Who pays for what, and who delivers it.

The working business model.

Most of what Third Attractor does is not advice. It builds the machinery that lets a lot of separate family decisions add up to something, and families would pay a flat annual membership for it. That membership is the proposed recurring income.

Deeper support from WAIC, Bespoke, other specialists or a family's existing advisers is chosen separately. Investment management and project funding have their own arrangements.

Symviosis would provide agreed software and technical capability for a share of membership revenue. A regulated joint venture is proposed as the licensed home for any new investment product.

Pricing, scope, delivery costs and partner terms are proposals to be tested and agreed. Nothing here is signed, and page eight lists what is settled and what is not.

THE DECISION THIS PAPER IS FOR

Agree a defined first phase: the case, the responsible people, the deliverables, the cost, the commercial terms and the review point.

thirdattractor.com
hello@thirdattractor.com

ACCOUNTABILITY

What we are responsible for, and who does it.

Being responsible for something is not the same as owning it. The most consistent outside criticism of this plan is that it has more concept than organisation, which is fair.

A view of the world	What is changing, what the evidence supports, and where we are uncertain.
Helping families choose	What deserves attention, what to leave alone, and what is theirs to carry.
Finding where action matters	The few points where a modest action could change a larger trajectory.
Knowing who is doing the work	Credible people and projects, what is promising, and what is missing. Readying work that is not yet backable.
Coordination and review	Bringing the pieces together, then examining what actually happened.

THE TEAM THE SERVICE REQUIRES

One role filled

Founder	James Hodges	FILLED
Operating lead	In discussion	FIRST HIRE
Research lead	Not appointed	OPEN
Software and data	Symviosis	PARTNER
Specialist depth	Per piece of work	BOUGHT IN

The operating lead is the first use of operating capital, ahead of research capacity or further partnerships.

THE ENTITIES, AND HOW MONEY MOVES BETWEEN THEM

- **Third Attractor operating company**, to be formed. Receives membership and engagement income, employs the team, contracts with families.
- **A regulated manager**, proposed as a joint venture with a partner holding FCA permissions. Any new investment product would sit there, not in Third Attractor.
- **Amphibian Capital**, an existing investment business founded by the same person. Families contract with it directly, and Third Attractor is paid nothing when they do.
- **Flourishing Futures Foundation**, existing and operating. A share of profit from either business may be given to it. Nothing comes back, and a gift carries no control.

> Structurally, legally and commercially coherent, in that order. Everyone involved expects to be paid, and the paper is better for saying so.

THE RECURRING INCOME

What a family pays, and how we are paid.

The family brief promises research, assessment and a practical next step. This page has to make that promise match what is actually charged for.

	YOU DECIDE	WE DECIDE	NEITHER
Family pays	A flat annual membership.	Fund fee and carry to the regulated manager, above a minimum.	The membership, or nothing.
Family gets	Research, all deal flow, access. They execute through their own family office.	Discretionary management within an agreed mandate.	Understanding, then they act elsewhere.
TA earns	The flat fee, and nothing else.	Nothing. Founder economics sit in the manager, not here.	The flat fee, or nothing.

THE PRICING RULE

The fee may depend on who you are. It should never depend on what you decide.

$100,000 to $150,000 a family a year. Priced on the people and entities served, the number of priorities taken through the work, and whether gatherings are included. A band is set at the start of a term and not re-rated for activity during it.

Included: shared research and field views, help choosing where to focus, an initial assessment of people and projects, introductions and light coordination, selected gatherings, and the decision record.

Commissioned separately: full diligence on a named opportunity, project design and implementation, deep governance work, legal and tax, and anything needing sustained specialist time.

WHAT TRIGGERS A SEPARATE SCOPE, AND WHO APPROVES IT

Nothing additional is started inside the membership and billed afterwards.

INCLUDED	BECOMES A SEPARATE SCOPE WHEN	APPROVED BY
An initial view of a question, drawing on existing research.	It needs primary research, site visits or commissioned analysis.	The family, in writing, before work starts.
A first read on an operator, and whether it is worth pursuing.	It becomes full diligence on a named opportunity.	The family, against a written scope and fee.
Introductions, and convening the people a piece of work needs.	We are asked to design, manage or staff the work.	The family, and the operator where relevant.

FOUR WAYS MONEY COULD REACH US, STATED RATHER THAN SUMMARISED AS ONE

A no-referral-fee policy answers only the third.

Shared membership income. A proposed share to Symviosis for delivering part of the service. Continuing, material, and set out on page four.

Commissioned work. We are paid for scoped engagements beyond the membership. Real revenue and a real incentive.

Referral compensation. None proposed, from any partner, in any direction.

Ownership in recommended organisations. The founder owns Amphibian Capital and would own part of the regulated manager. This is the one that matters.

PROPOSED TERMS

How the Symviosis share would work.

Test the working relationship on real cases, with money flowing on agreed terms, before anyone discusses ownership.

THIRD ATTRACTOR · 80 TO 70%	SYMVIOSIS · 20 TO 30%
Core working range of the revenue available to share.	Complementary by construction: the two always total 100%.

IF THE EXPANDED CONTRIBUTION IS AGREED

Where Symviosis takes on materially more, such as dedicated engineering, hosting the shared record or supporting families directly, the proposed range is 25 to 35% to Symviosis, which makes Third Attractor's complementary share 75 to 65%. Earlier drafts stated these two ranges in a way that did not reconcile. Correcting the arithmetic does not make either range agreed.

A RECURRING SHARE, OR A PRICED BUILD

A one-off integration is a different thing from a permanent change to the recurring split, and a separately priced build is usually clearer than moving the recurring share up and leaving it there. The proposed integration budget is treated here as a one-time setup cost paid from operating capital, not a continuing deduction and not credited against the revenue share.

WHAT IS ACTUALLY BEING SHARED

● ILLUSTRATIVE · DEDUCTIONS NOT YET AGREED

MEMBERSHIP RECEIPTS → AGREED DEDUCTIONS → REVENUE AVAILABLE TO SHARE → AGREED SPLIT

FAMILIES	RECEIPTS	DEDUCTIONS	AVAILABLE TO SHARE	TA AT 75%	SYMVIOSIS AT 25%
5	$625,000	$134,000	**$491,000**	$368,250	$122,750
10	$1,250,000	$228,000	**$1,022,000**	$766,500	$255,500
20	$2,500,000	$396,000	**$2,104,000**	$1,578,000	$526,000

At the $125,000 midpoint. Deductions are payment and collection costs, third-party data and software licences passed through, and direct gathering costs not covered by donated venues. They fall as a share of receipts with scale because most are fixed. Every figure illustrates the mechanism rather than forecasting a result.

Third Attractor bears the team, the family relationship, research, and the cost of anything it commissions from specialists.

Symviosis bears its own engineering, hosting and support costs, and is responsible for the platform working.

Neither bears the other's overheads. Anything shared is listed as a deduction above, by name, before the split is applied.

SEQUENCE

What has to be proved at each stage.

Each stage has a single purpose and something specific that must be true before the next one starts. Timelines are indicative; the evidence is not.

STAGE	ITS ONE PURPOSE	THE SPECIFIC TEST	EVIDENCE REQUIRED TO PROGRESS	INDICATIVE
Crawl	Complete one real decision case, end to end, and record what it cost.	Did a family take a decision it would not otherwise have taken, and was it better?	One finished case with a baseline, a written decision and an actual cost to serve.	0 to 6 months
Walk	Show the same service works for a second and third family without being rebuilt.	Can somebody other than the founder run an engagement to the same standard?	Three to five families served, the operating lead in post, and a renewal.	6 to 18 months
Run	Carry a portfolio of families and cases on shared infrastructure.	Does margin improve with scale rather than erode?	Unit economics from real delivery, and a platform carrying the load.	18 months on

WHAT RECURS

Annual family memberships, the only recurring line in the model today. Everything else is episodic, optional, or somebody else's revenue.

WHAT IT COSTS TO DELIVER

Unknown, and the central gap. The estimate is one engagement lead carrying three to four families well. At that ratio the price works; at two families it does not.

WHY A FAMILY RENEWS

Because the previous year produced a decision they are glad they took, rather than because of access, community or a platform licence.

WHERE THIS STOPS WORKING

Each has been seen in comparable organisations.

The research does not compound. Every family turns out to need bespoke work, cost to serve never falls, and the membership is a retainer with a better name.

Evidence never arrives. Outcomes take years, attribution is hard, and the argument closes on anecdote rather than measurement.

Growth comes from recruitment rather than renewal. New families join faster than existing ones renew, which looks like momentum and is churn.

THE THREE NUMBERS THAT SETTLE IT

The actual hours a complete engagement takes. How many a single lead can carry. What families pay once they have seen the work rather than the description. Cost to serve the fifth family should be materially below the first, and if it is not by the end of Walk, the structure should change.

THE HONEST RISK

That the work is genuinely valuable and still costs more to deliver than families will pay. That is a common outcome for advisory work of this kind, and it would not be discovered by writing more of this document.

AGREEMENTS BEFORE ARCHITECTURE

Whose data it is, and under which contract.

A family's information is the most sensitive thing in this arrangement. None of these six terms is documented today.

TERM	THE PROPOSED POSITION	WHY A FAMILY ASKS
Contracting party	The family contracts with the Third Attractor operating company, not with Symviosis or any other partner.	One counterparty, one place to complain.
Access	Visible to named individuals at Third Attractor, and the minimum technical access Symviosis needs to run the platform.	The ecosystem is not an access level.
Existing IP	Each party keeps what it brought: the platform, the research method, the family's own material.	Nothing is absorbed by taking part.
New work	Work produced for a family belongs to that family. Generalised research and method belong to Third Attractor.	The line between our case and their product.
Portability	A family can export everything produced for it, in a usable format, at any time.	Leaving should not cost you your record.
Exit	On termination, data is returned and deleted within an agreed period, with written confirmation.	The question nobody asks until they want to leave.

THE PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS, AND THEIR STATUS

None is governed by a signed agreement today.

PARTNER	PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION	CONTRACTS WITH	RELEVANT INTEREST	STATUS
Symviosis	Software, shared records, technical capability.	Third Attractor	Revenue share. Continuing.	UNSIGNED
Regulated manager	FCA permissions and the home for new products.	The family, directly	Founder would own part of it.	NOT FORMED
Amphibian Capital	Investment management, selected strategies.	The family, directly	Common founder. Disclosed.	UNSIGNED
WAIC, Bespoke, Supernova, All-Win	Governance, founder relationships, public markets.	The family, directly	No payment to us.	UNSIGNED
Flourishing Futures Foundation	Philanthropy, public-benefit research.	Donors, directly	May receive donated profit. No control passes.	OPERATING

ON GOVERNANCE CLAIMS

There is no documented mission lock and no veto right over Third Attractor held by the Foundation or anyone else today. Earlier material implied otherwise. Whether such a right should exist, and in what form, is an open question on page eight. Open-core licensing and any future ownership of the platform belong there too.

TWO SEPARATE DECISIONS

Operating capital and Catalyst capital are decided separately.

They fund different things and carry different risk. A backer can do either, both or neither.

OPERATING COMPANY, TWELVE MONTHS	$1,000,000
Operating lead, loaded cost	$220,000
Research lead, loaded cost	$160,000
Founder	$120,000
Symviosis integration, one-time setup	$150,000
Gatherings not covered by donated venues	$100,000
Legal, entity formation, audit	$90,000
Reserve and contingency	$160,000
Total	**$1,000,000**

CATALYST POOL — $1,000,000

Capital deployed into the work itself rather than into the organisation: catalytic first-loss, grants, transition finance, and the small early commitments that make a credible project fundable by others.

Proposed and unfunded. No vehicle exists, no instrument has been chosen, and nothing is currently being sought. It is here because the operating model assumes such a pool will eventually exist.

Whether it sits in a pooled vehicle or inside the Foundation determines whether it is philanthropic or return-seeking, and that has not been decided.

WHAT A BACKER IS TOLD, FOR EACH REQUEST

Where the answer is undecided, it says so.

ITEM	OPERATING CAPITAL	CATALYST POOL
Purpose	Twelve months of capacity to complete the first cases and hire the operating lead.	Capital into the work itself.
Recipient	Third Attractor operating company, currently being formed.	Undecided: a pooled vehicle or the Foundation.
Instrument	Not agreed. A convertible instrument or simple equity is under discussion.	Not chosen.
First commitment	**$350,000** for six months, the first two hires and the first two cases.	None sought at this stage.
Backer's position	Proposed: information rights, a board observer seat, economic participation set by the instrument.	Depends on whether the pool is philanthropic or return-seeking.
Review point	After two completed cases, or six months, whichever comes first.	After a first deployment.
Unspent funds	A term to settle inside the instrument, not a refund promise as earlier drafts implied.	Governed by the vehicle's own terms.

Earlier euro-denominated pilot, annual operating and platform assumptions are a different planning configuration and no longer apply.

Operating capital is a bridge rather than a substitute. Roughly ten families at the midpoint would cover the cost above, which is why ten is the number the model turns on.

No part of this funds investments, the Foundation, or payments to partner businesses other than the one-time Symviosis setup shown above.

THE AUTHORITATIVE STATUS PAGE

What is settled, proposed, and unresolved.

Where any other page disagrees with this one, this one is correct. Where a figure appears in older material, it is superseded.

AGREE BEFORE THE FIRST PAID CASE

- The operating entity, its ownership and who can bind it
- The family agreement: scope, term, approvals, exit
- The Symviosis agreement: revenue base, deductions, responsibilities, data, exit
- Which deliverables the membership includes, in writing
- One conflicts policy covering every entity
- The operating lead, appointed
- The first commitment of operating capital, and its instrument

OPTIONS ONCE THE RELATIONSHIP HAS BEEN TESTED

- Equity between Third Attractor and Symviosis in either direction
- A NewCo holding jointly created products
- A shared economic pool across the group
- Open-core commitments and platform licensing
- A documented mission lock or reserved matters
- Pricing tiers and a scaled service

SETTLED IN PRINCIPLE

One flat membership priced on size and scope. Specialist depth optional and separately commissioned. Investment and project funding outside it. Symviosis participates through revenue share rather than equity for now. Profit may be gifted to the Foundation, and nothing comes back. No referral fees.

PROPOSED, NOT AGREED

The $100,000 to $150,000 price. The 80 to 70 / 20 to 30 core split, and 75 to 65 / 25 to 35 on an expanded contribution. The deduction list, and therefore the share base. $1m operating and $1m Catalyst. The $350,000 first commitment. Every partner relationship on page six.

UNRESOLVED FACTS

The actual cost to serve one family. How many families one lead can carry. Whether families pay having seen the work. The operating entity and its jurisdiction. The instrument for operating capital. Whether the Catalyst Pool is philanthropic. Whether a mission lock should exist.

THE THREE QUESTIONS WE MOST WANT PUSHED ON

Is a membership the right structure, or is this project work priced as one? Is the revenue share with Symviosis the right instrument, or should it be a priced build? And is ten families a realistic break-even, or an arithmetic convenience?

Status of this document. A working paper for discussion with prospective partners and backers. It is not an offer and not an invitation to invest. Every percentage, range and amount is a working hypothesis, and no claim has been independently verified by a named external checker. The family brief is the front document, a short note covers how Third Attractor and Amphibian Capital connect, and a forty-nine-page working paper holds the underlying evidence.