

Doctrinal Proposal: THE THIRD WAY

Working version: v0.2 extended and enriched

Status: doctrinal document for discussion and refinement

Context: PG4 — the Web Application

Author: Open Public Service srl (<https://ops.ro>)

Working date: 28 May 2026

Doctrinal status note

This manual sets out an extended proposal for the concept of “THE THIRD WAY,” understood as a model for the design, governance, and implementation of complex operational management applications, in which AI is not a direct operational decision-maker but a partner in exploration, formalization, critique, doctrinal acceleration, and controlled learning.

Version v0.2 develops v0.1 in two major directions.

The first is the clarification of the concept of “in rem inventorying of situations,” in the sense of an objective, depersonalized, and neutral mapping of the state of facts.

The second is the introduction of the thesis on the rebalancing of cognitive functions: THE THIRD WAY not only protects human decision-making, but also produces cognitive growth among those who conceive the doctrine, implement the code, operate the application, and take part in the cycle of learning and refinement.

The manual is drafted as an informational document. It may serve as the basis for a candidate doctrinal decision for the development of applications, or for an implementation methodology applicable to the same applications.

Executive summary

THE THIRD WAY is a model for building and operating complex management applications, especially where processes are numerous, risks are significant, and decisions must be fast, compliant, traceable, and adaptable. It rejects two extremes: the use of AI as a free decision-maker, which can produce fast but hardly controllable solutions, and the use of classical software as mere procedural mechanics, which can be stable but insufficiently sensitive to atypical situations.

The concept starts from the idea that the doctrinal vision belongs to the human. The human defines meaning, purpose, limits, acceptable risks, and the philosophy of control. AI does not replace this vision, but iteratively transforms it into a doctrinal skeleton, tests it, stresses it, extends it, and helps it become applicable. After this stage, the application takes on the role of controlled execution: it does not improvise, but operates on the basis of a formalized model, with clear rules, statuses, thresholds, alerts, escalations, and responsibilities.

In this formulation, AI contributes to the system's intelligence, but does not occupy, unchecked, the seat of operational decision-making. Its power is used mainly before execution — in the inventorying of situations, the formalization of rules, the anticipation of solutions, the verification of doctrinal coherence, and the support of the remodeling process. In operation, the application becomes the environment in which this doctrine manifests itself in a disciplined, predictable, and traceable manner.

The major novelty of THE THIRD WAY is that it does not treat the human as a mere validator of AI decisions. The human remains in the position of author, designer, responsible operator, auditor, and participant in the system's learning. Through this participation, the human's cognitive functions are not amputated, but rebalanced and developed. Those involved in conceiving the doctrine, transposing it into code, operating the application, and continuously refining it come to think more systemically, more rigorously, and more responsibly.

Part I: Conception of THE THIRD WAY

The underlying problem

Complex operational management applications face a structural tension. On one hand, organizations need speed, compliance, and risk reduction. On the other hand, operational reality constantly produces exceptions, deviations, atypical situations, conflicts between rules, incidents, and critical events. Classical systems tend to handle normality well, but become stuck or bureaucratic when facing exceptions. AI, conversely, can quickly generate interpretations and solutions, but does not by itself guarantee predictability, traceability, accountability, and control.

The question, therefore, is not whether AI must be used or rejected. The correct question is where AI must be placed in the doctrinal and decisional chain. If it is placed too late, as a direct operational decision-maker, the risk becomes hard to control. If it is completely ignored, the organization loses a major capacity for exploration, modeling, and anticipation. THE THIRD WAY proposes placing AI in the doctrinal construction phase, not at the center of free operational decision-making.

This repositioning changes the nature of the entire application. The application is no longer just a working interface, nor a substitute for decision-making. It becomes the carrier of a formalized operational doctrine. It executes rules, preserves traces, triggers alerts, supports escalations, delimits responsibilities, and provides the conditions for governed learning.

Relation to existing solutions

AI as direct decision-maker or coordinator

The first solution is to use AI as a decision-maker, coordinator, or direct solver. In this variant, the system receives operational situations, interprets them, and proposes or executes decisions. The advantage is obvious: speed of analysis, great capacity for correlation, sensitivity to many types of cases, and the possibility of creative solutions.

The limit is just as important. The decision generated by AI remains exposed to risks of incomplete context, opaque reasoning, hallucination, improper risk interpretation, prioritization error, or lack of formal accountability. If the human must validate every decision, the system slows down. If the human does not validate, the risk shifts into operation and can become hard to detect before its effects materialize.

There is also a cognitive risk. The human can become accustomed to waiting for the machine's decision, then accepting it, marginally correcting it, or rejecting it, without fully exercising their own decisional construction. Over time, their role may be reduced to anxious oversight. This is not mature collaboration, but cognitive delegation with residual responsibility.

AI validated by another AI

The second solution is the use of a second AI as validator of the first. This increases speed and may reduce certain obvious errors, especially where cross-validation detects contradictions, omissions, or inconsistencies. Nevertheless, this solution does not produce validation in the strong sense. It produces a secondary probabilistic check.

The residual risk can become even harder to assess. Two models can err in similar ways, can share contextual limits, or can produce formal consensus where the initial problem was poorly defined. In the absence of an external doctrine and a control architecture, AI-with-AI validation can create the false impression of safety.

From an organizational standpoint, this variant does not solve the responsibility problem. Even if two systems reach the same conclusion, the organization must know who defined the criteria, who approved the risk, who executed it, and who can explain the decision. Validation between models does not replace governance.

Specialized AI and permanent self-learning

The third solution is the development of a specialized AI, permanently trained or adapted to the organization's domain. This direction can significantly increase the quality of responses. A specialized system can learn the organizational language, operational patterns, frequent exceptions, and subtle relationships among rules.

Specialization, however, does not eliminate risk. It transforms it. Governance problems appear: who validates the learning process, how doctrinal drift is prevented, how behavioral changes are audited, how useful experience is separated from historical errors, and how the codification of mistaken tacit practices is stopped. Without control rules, specialized AI can become a new black box, all the more convincing because it appears familiar with the domain.

Specialization may be useful as an auxiliary layer, but must not be confused with doctrine. A specialized AI can support analysis, retrieve case histories, signal patterns, and propose adjustments. But the standard must be changed by recorded decision, not by tacit learning of the model.

Classical software, without doctrinal AI

The fourth solution is the classical application based on rules, forms, workflows, and approvals. This provides stability, control, and predictability. It is a robust solution for standardized processes, especially when variation is small and risks are well known.

The limit appears when processes are complex, contextual, dynamic, or exposed to critical events. A classical application can handle what has already been anticipated, but struggles to inventory, quickly enough, what may yet arise. It can also become cumbersome, over-processed, or dependent on very capable operators to compensate for unformalized areas.

Classical software can preserve a good doctrine, but does not produce one by itself. It needs a prior modeling stage, in which the operational reality is understood, segmented, classified, and translated into mechanisms. Here AI can be extremely valuable, if kept in the right position.

THE THIRD WAY

THE THIRD WAY combines the exploratory and formalizing power of AI with the stability of a governed application. AI does not decide freely in operation, but participates intensely in building the doctrine. The human is not reduced to an anxious validator of machine-proposed decisions, but remains the author of the vision, the judge of risk, and the bearer of meaning. The application is not just a digital form, but the formalized expression of a living, controlled, and auditable doctrine.

In this configuration, the operational decision is pre-structured. It is not generated ex nihilo by AI under pressure, but is channeled through a system of rules, states, roles, alerts, thresholds, escalations, and anticipated solutions. AI helps design and revise this system, but execution remains disciplined.

THE THIRD WAY can be expressed through four complementary formulas:

- **Doctrinal AI, not operational decision-making AI:** AI supports the construction and revision of the doctrine, not the substitution of executable decision-making.
- **Human as author of the vision, not passive validator:** the human formulates the system's purpose and acceptability criteria.
- **Application as executable doctrine:** code is not merely functionality, but the institutionalization of rules.
- **Governed learning, not adaptive drift:** the system refines itself through recorded decisions, not through silent practice.

Proposed definition

THE THIRD WAY is a model for the design, governance, and implementation of complex operational applications, in which the human formulates the doctrinal vision, AI assists its exploration and formalization, and the application executes processes through explicit, traceable, controlled, and revisable mechanisms.

In its short form:

THE THIRD WAY does not transfer decision-making to AI; it uses AI to extend the field of situations, accelerate the formalization of rules, anticipate solutions, and discipline the evolution of doctrine through explicit decisions.

In its extended form:

THE THIRD WAY is the method by which the human, AI, and application are repositioned into a chain of mature responsibility: the human formulates the vision and risk criteria, AI amplifies analysis and formalization, the application executes the doctrine through rules and controls, and the organization learns through audit, decision, and remodeling.

Part II: Rebalancing of cognitive functions

Central thesis

THE THIRD WAY is not merely a solution for reducing AI risk. It is also a model for cognitive growth. Those who take part in the doctrinal conception, in the implementation of the programming code, in the operation of the application, and in the learning and refinement cycle are not diminished by the presence of AI. On the contrary, if the method is applied correctly, the minds of all these actors grow.

This growth must not be understood metaphorically in a vague sense. It means the development of concrete cognitive capacities: the capacity to distinguish situations, to formulate rules, to see systemic risks, to separate the person from the state of facts, to design responsibilities, to anticipate effects, to think in causal chains, and to transform experience into standard.

The process is the reverse of cases in which the human leaves the seat of decision-making to make immediate room for AI. In those cases, the human can become faster at consuming decisions, but weaker at producing them. In THE THIRD WAY, the human does not simply receive answers. They learn to construct the system that makes the answers possible, controllable, and auditable.

Rebalanced cognitive functions

In a classical system, many cognitive functions remain informally distributed across the organization. One person knows from experience what risk means. Another knows how to resolve an exception. Another knows what should not be done, even though the rule is not written. This tacit intelligence is useful, but fragile. It may disappear with people, may be applied unevenly, and may remain non-auditable.

In a system where AI decides directly, part of these cognitive functions may be absorbed by the machine. The human ends up validating, overseeing, or correcting. The risk is not only the punctual error, but the gradual atrophy of the competence to think systemically.

THE THIRD WAY proposes a different path. Cognitive functions are rebalanced as follows:

Cognitive function	In the decision-making AI model	In THE THIRD WAY
Observation of the situation	AI interprets the case	Human and application capture the state of facts; AI helps with classification
Formulation of the problem	AI formulates the problem	Human defines the problem; AI tests the variants
Decision	AI proposes or executes	The application executes approved rules; the human keeps control over exceptions
Learning	The model adapts opaquely or semi-opaquely	The standard is changed by formal decision
Responsibility	Remains ambiguous	Is explicitly assigned through roles and rules
Organizational memory	Partially shifts into the model	Is recorded in registers, decisions, and artifacts

Growth of the mind in the four phases

Doctrinal conception

In the doctrinal conception phase, the human is obliged to formulate what usually remains implicit. They must say what is meant by correct process, deviation, risk, criticality, responsibility, escalation, and closure. AI helps them see alternatives, detect contradictions, and extend the field of situations.

The result is the growth of the capacity for operational abstraction. The human no longer relates only to concrete cases, but to families of cases, rules, exceptions, and control mechanisms.

Code implementation

In the implementation phase, the doctrine is forced to become precise. Code does not tolerate unlimited ambiguity. If a rule has exceptions, they must be formulated. If a status has transitions, they must be defined. If an alert has severity, it must be computed or established.

Programmers and architects no longer implement mere functional requirements. They translate a doctrine into executable mechanisms. This translation develops their systems thinking, their attention to consequences, and their capacity to see how a doctrinal decision becomes operational effect.

Operation of the application

In the operation phase, users are not just step-executors. They are participants in a formalized reality. Each action has context, justification, trace, and possible consequence.

The user learns to work in a system that demands clarity, role compliance, and attention to early signals.

This produces cognitive discipline. The operator relies not only on intuition, but on understanding the state of facts, the applicable rule, and their own responsibility.

Learning and refinement

In the learning phase, the organization transforms experience into standard. Incidents, deviations, blockages, and exceptions do not vanish into informal conversations. They become material for audit, decision, and remodeling.

This phase develops organizational meta-cognition: the system's capacity to understand how it thinks, how it decides, where it errs, and how it corrects its own rules.

The pedagogical effect of the application

An application built on THE THIRD WAY is not merely a tool. It becomes a formative environment. Users learn to see processes through the lens of rules, risks, responsibilities, and signals. Implementers learn to transform doctrine into architecture. Decision-makers learn not to confuse urgency with improvisation. Auditors learn to seek states of facts, not premature culprits.

In this sense, the application has a pedagogical effect. It does not teach through courses, but through the way it obliges the organization to think and act. Every field correctly completed, every alert closed with justification, every exception escalated, and every rule remodeled contributes to the growth of the collective mind.

Part III: The range of activities and processes where THE THIRD WAY can be applied

Applicability criteria

THE THIRD WAY is not necessary for every application. It becomes relevant where complexity, risk, operational variation, and the need for compliance coexist. The simpler, more repetitive, and less risky the processes are, the more classical software is sufficient. The freer, more creative, or more strategic the decisions, the more direct human intervention remains dominant.

THE THIRD WAY is justified in the intermediate and difficult zone: processes that can be industrialized but are not trivial; processes that can be standardized but are exposed to exceptions; processes that are repeatable but carry significant risk in case of deviation; processes that demand speed but cannot renounce traceability.

An additional criterion is the existence of a formative stake. If the organization only wants to offload tasks, simple automation may suffice. If it wants to raise its level of discipline, clarity, and operational intelligence, THE THIRD WAY becomes much more appropriate.

Suitable activities

Operational management with significant risk

Suitable are processes in which many actions must be coordinated quickly, and where delay or error can produce operational, commercial, reputational, or legal effects. Here THE THIRD WAY can transform tacit experience into explicit rules and reduce dependence on the memory or intuition of key persons.

Examples of activities:

- **Coordination of complex commercial campaigns:** activities with many roles, deadlines, dependencies, materials, approvals, and execution risks.
- **Management of operational incidents:** situations where signals must be captured early, classified, and escalated in a disciplined manner.
- **Procedural compliance control:** verification of compliance with mandatory steps, responsibilities, deadlines, and conditions.
- **Governance of distributed activities:** processes in which several teams or roles contribute to the same outcome, and ambiguity produces risk.

Processes with frequent exceptions

THE THIRD WAY is valuable where exceptions are not rare anomalies but a normal part of reality. In such cases, the standard procedure alone is not sufficient. The system must be able to distinguish benign exceptions from significant deviations, weak signals from real alerts, minor delays from critical risks.

Examples:

- **Conditional approvals:** cases where the general rule allows exceptions, but only with justification and escalation.
- **Deviations from operational standard:** situations where the deviation must be recorded, evaluated, and eventually transformed into a new rule.
- **Unwanted events:** incidents, blockages, responsibility conflicts, systemic delays, or risk overruns.

Systems that must learn without drifting

A living application must learn. But continuous learning can become dangerous if it is not governed. THE THIRD WAY applies very well where accumulated experience must be transformed into a standard, but only through explicit decision.

Examples:

- **Updating rules based on incidents:** each relevant event can generate a rule revision, but not automatically and not tacitly.

- **Improvement of playbooks:** solutions are adjusted based on real cases, but with traceability.
- **Calibration of alert thresholds:** thresholds may be modified, but only after analysis and recording.

Domains with strict separation of responsibilities

The concept is suitable in domains where contractual, operational, and control roles must not be mixed. If a person has a contractual identity, an operational role, and possibly a control function, the application must be able to separate these planes. THE THIRD WAY is not based on the assumption that “the user knows what they are doing”; it explicitly models who can do what, in what context, and with what accountability.

Processes with fragile organizational memory

THE THIRD WAY is suitable where the organization depends on people who “know how it is done,” but this knowledge is not sufficiently recorded. Such a system should not eliminate those people’s expertise, but raise it to the rank of a debatable, verifiable, and refinable standard.

Examples:

- **Commercial practices with tacit rules:** situations where experienced people know what risks exist, but the procedures do not describe them.
- **Cross-cutting processes:** activities that span several departments and where responsibility is diluted.
- **Areas with weakly formalized control:** activities where the risk is known, but its capture in the system is incomplete.

Less suitable activities

THE THIRD WAY may be excessive for simple processes, with low risk, reduced variation, and minor consequences. Not every task list needs to be turned into a doctrinal system. Likewise, it is not suitable for areas of free creation where the main value is individual expression rather than compliance. Finally, it is not suitable where the organization does not accept formalization, traceability, and decisional discipline. Without this minimal culture, the concept turns into a sophisticated form without substance.

Part IV: General model of the elements composing THE THIRD WAY

Human vision as the point of origin

The first element is human vision. The human defines what problem must be solved, what kind of organization is desired, which risks are acceptable, which values cannot be sacrificed, and what type of control is legitimate. Without this point of origin, AI can produce a formally coherent model, lacking strategic fidelity.

Human vision is not a mere preference. It establishes the selection criteria for everything that follows: which situations matter, which risks are relevant, what compliance means, what level of speed is necessary, and what form of responsibility is acceptable.

AI as doctrinal amplifier, not as sovereign author

The second element is AI used as a doctrinal amplifier. Its role is to help transform the vision into a system skeleton. AI can propose classifications, inventory scenarios, compare variants, signal contradictions, and formulate first versions of the rules.

These contributions, however, are not doctrine by the mere fact of being generated. They become relevant only after human critique, revision, selection, and recording. AI has great exploratory power, but does not, in itself, have doctrinal authority.

AI must also be used through its limits. A mature collaboration does not ask AI to appear infallible. On the contrary, it asks it to expose its uncertainties, assumptions, areas of incomplete context, and possible interpretation risks. These declared self-limitations become working material for the doctrine.

In rem inventorying of situations

The third element is in rem inventorying of situations. This expression is inspired by analogy with legal and administrative language. In Latin, “in rem” means “with regard to the thing,” to the object, or to the state of facts itself, in contrast with “in personam,” which concerns the person.

In THE THIRD WAY, in rem inventorying is not an investigation of guilt and not an assignment of personal responsibility. It is the process by which the system maps the objective states of facts of operational reality, independently of the persons involved, of contextual interpretations, or of the premature need to identify a responsible party.

Proposed definition:

In rem inventorying of situations is the process by which the application, with doctrinal assistance from the human–AI tandem, maps the objective states of facts of operational reality, independently of the persons involved, of culpabilities, or of contextual interpretations. It aims to identify, classify, and stabilize situations as objects of management, risk, and control, before the system moves on to the attribution of responsibilities, alerts, rules, or solutions.

This inventorying has four fundamental functions.

Objective focus

The analysis concentrates on the situation, object, process, risk, document, status, or state of facts. The initial question is not “who made a mistake?” but “what exists in reality?”. This inversion is decisive. It reduces defensive tension, increases the quality of audit, and allows the application to work with stable operational objects.

Example: one does not begin by identifying the person who managed an activity, but with the objective state of that activity: missing documents, overdue deadline, unclosed alert, incoherent status, logistical risk, approval blockage, or unavailable resource.

Mapping of material and operational reality

In rem inventorying creates a map of the organizational reality. This map must be consultable by the relevant actors and must remain valid regardless of changes in personnel. It does not describe impressions, but formalized situations.

By analogy with the general opposability of in rem rights, a situation inventoried in rem acquires the value of a common reference. It becomes an operational object recognized in the system. It does not depend on the memory of an operator, the opinion of a person, or the context of a conversation.

Depersonalization of analysis and neutrality

In rem inventorying is a protection against the premature personalization of problems. Before liability there is the state of facts. Before sanction there is classification. Before decision there is neutral description.

This neutrality does not exclude responsibility. It only postpones it until the situation is sufficiently clear. The system does not confuse the capture of a vulnerability with the accusation of an actor. This separation is essential for mature risk management.

Rigorous structure and classification

Situations inventoried in rem are not merely enumerated. They are classified according to objective criteria: typology, impact, urgency, severity, affected domain, rules under tension, current status, possible evolution, and relationship with other situations. The aim is the transition from fluid perceptions to stable registers.

In rem inventorying is not chaotic exhaustiveness. It is ordering. It does not seek to produce an infinite list, but to create a system for recognizing operational reality.

From in rem inventorying to responsibility

The initial depersonalization does not mean the absence of responsibility. On the contrary, it makes responsibility more correct. A responsibility attributed before the state of facts is clarified is fragile, conflictual, and often unjust. A responsibility attributed after in rem inventorying is more solid.

The correct path is:

1. Capture of the state of facts.
2. Stabilization of the situation as an operational object.
3. Classification of the situation.
4. Identification of applicable rules.

5. Determination of the formal responsible party.
6. Triggering of the alert, escalation, or solution.
7. Auditing of the result.

This order protects the system from two errors: the premature hunt for culprits and the final absence of responsibility.

Rigorous formalization

The fourth element is formalization. An inventoried situation does not become operable until it is translated into explicit elements: definition, trigger, conditions, responsible role, status, rule, alert, automation, escalation, anticipated solution, and closure criterion.

Formalization is the transition from language to system. It transforms the vision into elements that the application can interpret, display, verify, execute, or audit. In THE THIRD WAY, formalization is not a bureaucratic act, but the condition of operational existence. What is not formally recorded does not exist operationally.

Alerts, rules, and automations

The fifth element is the design of execution mechanisms. Alerts, rules, and automations are the application-level expression of the doctrine. They must be built in a differentiated way, not uniformly.

An alert must have source, trigger, severity, recipient, deadline, required action, and closure condition. A rule must have a scope of application, activation conditions, effect, allowed exceptions, and relation to other rules. An automation must have a competence limit, execution log, stopping conditions, and an escalation mechanism.

In this logic, automation is not an objective in itself. Automation is permitted where the rule is sufficiently stable, the risk is calibrated, and the consequences are controllable. Where uncertainty remains large, the system must not automate the decision, but rather automate signaling, documentation, escalation, or the preparation of options.

Anticipation of solutions

The sixth element is the anticipation of solutions. For each relevant family of situations, the system must define possible responses before the moment of crisis. These responses may be standard procedures, playbooks, escalation paths, preventive blocks, remediations, communications, approval requests, or automatic actions.

Anticipation does not mean rigidifying all decisions. It means reducing uncontrolled improvisation. A critical situation must not find the organization in a state of having to invent from scratch. The system must offer permitted paths, clear responsibilities, and selection criteria.

The 11 principles of governance

THE THIRD WAY is governed by a set of principles ensuring its stability and limits.

Principle	Role in THE THIRD WAY	Operational interpretation
Predictability	Stabilizes execution	Results must be consistent regardless of operator or similar context.
Traceability	Makes the system auditable	Each decision, transformation, and artifact must have source and history.
Discipline and control	Prevents improvisation	Rules prevail over the unescalated individual exception.
Optimization and economy	Prevents over-processing	Resources are allocated in proportion to actual risk.
Early-Warning reactivity	Shifts attention ahead of crisis	Early signals become a doctrinal object, not just late observations.
Formalization	Creates operational existence	What is not formally recorded does not exist operationally.
Modeling and remodeling	Allows controlled adaptation	The standard is changed through recorded decisions, not through silent practice.
Uniqueness of responsibility	Eliminates ambiguity	A single formal responsibility must be identifiable for each activity.
Separation of identity domains	Protects the role architecture	Contractual, operational, and control identities are not confused.
Permanent compensatory attention	Covers non-automated areas	Active human vigilance remains necessary where automation does not reach.
Inter-modular non-retroactivity	Protects system stability	A module does not tacitly invalidate the outputs of another module; corrections are made only through explicit procedure.

The reflexive engine: doctrinal decisions on development and implementation

The seventh element is the reflexive engine. An application built on THE THIRD WAY does not have only operational rules. It also has rules about how rules are born, validated, modified, and implemented.

This reflexive engine is based on three sources:

- **Vigilant human observations:** the human detects tensions, unclear zones, unwanted effects, inconsistencies, or risks that have not been formalized.

- **AI's self-declared limitations:** AI must also be used through what it acknowledges it cannot guarantee: complete memory, contextual stability, institutional discernment, real responsibility.
- **Serene and constructive human-AI collaboration:** errors and limits are not hidden, but transformed into development decisions, doctrinal adjustments, and control mechanisms.

This component is essential because it protects THE THIRD WAY from its own success. A coherent system can become dogmatic. A formalized system can become rigid. An efficient system can begin to ignore rare cases. The reflexive engine obliges the doctrine to remain alive, yet governed.

Logical architecture of the model

The general model can be described through the following chain:

Level	Central question	Dominant actor	Main output
Vision	What do we want to obtain and what risk do we accept?	Human	Doctrinal intent
In rem observation	What state of facts exists?	Human + application + auxiliary AI	Neutral map of situations
Exploration	What situations can exist?	Human + AI	Extended inventory and taxonomy
Formalization	How do situations become operable?	Human + AI	Rules, alerts, statuses
Anticipation	What responses are permitted?	Human + AI	Playbooks and solutions
Implementation	How does the application execute the doctrine?	The application	Automations, workflows, logs
Control	How do we know what happened?	Application + human	Traceability and audit
Remodeling	How does the system learn without drift?	Human + AI	New doctrinal decisions
Cognitive growth	How does the organization become more intelligent?	All actors	Enhanced capacity for operational thinking

Part V: Methodology for implementing THE THIRD WAY

Methodological principles

The implementation of THE THIRD WAY must avoid two risks. The first is the rush to build screens before doctrine. The second is the endless postponement of the application in the name of a perfect doctrine. The correct methodology is iterative: enough doctrine to build a functional slice, enough application to test the doctrine, enough audit to correct both.

The proposed methodology has ten stages.

Stage of domain delimitation

The first stage establishes the exact domain of application. One does not begin with the question “what features do we want?”, but with the question “what processes do we want to govern?”. The domain must be delimited by objectives, risks, actors, responsibilities, types of events, and modular boundaries.

Recommended deliverables:

- **Domain sheet:** describes the process or family of processes.
- **Initial risk map:** identifies the areas where error produces consequences.
- **List of preliminary roles:** separates contractual, operational, and control roles.
- **System boundaries:** defines what falls inside and what falls outside the application.

Stage of doctrinal vision

The second stage formulates the human vision. Here AI can assist with structuring, but must not substitute for the decision of meaning. The human must establish the system’s purpose: what constitutes a correct process, what constitutes a deviation, what constitutes a risk, what must not be permitted, and what must be escalated.

Key questions:

- What kind of operational behavior must the system produce?
- Which forms of improvisation are acceptable, and which are forbidden?
- Which risks must be reduced as a priority?
- What must always be traceable?
- What cannot be automated without control?
- What cognitive capacities must the system develop in people?

Stage of in rem inventorying

The third stage inventories situations as objective states of facts. AI is used intensively to extend the field of scenarios and propose classification criteria, but the human decides the status of each scenario. The result must not be a raw list, but a depersonalized operational taxonomy.

The methodological principle is simple: the situation is recorded first, not the person. The person, the role, the responsibility, and any consequences appear later, after the operational object is stabilized.

Recommended classifications:

- **Normal situations:** standard, expected, repetitive cases.
- **Atypical situations:** deviations that are not necessarily critical.
- **Unwanted situations:** events with clear negative impact.
- **Critical situations:** events with high risk, systemic effect, or urgency.
- **Impossible but doctrinally useful situations:** test cases for limits, blockages, and prohibitions.
- **Compound situations:** combinations of risks that, taken separately, seem small, but together become relevant.
- **Situations of structural unclarity:** cases in which the real problem is the absence of a clear rule or responsibility.

For each situation, the following sheet is recommended:

Field	Description
Situation code	Unique identifier
Name	Short and clear formulation
State of facts	Objective, depersonalized description
Family	Normal, atypical, unwanted, critical, impossible, compound, structural unclarity
Affected object	Process, document, deadline, resource, status, risk, artifact
Trigger	What makes the situation observable
Early signals	Indicators preceding the occurrence of the effect
Associated risk	What may happen if no intervention occurs
Urgency level	Time available for reaction
Affected rules	Which rules are activated or placed under tension
Missing data	What information is missing for clarification
Subsequent	Who may become responsible after classification

responsible role

Anticipated response What course of action is permitted

Closure criterion How the situation is considered resolved

Stage of taxonomy and normalization

The fourth stage normalizes the inventoried situations. Similar situations must be grouped. Names must be stabilized. Categories must be cleared of overlaps. Here AI can help detect redundancies, but the taxonomy decision belongs to the doctrine.

Recommended deliverables:

- **Catalog of types of situations:** canonical names and definitions.
- **Dictionary of operational terms:** ambiguous terms are clarified.
- **Situation–risk matrix:** each family of situations is linked to possible risks.
- **Situation–rule matrix:** each situation is linked to the rules that govern it.

Stage of formalization

The fifth stage transforms the taxonomy into mechanisms. Each relevant situation must be translated into rules, alerts, statuses, responsibilities, and possibly automations. This is the stage in which the doctrine begins to become application architecture.

Recommended deliverables:

- **Rule register:** each rule has a code, scope, conditions, effects, exceptions, and relationships.
- **Alert register:** each alert has a trigger, severity, recipient, and SLA.
- **Status register:** each operational object has permitted states and transitions.
- **RACI matrix or functional equivalent:** clear responsibilities for activities.
- **Escalation policy:** conditions under which a situation moves up the control level.

Stage of solution anticipation

The sixth stage defines the possible responses. Each relevant situation must have at least one response path: automatic resolution, notification, escalation, blocking, information request, human approval, or incident opening.

Solutions must be grouped into levels:

- **Automated solutions:** permitted only for stable cases, with controlled risk.

- **Guided solutions:** the application proposes the steps, the human executes or confirms.
- **Escalated solutions:** the case is transmitted to a higher or specialized role.
- **Blocking solutions:** the system halts progress until clarification.
- **Remodeling solutions:** the case indicates a doctrinal gap and triggers revision.

Stage of application design

The seventh stage transforms the mechanisms into modules, screens, workflows, databases, and APIs. Here, contamination between doctrine and interface must be avoided. The interface is important, but is not the source of the doctrine. It must express the doctrine already formalized.

Design principles:

- **Each screen must correspond to a real operational need.**
- **Each important action must leave a trace.**
- **Each automation must have activation and stopping conditions.**
- **Each alert must have a responsible party and a deadline.**
- **Each exception must be visible as an exception, not hidden in the normal flow.**
- **Each situation must first be viewable in rem, before the assignment of personal responsibility.**

Stage of incremental implementation

The eighth stage builds the application incrementally. It is not recommended to implement the entire system before testing the first doctrinal mechanisms. A vertical slice containing all the levels is preferable: situation, rule, alert, responsible party, action, log, audit, and possibly revision.

A minimal vertical slice should demonstrate:

- capture of a situation;
- its in rem description;
- its classification;
- the triggering of a rule;
- the generation of an alert;
- the assignment of a responsibility;

- the execution of an action;
- the recording of the result;
- the possibility of audit;
- the identification of any need for remodeling.

Stage of formative operation

The ninth stage concerns how the application is actually used by people. Operation is not just technical exploitation. It is also a formative process. Users must understand why the system requires certain fields, why it separates the state of facts from responsibility, why it escalates certain exceptions, and why it does not allow silent improvisation.

Recommended deliverables:

- **Internal operations manual:** explains not just the steps, but their rationale.
- **Alert interpretation guide:** clarifies severities, deadlines, and responses.
- **In rem recording guide:** instructs operators to describe states of facts, not accusations.
- **Journal of cognitive difficulties:** notes where users get stuck, confuse terms, or request clarifications.

Stage of audit and remodeling

The tenth stage verifies whether the system functions according to the doctrine, and whether the doctrine remains adequate to reality. Audit must not be an exceptional activity, but part of the system. Every incident, deviation, blockage, or tension can become a source of improvement.

Types of audit:

- **Compliance audit:** checks whether the rules have been observed.
- **Traceability audit:** checks whether the history can be reconstituted.
- **Efficiency audit:** checks whether the system over-processes or under-processes.
- **Risk audit:** checks whether early signals have been detected.
- **Doctrinal audit:** checks whether the rule itself is still correct.
- **Cognitive audit:** checks whether the system increases or diminishes people's capacity to understand the processes.

The implementation cycle

The methodology can be summarized through the following cycle:

1. Domain delimitation.
2. Formulation of human vision.
3. In rem inventorying assisted by AI.
4. Taxonomy and normalization.
5. Formalization into rules, alerts, and responsibilities.
6. Anticipation of solutions.
7. Application design.
8. Incremental implementation.
9. Formative operation.
10. Operational, doctrinal, and cognitive audit.
11. Remodeling decision.
12. Controlled forward propagation.

Part VI: Risks of THE THIRD WAY and protection mechanisms

The risk of an overly ambitious doctrine

A major risk is the desire to inventory and formalize everything before any implementation. This can produce paralysis. The protection lies in delimitation, prioritization, and incremental implementation. One does not formalize the entire universe, but first the processes with high risk and high value.

The risk of false exhaustiveness

AI-assisted inventorying can give the impression that all situations have been covered. This impression is false. AI can massively extend the field of scenarios, but cannot guarantee exhaustiveness. The protection lies in recurrent audit, mechanisms for capturing new situations, and explicit status for the unknown.

The risk of confusing in rem with the absence of accountability

In rem inventorying may be misunderstood as the avoidance of responsibility. That would be a serious distortion. Its purpose is not to eliminate liability, but to place it on a clear factual basis. The protection lies in the explicit path from state of facts to classification, from classification to rule, from rule to formal responsible party.

The risk of rigidification

Formalization can transform the system into a rigid machine. The protection lies in modeling and remodeling through recorded decisions. The standard must be stable, but not frozen.

The risk of excessive automation

There is a temptation to automate everything that can be described. This is dangerous. Automation must be proportional to the maturity of the rule and the level of risk. Where the risk is high or the context unstable, the system must automate the alert, not the final decision.

The risk of doctrinal dependence on AI

AI can become too convincing. It can produce coherent texts, elegant taxonomies, and plausible solutions. The protection lies in human responsibility over the vision, in documentary re-anchoring, in explicit decisions, and in accepting AI's self-declared limits.

The risk of disguised cognitive diminishment

Even THE THIRD WAY can degenerate if people begin to use AI in order to avoid thinking, rather than to amplify it. The protection lies in the requirement that AI produce variants, questions, contradictions, and hypotheses, not simply final answers. The human must remain an active participant in the formulation of the problem and in the validation of meaning.

The risk of uncontrolled retroactivity

Changing a rule in one module can affect the interpretation of previous outputs of another module. The protection lies in inter-modular non-retroactivity, understood not as an absolute prohibition of correction, but as a prohibition of silent invalidation. Retroactive corrections must be possible only through audit, explicit decision, and impact marking.

Part VII: Maturity criteria

An organization or application can be considered close to THE THIRD WAY if it meets the following criteria:

Level	Criterion	Verification question
Doctrinal	Explicit human vision exists	Is it clear what kind of operational behavior we want?
In rem	Situations are described in depersonalized form	Can the state of facts be recorded before the attribution of responsibility?
Exploratory	Situations are systematically inventoried	Are normal, atypical, unwanted, and critical cases covered?
Taxonomic	Situations are classified	Are there stable families, types, and criteria

Formal	stably Rules are recorded	of differentiation? Are there registers of rules, alerts, statuses, and responsibilities?
Applicative	The application executes the doctrine	Do the screens and workflows express rules, not improvisations?
Operational	Alerts and escalations function	Does the system react before the risk becomes a crisis?
Auditable	History can be reconstituted	Can one find out who did what, when, why, and on the basis of which rule?
Adaptive	The standard can be remodeled	Is there a formal mechanism for changing the doctrine?
Reflexive	AI and human correct their method	Are limits, errors, and tensions transformed into decisions?
Cognitive	People become more competent	Does the system increase understanding, not just execution speed?

Proposed maturity levels

Level	Name	Description
0	Fragmentary automation	Tools exist, but there is no unifying doctrine.
1	Classical proceduralization	Rules and workflows exist, but with little capacity for adaptation and learning.
2	AI-assisted doctrine	AI helps with formulation, but the application does not yet fully execute the doctrine.
3	Executable doctrine	Rules, alerts, statuses, and responsibilities are coherently implemented.
4	Governed learning	Audit and real experience produce recorded remodelings.
5	Organizational cognitive growth	The system develops people's capacity to think about and conduct complex processes.

Part VIII: Condensed doctrinal formulation

THE THIRD WAY is the path by which complex applications neither surrender to AI nor refuse its power. The human formulates the vision, AI extends the field of situations and accelerates formalization, and the application executes through explicit rules, alerts, responsibilities, and controlled automations.

It applies to processes in which speed, compliance, risk, and adaptation must coexist. It requires the in rem inventorying of situations, their formalization into application-level mechanisms, the anticipation of solutions, and a continuous discipline of audit and remodeling. In this model, learning is permitted, but not tacit; automation is desired, but

not unlimited; AI is used intensively, but not as sovereign; the human leads the vision, but is not left alone in the face of complexity.

The shortest formula is:

THE THIRD WAY is the doctrine by which the human does not cede the seat of decision, AI is not excluded from the construction of the system's intelligence, and the application becomes the executable environment of a clearer, more disciplined, and more living organizational thinking.

Proposal for next steps

To transform this manual from an informational document into a doctrinal component for the development of a specific application, the following steps are recommended:

1. Establishing an operational, doctrinal, and cognitive audit mechanism for this concept.
2. Transforming the 11 principles into an official set of governing principles.
3. Defining an official sheet template for in rem situations.
4. Defining an official register template for rules, alerts, and anticipated solutions.
5. Selecting a process intended to be operated within the future application, for the pilot application of the methodology.

Conclusion

THE THIRD WAY is not an isolated technical solution. It is a philosophy of institutional design transposed into application form. It requires rigor, patience, discipline, and genuine collaboration between human and AI. But precisely this collaboration can produce a rarer type of application: one that does not merely store data and does not merely automate steps, but embodies an operational doctrine, makes it executable, and keeps it alive through governed learning.

In this perspective, such an application conceived under this concept can become not just a web application, but a model for the mature use of AI in complex operational systems: without abandoning human responsibility, without the illusion of classical software neutrality, and without the uncontrolled transfer of decision-making to the machine.

Furthermore, any application that adopts THE THIRD WAY can become an environment in which people learn to think better precisely because they work with AI without abdicating before it. This is the highest stake: not only the protection of decision, but also the growth of the mind that decides.