



Global Integrated Care
International

A senior entrepreneur started with a question about care.

It led to a much bigger question about AI:

**Who should have the authority to decide
when an AI-enabled service is ready
to affect people's lives?**



MEDIA BRIEFING

Who Should Have Authority Over AI When Human Lives Are Involved?

Global Integrated Care International (GIC) - Ottawa, Canada | September 2026

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Who gets to say that an AI-enabled system is ready to affect a human life - the company that built it, the AI itself, independent researchers, governments, or a governed combination of them?

General media background and source guide
For independent examination, challenge and reporting.

1. THE STORY IN BRIEF

Global Integrated Care International (GIC) is an Ottawa-based, Canadian-incorporated commercial company developing AI-enabled approaches to care navigation and communication. Its work began with a practical care question and developed into a broader governance question: should the organization building and commercially operating an AI-enabled system also be the only institution deciding whether that system is ready for consequential deployment?

GIC's answer is no. The developing **Tri-Alliance governance architecture** is intended to separate commercial development from independent research and evaluation, and from governmental institutional review and determination.

Status note for journalists: CON1 and CON2 are proposed components of the developing Tri-Alliance governance architecture. Applications for participation are open. Participation, governmental endorsement, institutional determination, or formal affiliation should not be inferred unless independently confirmed.

Huibert H.W. Arnold, President and Founder of GIC, began with the problem of helping people seeking care and the professionals and organizations providing it communicate and navigate services more effectively. That work produced the service-seeker and provider-facing environments known as **Heather** and **Mary**.

As increasingly capable AI became available, the central problem changed. The question was no longer only what AI could do, but **who should possess authority around what it is permitted to do**, who should independently challenge the system, and what should count as evidence that an action actually occurred.

AI CAPABILITY IS NOT AI AUTHORITY.

GIC is therefore developing an institutional architecture in which commercial ownership, independent evaluation and governmental determination are deliberately separated rather than collapsed into the developer.

The proposed constitutional operating sequence is:

GIC PRESENTS	CON2 EVALUATES & SUBMITS	CON1 REVIEWS & DETERMINES	GIC DECIDES WHETHER / HOW TO COMMERCIALY DEPLOY
-------------------------	---	--	--

No CON2 submission means no CON1 review. A CON2 submission is not itself an endorsement. Institutional determination is intended to occur through the Charter-governed CON1 process, while the final decision whether and how GIC commercially deploys remains with GIC.

CON2 - Research & Evaluation Consortium

CON2 is being designed so qualified outside participants can independently **research, challenge, test and evaluate** qualifying GIC systems and service modules. Its purpose is not to validate GIC automatically. Participants must remain free to identify weaknesses, risks, alternatives, dissent and unresolved questions - including telling GIC when they believe it is wrong.

CON1 - Governmental Review Consortium

CON1 is being designed as a separate route for governmental and institutional review and determination of qualifying material that has first passed through CON2. It is not intended to operate GIC or replace the independent research and evaluation function of CON2.

2. WHY THE GOVERNANCE QUESTION MATTERS

As AI systems move beyond generating answers toward initiating, recommending or facilitating consequential actions, fluent language can create a dangerous illusion: a model can say something happened without possessing independent evidence that it actually happened.

The developing GIC architecture therefore separates institutional accountability from operational-state integrity.

Institutional Accountability

CAPABILITY	AUTHORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	ACCOUNTABILITY
------------	-----------	----------------	----------------

Operational-State Integrity

REQUESTED	AUTHORIZED	ATTEMPTED	CONFIRMED
-----------	------------	-----------	-----------

The operational principle is straightforward: **AI-generated language alone must not create operational reality.** A model's statement that an action was completed is not, by itself, execution evidence. Confirmation must come from the authorized execution layer or other governed source of confirmation.

Likewise, no AI model should be the final authority for its own authorization, scope, monitoring, escalation or continued operation. AI can contribute intelligence, analysis and interaction; governance authority must remain externally defined and accountable.

Evidence informs a determination. Evidence does not itself constitute the determination.

The distinction is intentionally uncomfortable for the developer. If independent evaluation is meaningful, it must be capable of producing disagreement, conditions, criticism or a conclusion that a proposed system should not proceed through the governance pathway.

The immediate application is care. The underlying governance question extends to any field in which AI-generated decisions or actions can materially affect people, institutions or public interests.

3. WHAT JOURNALISTS CAN EXAMINE

GIC is not asking journalists to accept a claim of safety, endorsement or institutional success. The public material below is offered for examination, challenge and independent reporting.

Our Story

https://globalintegrated.care/GIC_Our_Story_LinkedIn.pdf

The human and institutional narrative: how a care project developed into a question about authority over AI.

Executive Demonstration v.2 - Purpose, Architecture & Evidence

<https://globalintegrated.care/executive-demonstration33.html>

Public demonstration environment presenting the governance architecture, Heather and Mary, and the accountability and operational-state distinctions.

Applications Now Open - CON1 / CON2

<https://globalintegrated.care/applications-now-open.html>

The two proposed participation routes and the constitutional relationship between independent evaluation and governmental review. Initial application deadline: **October 15, 2026**.

Governance Portal

https://globalintegrated.care/governance_portal.html

The broader public governance environment and supporting materials.

Questions worth investigating

1. Can a commercial AI developer create genuinely independent mechanisms capable of challenging its own systems?
2. What authority should remain outside an AI model as agentic capabilities expand?
3. What evidence should be required before an AI-related action can be treated as completed?
4. How should research evaluation and governmental determination be separated?
5. Can such an architecture operate internationally without becoming subordinate to one government, corporation, jurisdiction or AI provider?

GIC is a for-profit commercial enterprise. The proposed governance architecture is intended to preserve that commercial reality while creating independent scrutiny and plural institutional participation. Participation does not imply ownership of GIC, operational control of GIC, endorsement of GIC, or responsibility for GIC's commercial operations.

4. THE HUMAN DOORWAY

At 83, Arnold says questions about ageing and care are no longer abstract. Yet the project's central question now extends far beyond ageing:

As artificial intelligence becomes capable of doing more than answering questions, who should retain the authority surrounding what it is permitted to do?

GIC's proposed answer is not that governments should run the company, that researchers should run the company, or that an AI model should govern itself. It is an attempt to create **separation of functions**: the commercial developer presents; independent evaluators examine and challenge; governmental participants review qualifying submissions and make institutional determinations under the developing Charter; and the company retains responsibility for whether and how it commercially deploys.

The architecture is still developing. The **Tri-Alliance Founding Charter v2.0** is under preparation, and the detailed participation and governance instruments will continue to define the boundaries, procedures and responsibilities of the proposed institutions.

For that reason, the invitation to journalists is intentionally not an invitation to repeat GIC's claims. It is an invitation to test them.

EXAMINE IT. CHALLENGE IT. DECIDE WHETHER IT IS A STORY.

MEDIA CONTACT

Huibert H.W. Arnold

President & Founder

Global Integrated Care International (GIC)

Ottawa, Canada

president@globalintegrated.care

<https://globalintegrated.care>

Document date: September 22, 2026

Purpose: General media background and source guide. Journalists should independently verify claims, institutional status and external participation before publication.