



THE ENOCH MODEL

A Consulting Methodology for Technology That Honors the Human Person

33 Consulting · Jonathan Alan Simmons
a division of 33 Holding Group, Inc. · Version 1.0 · May 2026

THE NAME

Walking With

Enoch walked with God. Genesis 5:24 gives us the whole description. Not "worked for." Not "served at appointed times." Walked with. Present. Accompanying. Continuous.

This is the posture of the methodology. Not the consultant who arrives, imposes a framework, and leaves. The one who walks alongside — through the audit, through the hard truths, through the build, through the governance. Enoch is also cited in Jude as a truth-teller: someone who said what was true regardless of what it cost him.

The name is not incidental. It is the operating principle.

THE FOUNDING PRINCIPLE

Dignity Is First

Dignity is first. Not efficiency. Not speed. Not the number at the bottom of the ROI model. The person in the system — your customer, your employee, your patient, your investor — bears an infinite dignity that no algorithm can price and no data set can capture.

Pope Leo XIV formalized this in May 2026. Article 82 of Magnifica Humanitas states that human dignity "cannot be reduced to data or algorithmic optimization." We built our architecture around that principle before the encyclical required it. The confirmation was not surprising. It was the point.

HOW WE WORK

The Commitment

We start with the end in mind. Not the end you walked in with — the end the work actually requires. We will tell you the honest truth about the gap between those two things, no matter what it costs us to say it. If the architecture is wrong, we will say so. If the numbers don't hold, we will say so. If the direction needs to change, we will say so — and we will change it with you.

We are detailed. The gap between a system that works and one that fails is almost always in the specifics that nobody wanted to spend time on. We spend time on them.

We are willing to revise the end as the model gets flushed out. We will not revise our commitment to the person in the system or our commitment to telling you what is true.

THE FIRST QUESTION

Babel or Jerusalem

Before any recommendation — any vendor, any platform, any line of code — one diagnostic question is answered:

Is this a Babel project or a Jerusalem project?

Babel is built top-down, for scale, for uniformity, without asking what it does to the people inside it. Looks like progress. Breaks under its own weight.

Jerusalem is built from the ground up, for the people who will actually live inside it, with accountability distributed rather than concentrated. Slower to build. Holds.

The answer shapes everything that follows.

Source: Magnifica Humanitas, Art. 7–10, 16 · Pope Leo XIV, May 2026

The Enoch Model

Each phase produces a living .md file the client owns and maintains after the engagement ends. The methodology builds capability, not dependency.

PHASE 0

INTAKE

One conversation before the engagement begins. Is this organization ready to hear a hard audit? Who owns the decision to act? What is the presenting problem versus the real problem?

Deliverable: INTAKE.md — presenting problem, real problem, named decision-maker, scope, decision to proceed.

Stakeholders: CEO or equivalent. Named decision-maker.

Inputs: Nothing. This is where fit is determined.

PHASE 1

EXAMINE THE WALLS

Full audit: what AI is deployed — officially and unofficially — what data is collected and where it flows, who is affected, regulatory exposure (GDPR, EU AI Act, Colorado AI Act, HIPAA), human impact. The Babel/Jerusalem verdict — named, not hedged.

Deliverable: AUDIT.md — current state, gap analysis, regulatory exposure, human impact, verdict. VISION.md — what this organization's relationship with technology looks like when it is working correctly.

Stakeholders: CEO, CTO, Legal, HR, at least one frontline user.

Inputs: AI vendor contracts. Data governance documentation. System access. Prior audits.

PHASE 2

ESTABLISH THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLES

From the audit, identify which principles govern this engagement — not all of them, the specific ones. Each maps to a design constraint. Not a values exercise. An architecture specification.

Deliverable: PRINCIPLES.md — governing principles, non-negotiables register, risk register (named consequences, not abstract risk).

Stakeholders: CEO or mission authority. Technology decision owner. Legal. Not a committee.

Inputs: AUDIT.md, VISION.md. Founding documents — the original, not the marketing version.

PHASE 3

DESIGN THE ARCHITECTURE

One recommendation, not three options. The design comes from the governing principles, not the other way around.

Deliverable: ARCHITECTURE.md — technical specification, data flows, human oversight points, compliance mapping, implementation phasing, and what the system cannot do.

Stakeholders: CTO or technical lead. Legal. CEO. Vendor technical lead if applicable.

Inputs: AUDIT.md, VISION.md, PRINCIPLES.md. Current technical stack. Honest budget and timeline.

PHASE 4

BUILD AND VERIFY

At every milestone: does this do what it is supposed to do for the person it is supposed to serve? Not "does it pass the tests." Whether the system honors its design intent.

Deliverable: BUILD_LOG.md — milestone verifications with named sign-offs against ARCHITECTURE.md, PRINCIPLES.md, and human impact.

Stakeholders: Engineering lead. Project owner. An outside voice at each verification point.

Inputs: ARCHITECTURE.md as the reference. Access to the actual build.

PHASE 5

GOVERN CONTINUOUSLY

The accountability structure that makes the other four hold. Named owner — not a committee — with quarterly and annual cadence and a trigger mechanism for emergency review.

Deliverable: GOVERNANCE.md — charter, named owner, review cadence, triggers. STATUS.md — living document: current phase, active items, blocked items.

Stakeholders: Named owner inside the organization. Accountability partner outside — ideally on retainer.

Inputs: ARCHITECTURE.md as baseline. Prior BUILD_LOG.md entries. Regulatory monitoring.

DOCUMENT GOVERNANCE

The .md File Structure

Every engagement produces and maintains a living set of version-controlled files. The client ends the engagement with a repository they own and can maintain independently.

FILE	PHASE	CONTENTS
INTAKE.md	0	Presenting problem, real problem, scope, decision to proceed
AUDIT.md	1	Current state, gaps, regulatory exposure, human impact, verdict
VISION.md	1 bridge	What it looks like when it is working correctly
PRINCIPLES.md	2	Governing principles, non-negotiables, risk register
ARCHITECTURE.md	3	Technical specification, data flows, compliance mapping
BUILD_LOG.md	4	Milestone verifications, named sign-offs, drift flags
GOVERNANCE.md	5	Charter, named owner, review cadence, triggers
STATUS.md	Living	Current phase, active items, blocked items, next action

THE STANDARD THAT DOES NOT MOVE

At every phase, one test: does this honor the dignity of the person in the system, or does it consume them?

That question is not soft. Applied honestly, it kills bad architectures before they are built. It stops scope creep toward surveillance. It gives the client a standard they can use to evaluate their own system after we are gone.

We are not willing to revise that standard. Everything else is negotiable.

Nehemiah did not build Jerusalem by imposing a plan. He prayed, planned wisely, placed God first and the human person at the center — and the rejected stones became cornerstones.

That is the methodology.



33 Consulting · a division of 33 Holding Group, Inc.
2121 S. Broadway, #511 · Denver, CO 80210
jon@enochcap.com · 720-360-5015 · 33-holding.com/consulting
USP 11,042,641 · USP 11,151,254