

Formación Integral 3.0 — Integral Learning 3.0

Human-AI learning, tacit knowledge transmission and cross-context experimentation

In one sentence: Formación Integral 3.0 asks how trusted masters, younger practitioners and AI can learn and execute together so that knowledge and capability can travel from communities to the world - with real human learning, portable context, explicit permissions and verifiable outputs.

Who we are - and why this exists

This note is prepared by Tegrity.ai, a group within The Integral Management Society, a small Swiss non-profit association that carries forward the communities of practice from which it emerged. The Association is safeguarding, documenting and internationally representing master-apprentice communities of practice legally organized since 1898. These local communities, now projected internationally, combine innovation with the preservation of craft, judgement and local knowledge through learning by doing.

From Formación Integral 1.0 to 3.0

For us, this master-apprentice and community-of-practice learning model is Formación Integral 1.0. This form of integral, holistic learning was later recognized by UNESCO in the wider Totonacapan ecosystem.

In 2005, we launched Formación Integral 2.0* (Integral Learning 2.0), a programme for a region where household Internet access and computers were scarce. It worked through three connected pillars: sharing scarce devices and connectivity through cyber-schools; building on existing community and trust networks by preparing teachers, cyber-school operators, adults and trainers; and turning potentially harmful or unproductive internet-café use - including excessive time on emerging social networks and access to pornography - into practical learning. Some of the young people who learned through the programme were later hired by international companies for subsequent projects in the region.

Formación Integral 3.0 carries these same pillars into the AI era: personalized resources without dependence on expensive online models, working through existing community networks of trust, and human competence demonstrated in practice. Whereas Formación Integral 2.0 brought knowledge from the world to the region, Formación Integral 3.0 enables tacit and ancestral knowledge from communities to reach the world—and tests whether AI can truly understand and transmit it without losing its cultural meaning.

* Formación Integral 2.0 was developed in collaboration with a former Nokia Information Management group.

FORMACIÓN INTEGRAL 2.0
WORLD → REGION

FORMACIÓN INTEGRAL 3.0
REGION → WORLD

How Formación Integral 3.0 works

Architecture axis	What it means	Why it matters
1. Share scarce resources; preserve personalized learning	In 2.0, cyber-schools made personalized support possible despite scarce computers and connectivity. In 3.0, portable context and instructions allow a practitioner to continue a personalized learning path without depending on continuous access to the most expensive online resources.	The same principle applies: personalization must work within limited resources rather than depend on the largest models or permanent high-cost connectivity.
2. Follow community trust networks; train the trainer	In both 2.0 and 3.0, the programme follows the community's existing networks of trust and trains practitioners who can help others learn.	AI enters through trusted people and relationships, strengthening the community's own capacity instead of bypassing it.
3. Turn access into demonstrated human competence	In 2.0, the challenge was to gain access to knowledge and turn internet-café use into learning. In 3.0, AI already provides knowledge; the challenge is to put it into practice.	Human learning is demonstrated through execution, judgement and adaptation - not by repeating information or producing prompts.

The pilot: can both a practitioner and an AI agent learn from a master?

A master or community knowledge holder demonstrates a tacit or ancestral practice. The practitioner and the AI agent learn collaboratively: the practitioner through guided practice, and the AI by observing, asking questions and organizing what is being transmitted. Their interaction helps clarify, test and retain the practice, so competence can develop faster and younger practitioners can become active participants in intergenerational cultural transmission. The community reviews what they produce together before anything is transmitted.

1. CHOOSE → The community chooses a practice and a knowledge holder.	2. AGREE → Participants agree consent, attribution and what may be shared.	3. DEMONSTRATE ↓ The master demonstrates the practice in its real context.
6. REVIEW & TRANSMIT The community reviews the result before it travels outward.	5. TEST ← The practitioner and the AI each show what they learned.	4. PRACTISE ← The practitioner performs it while the AI learns alongside.

Formación Integral 2.0 brought knowledge from the world into the region. Formación Integral 3.0 helps living knowledge from the region reach the world.

Why this is a genuine lab

This is a genuine lab because it examines how a practitioner and an AI agent can support each other in acquiring, applying and transmitting a practice. The practitioner demonstrates competence, while the AI must show whether it can understand and represent tacit or ancestral knowledge without stripping away its cultural context. The community decides what is accurate, what may be shared and what the AI has not understood.

The result can strengthen intergenerational transmission, give community knowledge new value and add real non-Anglo-Saxon cultural content to AI systems. Work on a Totonacapan practitioner census can identify knowledge holders who may wish to participate.

Why cross-context testing matters

Formación Integral 3.0 is a transferable architecture, not a fixed Totonacapan template. Cross-context testing matters because dominant AI training and design frames are often English-language and Anglo-American. Real cultural content from Totonacapan and other communities can reveal what generic systems fail to understand, preserve or transmit.

The comparative question is practical: which elements transfer well - resource-aware personalization, trusted intergenerational learning, explicit permissions and challenge-based human-AI co-learning - and which must be redesigned so that meaning, dignity and usefulness survive across languages, technologies and institutions?

Ways to participate, contribute or stay connected

- Challenge the architecture: where would it fail, exclude people or need to change?
- Share a similar case from another community, culture, language or learning network.
- Join in any useful role - practitioner, master or knowledge holder, community host, researcher, educator, technologist, reviewer, funder or connector.
- Propose a bounded cross-context challenge or comparison where genuine mutual interest exists.
- Stay in contact and follow how the lab evolves, even without joining an initial experiment.