & DETERMINES
GIC → DECIDES WHETHER AND HOW TO COMMERCIALY DEPLOY

NO CON2 SUBMISSION → NO CON1 REVIEW.

CON1 provides independent governmental review following a CON2 submission. Under the applicable governance framework, a CON1 determination may endorse, endorse subject to conditions, decline, or determine that further review is required.

A CON1 endorsement represents a positive determination reached through the defined CON1 review process. It does not, by itself, require a participating government or institution to deploy a GIC service.

Participation is not endorsement. Research is not endorsement. CON2 submission is not endorsement. Formal CON1 endorsement arises only through the defined CON1 governmental review process.

X. Different Regions, Shared Responsibility

The Tri-Alliance is intended to engage across jurisdictions, but it does not assume that one legal, professional or cultural framework can simply be imposed everywhere. Laws, regulatory obligations, professional duties and social expectations differ between countries.

The founding regional architecture of the Tri-Alliance comprises six regions:

Africa • Asia • Europe • North America • South America • Oceania

Regional CON1 and CON2 bodies may operate within these regions under the common Tri-Alliance constitutional framework.

Common constitutional principles and decision machinery do not require identical regional conclusions. Regional bodies may consider region-specific circumstances, evidence and requirements, and different regions may legitimately reach different substantive determinations.

National sovereignty remains preserved. A regional determination does not displace applicable national law, regulation, professional requirements or governmental authority, and individual governments remain free to impose stricter requirements within their own jurisdictions.

Regional independence must not become regional isolation. Material safety, security, AI-governance or systemic risks identified in one region should, where relevant, be capable of informing evaluation and review elsewhere in the Tri-Alliance.

Responsible international governance therefore requires both common principles and respect for applicable local requirements.

Our aim is not uniformity for its own sake. It is interoperability without erasing legitimate difference.

XI. Restraint Is Part of Innovation

Ambition and restraint are not opposites. In consequential environments, restraint is one of the disciplines that makes ambitious innovation sustainable.

We will not treat technical possibility as sufficient justification for operational deployment. We will seek to match capability with governance, safeguards, authority, evidence and appropriate human responsibility.

We choose transparency over opacity, stewardship over unchecked control, and practical accountability over promises that cannot be verified.

We will learn from experience. We will change where evidence shows that change is necessary. And we will seek common ground without demanding identical views.

XII. Our Invitation

The Tri-Alliance invites governments, institutions, professionals, researchers, companies, technology providers, care organisations, community representatives and other appropriate contributors to question, challenge, contribute and help improve this work.

The invitation provides two principal institutional routes.

Governmental participation → CON1 - Governmental Review Consortium

Governments may participate in independent governmental review of evidence and evaluation submitted through CON2, identify jurisdiction-specific concerns, and contribute to the development of responsible and replicable international governance approaches.

Research and evaluation participation → CON2 - Research & Evaluation Consortium

Universities, research institutions, researchers, care organisations, appropriate companies, technology contributors, governmental research facilities and other qualified contributors may independently research, challenge, test and evaluate qualifying service modules, identify risks, limitations and alternatives, and contribute evidence for subsequent CON1 governmental review.

We do not ask participants to surrender their identity, ownership or independent judgment. We ask them to help build approaches to increasingly capable AI in which authority is clear, responsibility remains visible, and technology continues to serve human purpose.

The work will evolve. New technologies will challenge today's assumptions. New jurisdictions and participants will bring different perspectives. The governance framework must be strong enough to learn without pretending that every future question has already been answered.

RESTORING THE HUMAN VOICE - TOGETHER

Governance for an age of increasing AI capability.

Technology may evolve. Governance remains above the technology.

AI capability is not AI authority.

This is a beginning, not an ending.

Relationship to the Founding Charter

This Manifesto expresses the public principles, purpose and direction of the Tri-Alliance. It complements, but does not replace, the Founding Charter.

Where any inconsistency, ambiguity or difference of interpretation arises between this Manifesto and the Founding Charter, the Founding Charter shall prevail.

Questions concerning ownership, authority, governance mechanics, legal obligations and amendment shall be governed by the Founding Charter and other applicable governing instruments.

Issued by Global Integrated Care International under the Tri-Alliance Governance Framework | 2026