Monocentric Relationship Management (MRM) and Mcorebrain™

Defining the Single AI Paradigm Beyond CRM

Aydin Habibi Javanbakht — Berlin, Germany

Preferred citation name: Javanbakht, A.H.
Contact: aydin.habibi@outlook.com | LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/aydin-habibi
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1371-8120
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17334762

Version 3.0 | October 2025

Abstract

This concept note formalizes Monocentric Relationship Management (MRM) as an AI-native paradigm that consolidates the entire relationship lifecycle—from acquisition to retention—under a single accountable AI controller. Unlike traditional CRM or ERP architectures that fragment responsibility across modules and departments, MRM defines a unified, policy-driven intelligence fabric where all actions are executed, audited, and continuously improved within one closed-loop system.

The Mcorebrain™—the paradigm's cognitive nucleus—interprets natural-language prompts, constructs full operational systems (logic, data models, and user interfaces), and adapts them dynamically as objectives and governance conditions evolve. The note aims to provide a bridge between academic AI governance theory and executive system design, offering a blueprint for organizations seeking AI-native governance models beyond CRM.

This version (v3.0) builds upon the foundational concept note "Monocentric Relationship Management: Defining the Single AI Paradigm Beyond CRM" (Javanbakht 2025, v2.0; DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17209903). It extends the framework through the introduction of the Mcorebrain™ as the autonomous cognitive intelligence and a prompt-driven generation model, reframing MRM as a self-building, self-governing enterprise system.

Version Lineage

Version 3.0 integrates the conceptual and governance foundations introduced in v2.0 (2025) and expands them through:

1. The introduction of Mcorebrain™, a unified AI brain that transforms user intent into executable architecture under policy constraints.

2. The definition of a prompt-driven generation loop connecting user intent, governance policy, and system execution.

3. The alignment of MRM governance with global standards such as NIST AI RMF 1.0, OECD AI Principles, ISO/IEC 42001, and GDPR.

1. Motivation and Problem

Enterprises often operate a 'tool zoo' of disconnected systems across marketing, service, compliance, and finance. This fragmentation undermines accountability, creates redundant data flows, and introduces compliance risk. MRM proposes an alternative: a single AI-governed control plane that centralizes policy, memory, and operational intelligence—bridging organizational silos and redefining relationship management as a governed control system.

2. Boundary Conditions and Principles

MRM is defined at the paradigm level—independent of vendors, technology stacks, or architectures. It is grounded in five principles: (a) unified memory combining facts and episodes; (b) explicit governance via policy-as-code; (c) human oversight and explainability; (d) continuous learning under audit; and (e) legal and ethical compliance as system primitives rather than afterthoughts.

3. Core Concept: One AI Brain called 'Mcorebrain™'

MRM reframes predictive and prescriptive AI as a control system operating in a closed loop: sense → plan → act → evaluate → learn. This loop replaces multi-system handoffs with continuous accountability. The Mcorebrain™ acts as the singular executive agent that connects enterprise data, intent, and execution under explicit governance.

3.1 The Mcorebrain™ — Core Intelligence of MRM

The Mcorebrain™ functions as the autonomous cognitive nucleus of MRM. It interprets human prompts, validates them against encoded policy constraints, and autonomously builds or reconfigures operational systems—including data models, business logic, and user interfaces. This enables organizations to design and adjust complex systems through declarative intent rather than procedural configuration.

4. Architecture Abstraction (Conceptual)

The MRM architecture comprises four layers: (a) Perception and Memory, integrating transactional and episodic context; (b) Cognition, combining planning, simulation, and critique; (c) Governance, embedding consent, policy, and audit; and (d) Actuation, interfacing with existing enterprise systems. The model is agnostic to technology and vendor boundaries, focusing instead on flow, policy enforcement, and accountability.

5. Lifecycle Coverage (End-to-End)

MRM spans the entire relationship lifecycle—awareness, onboarding, service, growth, retention, and recovery—without delegating accountability to external systems. It ensures consistent governance and measurement across all lifecycle stages while allowing AI-driven adaptation.

6. Evaluation Framework (Business, Operations, and Risk)

(1) Outcomes: quantify deltas versus baselines for key objectives (e.g., retention, case resolution, churn) using causal or off-policy designs. (2) Operations: measure end-to-end latency, throughput, and human workload changes. (3) Governance: track policy violations per 1,000 actions and human-approval rates. (4) Learning Quality: monitor calibration, drift resilience, and decision quality improvement over time.

7. Differentiation from Adjacent Ideas

AI-enhanced CRM adds local intelligence but remains modular and fragmented. Agentic orchestrations coordinate multiple bots without unified accountability. xRM expands who is managed; MRM defines how it is managed—through one cognitive controller with explicit governance and unified memory.

8. Governance and Risk Controls

Adopt recognized frameworks for AI risk management; implement policy-as-code; simulate decisions pre-deployment; monitor bias and impact; maintain immutable audit trails; and align with GDPR, NIST, OECD, and ISO/IEC AI standards. Governance and safety are built-in properties of the paradigm.

9. Limitations and Open Questions

This concept remains paradigm-level. Open research areas include: expressive and auditable policy languages; safe tool-use guarantees under distribution shift; balanced human-approval thresholds; and migration strategies for enterprises transitioning from fragmented legacy architectures.

Statement of Origination

To the best of the author's knowledge, this document is the first to define and formalize Monocentric Relationship Management as an AI-native paradigm for relationship governance and lifecycle control.

Disclaimer and Origin Statement

This note is provided for scholarly and professional discussion. It does not constitute legal advice or product guidance. Concept names are unprotected but academically attributable. Readers should cite this version (v3.0) when referencing the concept or Mcorebrain™ definition.

Citation

Javanbakht, A.H. (2025) Monocentric Relationship Management (MRM) and Mcorebrain: Defining the Single AI Paradigm Beyond CRM. Concept note (v3.0). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17334762.

References (Harvard style)

• NIST (2023) Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). Available at: https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf (Accessed: 27 September 2025).

• European Union (2016) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation – GDPR). Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj/eng (Accessed: 27 September 2025).

• OECD (2019) Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence (OECD AI Principles). Available at: https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles (Accessed: 27 September 2025).

• ISO/IEC (2023) ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial intelligence — Management system. Info: https://www.iso.org/standard/81230.html (Accessed: 27 September 2025).

• Javanbakht, A.H. (2025) Monocentric Relationship Management: Defining the Single AI Paradigm Beyond CRM. Concept note (v2.0). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17209903.