The Orchestrated Diamond: A Framework for Mixed-Initiative Co-Creation in Design

Aaron Bockelie

Independent Researcher, Wichita, Kansas

July 27, 2025

The Double Diamond (DD) design process, while a seminal contribution to design methodology, is increasingly ill-equipped for the speed, complexity, and data-rich environment of modern product development. This paper posits that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) can address these limitations. The central contribution of this research is the proposal of a novel framework, The Orchestrated Diamond, which evolves the DD by integrating a dynamic spectrum of human-AI collaboration models. This framework maps specific interaction paradigms—AI-in-the-Loop (AITL), Human-Led Synthesis, Mixed-Initiative Co-Creation, and Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)—to the DD's four phases: Discover, Define, Develop, and Deliver. This structured approach moves beyond informal metaphors for AI collaboration to offer a robust, efficient, and innovative methodology for design. The framework's validity is established through a detailed analysis of its benefits in overcoming the DD's core weaknesses, a frank assessment of its inherent challenges such as algorithmic bias and the need for new designer competencies, and by drawing parallels with empirical case studies from product development, service design, and architecture. The paper concludes that The Orchestrated Diamond offers a necessary evolution of design practice, reframing the designer's role from that of a sole creator to a strategic orchestrator of a human-AI team. This has profound implications for the future of design as a collaborative, orchestrated process.

Keywords: Design methodology, Human-AI collaboration, Double Diamond, Mixed-initiative co-creation, Design process evolution, Artificial intelligence in design

Contents

1 Introduction: The Confluence of Design Process and Artificial Intelligence

1.1 The Imperative for Evolved Design Methodologies

The contemporary enterprise landscape is undergoing a tectonic shift, driven by the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and automation into the very fabric of operational workflows.[41] This transition, termed "Automation 5.0" or the era of intelligent automation, moves beyond simple task execution to embrace systems capable of predictive decision-making, continuous self-learning, and sophisticated cognitive functions.[37] This evolution is not merely incremental; it represents a fundamental rewiring of how organizations run and create value.[43] Enterprise systems, once static backbones, are now dynamic engines of insight and efficiency, leveraging AI for everything from supply chain optimization and personalized customer relationship management to automated HR processes and predictive maintenance.[41]

Industry analysts have underscored the transformative scale of this change. Gartner, for instance, identifies generative AI as a general-purpose technology with a projected impact comparable to the steam engine, electricity, and the internet.[23] This technology is poised to augment or automate core processes across a vast array of industries, including pharmaceutical discovery, manufacturing, media, architecture, and engineering.[23] Forrester reports that agentic AI—systems capable of setting goals, making decisions, and taking action—is evolving generative AI from simply producing "words" to executing "actions," fundamentally changing how work gets done.[22] As organizations increasingly embed these intelligent capabilities into their operations, the methodologies used to design the products, services, and systems that house them must necessarily evolve in parallel. Traditional design frameworks, conceived in a pre-AI era, risk becoming anachronistic, unable to fully harness the potential or mitigate the risks of this new technological paradigm.

1.2 The Paradox: Seminal Frameworks and New Paradigms

At the heart of modern design practice lies the Double Diamond (DD), a process model popularized by the British Design Council in the mid-2000s.[17] It has served as a foundational framework for a generation of designers, providing a simple, memorable, and visually intuitive map of the design journey [25]. Its core principle—a structured sequence of divergent and convergent thinking across four phases (Discover, Define, Develop, Deliver)—has offered a common language for designers to articulate and contextualize their work for clients and stakeholders [18].

Concurrently, as AI tools have become more accessible, practitioners across various fields have developed informal, grassroots models to describe their new collaborative workflows. One of the most prevalent is the "AI Sandwich" [3]. This simple but powerful metaphor describes a Human-AI-Human interaction pattern: a human initiates a task with a specific intent (the top slice of bread), an AI system generates content, analysis, or options (the filling), and a human provides the critical review, refinement, and final judgment (the bottom slice) [3]. This model has found resonance in fields as diverse as legal education, where students are taught to bracket AI-generated content with their own analysis [3], and creative writing, where the human acts as the essential element between AI-driven perception and action.[45]

The coexistence of the formal, top-down Double Diamond and the informal, bottom-up "AI Sandwich" reveals a significant paradox and a chasm between established design theory and emergent AI practice. While practitioners are creating ad-hoc mental models to cope with powerful new tools, the formal methodologies they are trained in often fail to account for this new reality. This paper addresses the central problem arising from this disconnect: the venerable but increasingly challenged Double Diamond process is ill-equipped to manage the speed, complexity, and data-rich environment of modern development, while the informal models of AI collaboration lack the structure and theoretical rigor needed for systematic and scalable implementation.

1.3 Thesis Statement and Research Trajectory

This paper posits that the documented limitations of the Double Diamond can be systematically addressed by moving beyond informal metaphors and formally integrating a spectrum of human-AI collaboration models into its structure [28]. The introduction of AI does not merely add a new tool to a designer's toolkit; it fundamentally shifts the nature of the design process itself, from a linear execution of steps to a dynamic management of a complex workflow. This necessitates a paradigm shift from process visualization to workflow orchestration [46].

To this end, we propose a new framework, **The Orchestrated Diamond**, which reframes the design process not as a static, sequential map, but as a dynamic orchestration of human and machine intelligence. This framework retains the familiar four phases of the Double Diamond but reconceptualizes them as distinct modes of collaboration, each requiring a specific and appropriate form of human-AI partnership.

The research will proceed as follows. Section 2 provides a critical deconstruction of the Double Diamond, examining its history, principles, and well-documented limitations, thereby establishing the clear need for its evolution. Section 3 develops a formal taxonomy

of human-AI collaboration models, moving from the "AI Sandwich" metaphor to a rigorous analysis of Human-in-the-Loop (HITL), AI-in-the-Loop (AITL), and Mixed-Initiative systems to provide a solid theoretical foundation. Section 4 details the proposed Orchestrated Diamond framework phase by phase, specifying the nature of the human-AI collaboration at each stage. Section 5 validates the framework by articulating its benefits, acknowledging its inherent challenges, and drawing parallels to empirical evidence and case studies where elements of this orchestrated approach are already yielding significant value. Finally, Section 6 discusses the broader implications of this framework for design practice, terminology, and future research in an era of increasingly agentic AI.

2 A Critical Re-examination of the Double Diamond Process

2.1 Origins and Enduring Principles

The Double Diamond design process model, while widely associated with the British Design Council, has a rich intellectual lineage. The Council popularized the model in 2004-2005 as a way to codify and visualize the design processes used within the organization and make them accessible to a broader audience.[17] The model itself was an adaptation of the divergence-convergence model proposed in 1996 by the Hungarian-American linguist and systems scientist Béla H. Bánáthy.[17] Bánáthy's work, in turn, built upon decades of research into problem-solving and design theory from luminaries such as John Dewey, who emphasized learning through inquiry; Alex Osborn and Sidney Parnes, who proposed divergent and convergent activities in their Creative Problem Solving model; and Herbert Simon, who defined design as devising actions to change existing situations into preferred ones [34].

The enduring power of the Double Diamond lies in its elegant simplicity. It presents the design process through two conjoined diamonds, each representing a cycle of divergent thinking (exploring an issue widely) followed by convergent thinking (taking focused action) [18]. This structure is broken down into four memorable, alliterative phases [25]:

1. **Discover:** The first divergent phase, focused on understanding the issue through user research methods like interviews, surveys, and field studies, rather than making assumptions [18].

2. **Define:** The first convergent phase, where insights from discovery are synthesized to frame a clear, actionable problem definition or design brief [18].

3. **Develop:** The second divergent phase, focused on generating a wide range of potential solutions to the defined problem, often through co-design and seeking inspiration from diverse sources [18].

4. **Deliver:** The second convergent phase, where different solutions are tested at a small scale, refined, and prepared for launch [18].

The primary objective of the Design Council was to create a framework that was easy to memorize, share, and use to contextualize the work of designers for clients and non-designers [25]. In this, it has been remarkably successful, becoming an accepted part of the global design language [25].

2.2 A Litany of Limitations in Modern Practice

Despite its widespread adoption, the Double Diamond has faced persistent and significant criticism, particularly as the complexity of design challenges and the pace of development have increased. These critiques reveal a model that, while conceptually elegant, often struggles to align with the realities of modern product and service development.

A primary critique is the model's **linearity and abstraction**. The clean, sequential diagram belies the often messy, chaotic, and iterative nature of real-world creative work [34]. Design is rarely a straight-lined process; it involves false starts, backtracking, and multiple cycles of reframing as new insights emerge.[33] The model's high level of abstraction, while making it memorable, renders it less useful for answering specific, practical questions about process. As one critic notes, it often becomes a ”black box masquerading as a glass box,” obscuring the actual art and craft of design behind a facade of ordered simplification.[33] This linearity is a holdover from a more waterfall-style approach to projects, which is fundamentally at odds with the agile and iterative methods prevalent in software and digital product development today.

Perhaps the most damaging critique is the **feasibility and reality gap**. The model is heavily centered on user needs, with little to no formal consideration for technical feasibility, budget constraints, or business viability until late in the process [35]. This creates what practitioners describe as a ”massive disconnect between what users want, and what can realistically be implemented” [35]. In many projects, teams spend the first diamond deeply understanding users and the second diamond brainstorming innovative solutions, only to discover during the ”Deliver” phase that ”75% of the ideas we came up with would need to be custom built, and will therefore cost too much” [35]. This often results in teams discarding their ambitious, user-centric designs and reverting to standard, out-of-the-box UI and features, rendering much of the initial discovery work moot [35].

This flaw is particularly acute in corporate environments where stakeholders often have a solution in mind and view extensive, open-ended discovery as "unnecessary friction" or a "waste of time".[19]

Furthermore, the original model suffers from a **lack of measurement and post-launch feedback loops**. It was conceived as an "idea funnel that transmutes questions into solutions," but without an explicit mechanism for measuring the success of those solutions in the real world [34]. In practice, design work is often considered complete once a prototype is tested and handed off to development [2]. However, this ignores the crucial design work that happens post-hand-off, as inevitable edge cases, error states, and technical hurdles emerge during the build phase. Without a formal process for continuous design involvement, this work is often rushed or squeezed in, leading to a degradation in quality and strained relationships between design and development teams [2].

Finally, the model is often seen as **insufficient for the complexity of modern systems design**. The challenges designers face today with intricate services and systems have left the Double Diamond "a bit short of breath" [34]. Its simple structure does not adequately account for the high levels of ambiguity and non-linearity inherent in discontinuous innovation, nor does it explicitly mention other crucial forms of design thinking, such as abductive reasoning, or foundational concepts like empathy [14]. This has led even the Design Council itself to explore successors, such as the Systemic Design Framework, that are better equipped to handle these complexities [34].

The common thread running through all these critiques is a fundamental temporal disconnect. The model's structure rigidly separates problem-finding (the first diamond) from solution-building (the second diamond). This sequential, waterfall-like separation is the root cause of its major flaws. If technical feasibility (a solution-space constraint) were considered during the problem definition phase, the feasibility gap would be mitigated. If feedback from the development and delivery phases could easily and continuously loop back to refine the problem definition, the lack of iterative feedback would be solved. The core issue is not the four phases themselves, but their strict segregation into two distinct, sequential stages.

2.3 Reactive Evolution: The Emergence of the Triple Diamond

In response to these well-documented failings, the design community has proposed various extensions, most notably under the umbrella of the "Triple Diamond".[44] It is not a single, unified model but rather a collection of interpretations that attempt to patch the perceived holes in the original framework.[29]

One common interpretation adds a third diamond focused on **experimentation and implementation**. This version, proposed by practitioners like Adam Gray, inserts a new diamond between "Develop" and "Deliver" or expands "Deliver" into a full diamond of its own.[19] The goal is to move beyond a simple tested prototype to a live, released MVP. This third diamond encompasses the detailed design of all screens, flows, and copy, followed by the build and the subsequent gathering of qualitative and quantitative data from a live release [2]. This directly addresses the critique that the Double Diamond ends too early and lacks a robust post-launch feedback mechanism.

A second interpretation places an additional diamond *before* the traditional two, focusing on **opportunity and strategy**.[29] This version acknowledges that a design process doesn't begin with a given problem; it begins with the strategic work of identifying which problem is worth solving in the first place. This initial diamond would involve divergent thinking to identify potential opportunities and convergent thinking to define a clear strategy and business case before the "Discover" phase even begins.

A third variation, described by Sophia Prater, inserts a central diamond focused on **structuring insights** [34]. This diamond sits between "Define" and "Develop" and is dedicated to the rigorous work of structuring research insights to properly inform the design of complex systems, particularly around information architecture.

While these Triple Diamond models offer valuable additions by formalizing stages that were implicit or missing in the original, they are ultimately additive patches. They extend the linear chain of the process—adding a stage before, after, or in the middle—but they do not fundamentally alter its sequential nature. They do not create the kind of dynamic, interwoven feedback loops that are necessary for truly agile and responsive development in a technologically complex environment. A more radical evolution is required, one that does not simply add another diamond but weaves new capabilities throughout the entire process, breaking down the rigid walls between the phases. This is the opportunity that the structured integration of AI presents.

3 A Taxonomy of Human-AI Collaboration in Creative and Analytical Workflows

3.1 Deconstructing the "AI Sandwich": From Metaphor to Model

The "AI Sandwich" has emerged as a popular and intuitive metaphor for describing a collaborative human-AI workflow [3]. Its common interpretation involves a three-part structure: a human provides the initial input, direction, or question (the top slice of bread);

the AI system performs a task, such as generating text, analyzing data, or creating an image (the filling); and the human returns to critique, refine, fact-check, and provide the final judgment (the bottom slice) [3]. This simple concept has proven remarkably versatile, finding application in diverse domains. In legal education, Professor Dyane O'Leary uses it to teach law students that they must be the "bread on both sides," responsible for both the initial framing of a legal query and the critical analysis of the AI's output [3]. In creative contexts, the human is described as the "cheese in the sandwich," making the crucial decisions between AI-driven perception (research) and AI-driven action (writing).[45]

While powerful as a mental model, the "sandwich" metaphor lacks the precision required for building robust, scalable systems. A more formalized approach can be seen in the concept of a "Model Context Protocol" (MCP).[6] An MCP is a structured framework for managing the information fed to an AI. It acts as a detailed "recipe card" (the protocol) and a well-organized set of ingredients (the context), ensuring that the AI's output is consistent and aligned with the user's intent. The MCP framework breaks down context into four key categories: System Context (what the AI always knows), User Context (personalization), Conversation Context (the ongoing interaction), and Task Context (the immediate goal).[6] This moves the discourse from a simple metaphor to a structured model of interaction. By formally classifying this pattern within established Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) theory, we can see that the "AI Sandwich" is a practical, user-friendly description of an AI-in-the-Loop (AITL) workflow. The human is in control, initiating the process and making the final judgment, which directly maps to the AITL definition where the human retains ultimate decision-making authority [28].

3.2 The Spectrum of Agency: HITL vs. AITL

To build a more sophisticated framework, it is essential to move beyond a single interaction pattern and understand the full spectrum of human-AI collaboration [27]. The most fundamental distinction in HCI literature is based on the locus of control and decision-making authority, primarily captured in the concepts of Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) and AI-in-the-Loop (AITL) [28].

Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) systems are those in which the AI system drives the decision-making process, but a human is integrated into the loop to provide supervision, validation, or intervention for edge cases [28]. In this model, the AI is in control of the operational flow, and human input is used to "guide" the model, correct its errors, or handle tasks that fall below a certain confidence threshold [28]. This architecture is prevalent in applications where accuracy and reliability are paramount, such as medical imaging analysis, content moderation, and the labeling of training data for supervised

machine learning.[47] The human acts as an oracle, a weak supervisor, or a final quality-control gatekeeper [28].

AI-in-the-Loop (AITL) systems, conversely, invert this relationship [28]. In an AITL model, the human retains full control and ultimate decision-making authority, while the AI acts as an assistant or an augmentative tool to enhance the human's capabilities [28]. The AI system provides decision support, automates routine sub-tasks, or surfaces insights for human interpretation, but it does not make the final decision [4]. This is the paradigm of AI as a smart tool—a sophisticated calculator or a research assistant—that enhances human performance without usurping human agency. As established, the "AI Sandwich" is a classic AITL pattern.

The distinction between HITL and AITL is not merely academic; it is a critical design choice that dictates the architecture, user interface, and risk profile of a system [28]. The decision hinges on whether the primary goal is to automate a process with human oversight (HITL) or to augment human judgment with AI assistance (AITL).

3.3 Towards Partnership: Mixed-Initiative and Collaborative Intelligence

The HITL and AITL models, while useful, primarily describe a master-servant dynamic. More advanced forms of collaboration aim for a true partnership, where the roles are more fluid and synergistic.

Mixed-Initiative (MI) systems are defined by the ability of both the human and the AI to proactively contribute to a shared goal, with the conversational or creative "initiative" shifting between them.[31] In an MI system, the AI is not merely responding to explicit commands; it can take the lead, make unsolicited suggestions, propose alternative paths, and actively shape the direction of the work.[32] This creates a dynamic, peer-to-peer interaction that is essential for co-creative tasks like brainstorming, game level design, or collaborative writing, where the goal is to generate novel artifacts through a real-time, improvisational partnership.[7] The system and the human become collaborators who iteratively build upon each other's contributions.[13]

Collaborative Intelligence (CI) and **Human-AI Teaming (HAIT)** represent a socio-technical perspective on this partnership, viewing the AI not just as a tool or a system, but as a genuine team member.[11] CI is defined by the synergistic combination of human and AI capabilities to achieve outcomes that would be unattainable by either agent alone.[9] This approach focuses on augmenting human intelligence, freeing people from automatable and repetitive tasks so they can focus on their unique strengths: creativity, strategic

thinking, empathy, and ethical judgment.[21] Successful HAIT depends on factors that are familiar from human teams: shared goals, interdependence, clear communication, evolving shared mental models, and, crucially, mutual trust.[11]

These different models are not mutually exclusive categories but rather points along a **spectrum of agency**. This spectrum progresses from low AI agency (AITL, where the AI is a responsive tool), to moderate AI agency (HITL, where the AI can execute processes but is gated by human approval), to peer-level agency (Mixed-Initiative, where the AI is a proactive partner), and ultimately towards fully agentic AI (where the AI can set and pursue its own goals with minimal oversight).[22] A sophisticated design framework should not be locked into a single mode of interaction. Instead, it should strategically select the appropriate level of AI agency for the specific task at hand within the broader workflow. This dynamic selection is the core principle that enables the transition from a simple design process to an orchestrated one.

Table 1: A Comparative Analysis of Human-AI Interaction Models

Model	Primary Locus of Control	AI's Role	Human's Role	Core Analogy	Primary Goal	Supporting Sources
AI-in-the-Loop (AITL)	Human	Assistant / Tool / Augmentation Layer	Decision-Maker / Orchestrator / User Supervisor	AI as a smart tool (e.g., spell-checker, research assistant)	Augment Human Performance	[28]
Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)	AI	Driver / Executor / Autonomous Process	Validator / Exception Handler	AI as a self-driving car with a human monitor	Ensure Accuracy & Reliability	[28]
Mixed-Initiative (MI)	Shifting / Shared	Partner / Collaborator / Co-Creator	Co-Creator / Peer / Creative Director	AI as a brainstorming partner or duet musician	Co-Create Novelty & Explore Possibilities	[7]
Collaborative Intelligence (CI) / Human-AI Teaming (HAIT)	Shared	Synergistic Teammate / Cognitive Enhancer	Strategist / Ethical Guide / Team Leader	AI as a full team member with specialized skills	Achieve Superior Synergistic Outcomes	[11]

4 The Orchestrated Diamond: A Proposed Framework for AI-Integrated Design

4.1 Framework Overview: From Sequential Phases to Orchestrated Modes

The proposed framework, The Orchestrated Diamond, retains the four familiar phases of the Double Diamond—Discover, Define, Develop, and Deliver—for their established conceptual clarity and mnemonic value [25]. The fundamental innovation of this framework lies in the reconceptualization of these phases. They are no longer treated as rigid, linear steps in a process but as distinct

modes of collaboration, each requiring a different configuration of human-AI interaction. This approach draws directly from the taxonomy of collaboration models established in Section 3. The role of the designer is elevated from that of a process-follower to that of an **orchestrator**, who strategically manages the workflow and facilitates the transitions between these collaborative modes. This dynamic structure directly addresses the core critique of the Double Diamond's restrictive linearity and its failure to represent the iterative nature of modern design work [34].

4.2 Phase 1 - Discover: AI-Assisted Inquiry (AITL Mode)

The first phase of the framework is dedicated to the divergent exploration of the problem space. The goal is to cast a wide net, gathering as much information as possible to understand the context, user needs, and market landscape.

- **Collaboration Model:** This phase operates in an **AI-in-the-Loop (AITL)** mode. The human researcher or designer maintains full strategic control over the inquiry, defining the research questions, setting the scope, and critically evaluating the information that is gathered. The AI functions as a powerful and tireless research assistant, dramatically accelerating the speed and expanding the breadth of the discovery process.
- **Human Role:** The human acts as a **Strategist, Researcher, and Prompter**. They are responsible for designing the research plan, formulating precise queries for the AI systems, and applying their domain expertise to interpret the outputs.

- **AI Role:** The AI's role is that of a **Research Accelerator**. It automates and augments data-intensive research tasks that are traditionally time-consuming and labor-intensive. Specific AI-powered tasks include:
  - **Large-Scale Data Analysis:** AI algorithms can analyze vast, unstructured datasets, such as thousands of customer support tickets, online reviews, or social media comments, to perform sentiment analysis and identify recurring themes or pain points.[41]
  - **User Research Augmentation:** Generative AI can assist in creating initial drafts of interview scripts or survey questions.[10] After interviews are conducted, AI-powered tools can provide automated transcriptions and summaries, freeing the researcher to focus on the interaction itself and accelerating the initial analysis.[5]
  - **Market and Competitive Analysis:** AI can rapidly scan and synthesize information about competitor products, market trends, and relevant academic or industry literature, providing a comprehensive landscape analysis in a fraction of the time required for manual research.[36]
- **Connection to DD Critique:** This mode directly enhances the traditional "Discover" phase. By leveraging AI, a design team can conduct a far wider and deeper divergent search than is manually feasible within typical project constraints, leading to a richer and more evidence-based understanding of the problem space from the outset.

4.3 Phase 2 - Define: Human-Led Synthesis (AITL/Human-Control Mode)

The second phase is a convergent activity focused on making sense of the vast information gathered during discovery and distilling it into a clear, concise, and actionable problem statement.

- **Collaboration Model:** This phase operates primarily in an AITL mode but with an explicit emphasis on **Human-Led Synthesis**. While AI can assist in organizing data, the ultimate act of defining the problem—of framing the challenge based on strategic goals, ethical considerations, and empathetic understanding—is a uniquely human responsibility that cannot be delegated.

- **Human Role:** The human is the **Synthesizer, Sense-Maker, and Decision-Maker**. They use their critical thinking, domain expertise, and strategic insight to interpret the patterns surfaced by the AI, identify the core user need or opportunity, and frame the definitive problem statement that will guide the rest of the project.[33]
- **AI Role:** The AI serves as a **Pattern Recognition Tool**. It helps to structure and process the large volume of raw data from the Discover phase, making it more manageable for human analysis. Specific AI-powered tasks include:
  - **AI-Assisted Affinity Mapping:** Instead of manually sorting hundreds of digital sticky notes, AI can process raw research data (e.g., interview excerpts, survey responses) and suggest thematic clusters or affinity groups, significantly accelerating the synthesis process.[36]
  - **Insight Identification:** AI can perform statistical analysis to identify correlations or anomalies in the data that might not be immediately apparent to a human analyst, pointing to potential areas of interest.[41]
  - **Problem Statement Ideation:** Once the human has identified the core insight, generative AI can be used as a tool to brainstorm multiple phrasings of the problem statement or to generate a range of "How Might We" (HMW) questions to explore different angles of the challenge.[10]
- **Connection to DD Critique:** This mode directly addresses the critique that the Double Diamond is too abstract and can lead to a "disordered mess".[33] By using AI to bring structure to the chaos of raw research data, the framework allows the human designer to focus on the higher-order cognitive task of synthesis and definition, resulting in a more concrete, evidence-backed problem statement.

4.4 Phase 3 - Develop: Mixed-Initiative Co-Creation (MI Mode)

The third phase marks the second point of divergence, where the team explores a wide array of potential solutions to the clearly defined problem.

- **Collaboration Model:** This phase shifts into a **Mixed-Initiative (MI)** mode. This is a true human-AI partnership where both agents can proactively contribute ideas and build upon each other's work. The creative initiative flows back and forth between the human designer and the AI system.

- **Human Role:** The human acts as a **Creative Director, Prompter, Curator, and Collaborator**. They set the creative direction, define the constraints for the AI, provide initial sparks of inspiration, and then curate, combine, and refine the multitude of options generated by the AI partner.[13]
- **AI Role:** The AI functions as a **Creative Partner and Ideation Engine**. Its role is not just to execute commands but to actively participate in the creative process. Specific AI-powered tasks include:
  - **Generative Design and Ideation:** AI systems can generate a vast number of design concepts based on a set of constraints (e.g., materials, cost, performance metrics, aesthetic style) provided by the human designer. This applies to UI layouts, product forms, architectural plans, and more.[8] This capability helps teams break free from cognitive biases and explore a much broader solution space.[40]
  - **Augmented Brainstorming:** The AI can serve as an inexhaustible brainstorming partner, suggesting unconventional solutions, providing visual inspiration, or developing variations on a human-generated idea.[21]
  - **Rapid Visualization:** Generative AI tools like Midjourney or Stable Diffusion can instantly create high-fidelity visualizations of abstract concepts, facilitating clearer communication within the team and allowing for faster evaluation and iteration of ideas.[15]
- **Connection to DD Critique:** This mode provides a powerful solution to the DD's critical feasibility gap [35]. By incorporating technical, financial, and material constraints directly into the generative design prompts, feasibility becomes an integral part of the ideation process, not an afterthought. This ensures that the divergent exploration of solutions is grounded in real-world viability from the start.

4.5 Phase 4 - Deliver: AI-Augmented Validation (HITL Mode)

The final phase is one of convergence, where the most promising solutions from the Develop phase are prototyped, tested, refined, and prepared for implementation.

- **Collaboration Model:** This phase primarily utilizes a **Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)** model. AI systems are given the autonomy to execute complex and repetitive tasks, such as generating code for prototypes or analyzing user testing data. However, the human designer must remain ”in the loop” to validate the outputs,

interpret the results, provide quality control, and make the final decisions on the solution's viability.

- **Human Role:** The human is the **Validator, Ethical Overseer, and Quality Control Manager**. They are responsible for reviewing AI-generated prototypes for accuracy and usability, interpreting the nuances of user feedback that an AI might miss, ensuring the final product is ethical and robust, and making the ultimate go/no-go decision [2].
- **AI Role:** The AI's role is that of a **Prototyping and Testing Engine**. It dramatically accelerates the iterative cycles of building and testing. Specific AI-powered tasks include:
  - **Rapid Prototyping and Code Generation:** AI tools can transform static design mockups into interactive prototypes or even generate front-end code, significantly reducing development time for testable artifacts.[24]
  - **Automated and Predictive Testing:** AI can automate various forms of testing, such as simulating diverse user scenarios, checking for accessibility compliance, or analyzing A/B test results.[40] Predictive analytics can be used on prototype usage data to forecast user satisfaction or identify potential friction points before a full-scale launch.[24]
  - **Feedback Analysis:** AI can process large volumes of user feedback from testing sessions, summarizing key themes and sentiments to help designers quickly identify areas for improvement.[38]
- **Connection to DD Critique:** This mode directly addresses the Double Diamond's lack of explicit and efficient feedback loops [34]. The sheer speed of AI-augmented prototyping and validation enables teams to conduct many more, and much faster, iterative cycles than is possible with traditional methods, leading to a more refined and robust final product.

Table 2: Mapping AI Roles and Tools to the Orchestrated Diamond Framework

Phase	Core Activity	AI Collaboration Model	Human's Primary Role	AI's Primary Role	Example AI-Powered Tasks & Tools
Discover	Divergent Research	AI-in-the-Loop (AITL)	Research Strategist	Research Accelerator	- Market trend analysis with predictive analytics platforms. - Sentiment analysis of user reviews using NLP tools. - Automated transcription and summarization of user interviews (e.g., Otter.ai). - AI-assisted affinity clustering of research data. - Generating "How Might We" questions from insights (e.g., ChatGPT). - Identifying data correlations with business intelligence
Define	Convergent Synthesis	Human-Led Synthesis (AITL)	Sense-Maker & Decider	Pattern Recognition Tool	

Phase	Core Activity	AI Collaboration Model	Human's Primary Role	AI's Primary Role	Example AI-Powered Tasks & Tools
Discover	Divergent Research	AI-in-the-Loop (AITL)	Research Strategist	Research Accelerator	- Market trend analysis with predictive analytics platforms. - Sentiment analysis of user reviews using NLP tools. - Automated transcription and summarization of user interviews (e.g., Otter.ai). - AI-assisted affinity clustering of research data. - Generating "How Might We" questions from insights (e.g., ChatGPT). - Identifying data correlations with business intelligence
Define	Convergent Synthesis	Human-Led Synthesis (AITL)	Sense-Maker & Decider	Pattern Recognition Tool	tools

5 Framework Validation: Benefits, Challenges, and Empirical Parallels

5.1 Articulated Benefits: Addressing the Double Diamond's Deficiencies

The proposed Orchestrated Diamond framework is not merely a theoretical exercise; it is designed to directly address the most pressing and well-documented deficiencies of the traditional Double Diamond model. By structuring the design process as a series of distinct human-AI collaborative modes, it offers tangible benefits.

First, the framework **overcomes the problem of rigid linearity**. The original DD's sequential nature is a poor fit for agile environments [34]. The Orchestrated Diamond is inherently iterative. The speed and low cost of AI-augmented prototyping and testing in the "Deliver" phase make it feasible to execute rapid feedback loops. An insight from testing can immediately inform a new round of ideation in the "Develop" phase or even trigger a reframing of the problem in the "Define" phase, breaking down the artificial walls between the diamonds.

Second, it systematically **bridges the feasibility gap**. A major failure of the DD is its tendency to produce innovative but ultimately unfeasible solutions by deferring technical and business constraints until the end of the process [35]. The Orchestrated Diamond integrates feasibility from the outset. In the "Develop" phase, the Mixed-Initiative co-creation process can be constrained by parameters such as cost, materials, or manufacturing techniques, ensuring that the generated ideas are grounded in reality.[39] Furthermore, the AI-Augmented Validation in the "Deliver" phase allows for low-cost, high-fidelity simulation and testing before significant engineering resources are committed, de-risking the entire development lifecycle.[24]

Third, the framework **integrates measurement and validation as a core component**. The original DD was criticized for lacking explicit mechanisms for measuring success or iterating post-launch [34]. The Orchestrated Diamond's "Deliver" phase is built entirely around the principles of testing, data analysis, and validation. This embeds a data-driven, evidence-based culture into the design process, ensuring that decisions are based on performance metrics rather than solely on intuition. This structure provides the explicit feedback loops that the original model lacks.[40]

5.2 Inherent Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

Adopting the Orchestrated Diamond framework is not without its own set of challenges. The integration of AI introduces new complexities and risks that must be proactively managed. However, the very structure of the framework provides a means of mitigation.

A primary concern is **algorithmic bias and ethical integrity**. AI models are trained on historical data and can inadvertently learn and amplify existing societal biases related to race, gender, or other protected characteristics.[21] An AI tool used in the ”Discover” phase might surface biased insights, or a generative tool in the ”Develop” phase might produce stereotypical imagery. The framework mitigates this risk by formally defining the human's role as an

Ethical Overseer, particularly in the Human-Led Synthesis (”Define”) and HITL Validation (”Deliver”) phases. These phases act as critical checkpoints where human judgment is explicitly required to scrutinize AI outputs for fairness, transparency, and accountability, in line with established ethical AI principles.[20]

Another significant challenge is **data quality and privacy**. The efficacy of the entire framework is contingent on access to high-quality, clean, and relevant data, which remains a major organizational hurdle for many enterprises.[14] Furthermore, the use of user data raises significant privacy concerns that require robust data governance and compliance with regulations like GDPR.[40] The framework addresses this by making data strategy an explicit consideration. The ”Define” phase, for instance, must include an assessment of data availability and quality as a key constraint on the problem definition.

Finally, there is the risk of **deskilling and over-reliance** on AI. Practitioners and academics alike express concern that an over-reliance on AI tools could lead to the atrophy of fundamental design skills and a decline in critical thinking.[38] The Orchestrated Diamond counteracts this by framing AI as a collaborator that elevates, rather than replaces, human expertise. The framework assigns distinct and cognitively demanding roles to the human at each stage—Strategist, Synthesizer, Creative Director, and Validator. These roles require a higher level of strategic thinking and critical judgment, shifting the designer's value away from mere execution and towards orchestration and curation. This purposeful design of the human's role is intended to foster a culture of ”collaborative intelligence” where the human-AI team achieves more than either could alone.[9]

While the framework introduces new risks, its structure also serves as a risk mitigation tool. By mandating specific points of human control, synthesis, and validation, it prevents the ”black box” problem of blindly trusting an AI from start to finish. It builds in the

necessary checkpoints for human judgment, making the process itself a protocol for safety and ethical diligence.

5.3 Empirical Parallels and Case Studies

The principles underpinning the Orchestrated Diamond are not merely speculative; they are mirrored in the successful application of AI across various industries. These real-world case studies provide empirical validation for the framework's phase-specific collaboration models.

In **Product Development**, companies like BMW and Mercedes-Benz exemplify the ”Develop” and ”Deliver” phases. They use AI-driven generative design to explore thousands of optimized vehicle component designs based on performance and material constraints, a clear example of Mixed-Initiative Co-Creation.[42] They then use AI-powered computer vision for automated quality assurance on the assembly line and predictive maintenance in deployed vehicles, which mirrors the AI-Augmented Validation of the ”Deliver” phase.[42]

In **Service and Experience Design**, streaming giants like Netflix and Spotify demonstrate the full cycle. They use sophisticated AI to analyze massive datasets of user behavior to discover viewing patterns and define opportunities for new content or features (Discover/Define).[42] They then use AI to generate personalized content, such as custom thumbnails for movies or algorithmically curated playlists, which is a form of co-creating the user experience (Develop).[24] This shows a direct link between the type of human-AI collaboration employed and the specific business value generated—in this case, hyper-personalization and user engagement [4].

In **Sustainable Architecture**, the framework's principles are used to tackle complex, multi-variable problems. AI tools are used in the ”Develop” phase to run simulations that generate building designs optimized for energy efficiency, daylighting, and sustainable material use, all within defined cost constraints.[26] This is a powerful example of using Mixed-Initiative Co-Creation to solve the DD's feasibility gap. AI-driven monitoring systems are then used in completed buildings for predictive maintenance and real-time optimization of HVAC and lighting systems, an application of the ”Deliver” phase's validation and feedback loop.[26]

Finally, in **Educational Content Development**, the entire Orchestrated Diamond is visible. AI is used to analyze student performance data to discover learning gaps and personalize learning journeys (Discover/Define).[1] It is then used to generate draft content, quizzes, and instructional videos (Develop).[1] Finally, AI automates the assessment and

grading process, providing feedback to both students and educators, which closes the loop in the ”Deliver” phase.[16]

These cases demonstrate that a causal link exists between the collaboration model and the value created. The Orchestrated Diamond is the first framework to make this link explicit, providing a strategic tool for design teams to select the right collaborative approach to achieve a specific goal, whether it be efficiency, innovation, or quality.

6 Discussion: Evolving Terminology, Practice, and Future Trajectories

6.1 The Lexicon of Collaboration: Beyond ”Augmented”

The terminology used to describe new paradigms is critical, as it shapes understanding and adoption. The initial working title, ”AI-Augmented Double Diamond” (AADD), while descriptive, is ultimately insufficient. The term ”augmented” implies that AI is solely a subordinate tool that enhances an existing human-led process. This accurately describes the AITL mode of the ”Discover” and ”Define” phases, but it fails to capture the peer-level partnership of the Mixed-Initiative ”Develop” phase or the AI-driven execution in the HITL ”Deliver” phase. The relationship is more complex and dynamic than simple augmentation.

A more precise and powerful term is **”The Orchestrated Diamond.”** The concept of ”orchestration” better reflects the designer's new, elevated role.[2] An orchestrator is not just a performer but a conductor who manages a complex system of agents—both human and artificial—and skillfully guides their interaction. They are responsible for selecting the correct collaborative mode for each phase of the work, managing the flow of data and insights between them, and ensuring that all parts work in harmony to achieve a unified goal.[2] This term correctly positions the designer's primary contribution as one of strategic management and creative direction, a role that is more critical than ever in an AI-infused environment. While alternatives like ”Mixed-Initiative Diamond” or ”Collaborative Diamond” capture aspects of the framework, ”Orchestrated” uniquely conveys the active, managerial, and dynamic nature of the entire process.

6.2 The Evolving Designer: From Creator to Orchestrator

The integration of AI as a collaborative partner precipitates a profound evolution in the role and skillset of the designer. The traditional emphasis on solitary creation and craft

is shifting towards a new set of competencies centered on collaboration, strategy, and management. The designer of the future is less of a hands-on creator and more of a **strategic orchestrator** of a human-AI team.

This role demands a new set of core competencies:

- **AI Literacy and Prompt Engineering:** A fundamental understanding of how different AI models work, their strengths, and their limitations is now essential. The ability to craft effective prompts that clearly communicate intent, context, and constraints to an AI is becoming a critical design skill in itself.[15]
- **Systems Thinking:** The modern design process is no longer a linear path but a complex, interconnected workflow. Designers must be able to think in terms of systems, understanding how to chain together different AI tools, data pipelines, and human checkpoints to create a seamless and efficient end-to-end process.[2]
- **Ethical Guardianship and Critical Judgment:** As AI takes on more of the generative work, the human's role as an ethical guardian becomes paramount. Designers must be adept at identifying and mitigating algorithmic bias, ensuring data privacy, and making the final call on whether a solution is not just effective but also fair, transparent, and responsible.[12] This includes the crucial skill of curation—the ability to critically evaluate a sea of AI-generated options and apply human taste, judgment, and strategic insight to select the most promising path forward.
- **Human-AI Teaming Skills:** Designers must learn how to effectively collaborate with non-human agents. This includes building trust in AI systems, understanding how to delegate tasks effectively, and fostering a shared mental model with their AI partners.[11]

This evolution of the designer's role is not unique; it serves as a powerful template for the future of knowledge work in general. Professionals in law, finance, marketing, and science will all need to transition from being individual contributors to becoming orchestrators of human-AI teams. The Orchestrated Diamond, therefore, can be seen not just as a framework for design, but as a case study in the future of collaborative, intelligent work.

6.3 Future Trajectories: Agentic AI and the "No-UI" Paradigm

Looking forward, the Orchestrated Diamond framework is positioned to evolve with the next wave of AI technology. The current landscape is dominated by tools that perform specific tasks. The future points towards the rise of **agentic AI**—integrated systems that can

autonomously understand high-level goals, break them down into sub-tasks, select their own tools, and execute complex, multi-step plans with minimal human intervention.[22]

In such a future, the Orchestrated Diamond might evolve significantly. Instead of a human designer orchestrating a collection of discrete AI tools (a summarizer, an image generator, a testing tool), they might collaborate with a single, powerful AI agent. This agent could fluidly switch its own internal modes, acting as a research assistant, a creative partner, and a testing engine as needed to accomplish the overarching goal set by the human.[30] The human's role as orchestrator would remain essential for setting the strategic direction and providing ethical oversight, but the ”orchestra” would become a single, highly versatile virtuoso.

This trajectory connects directly to the emerging concept of **”No-UI”** or ”Invisible UI” in enterprise systems.[48] As AI becomes more proactive, conversational, and context-aware, the need for complex graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for many tasks may diminish.[48] Interaction will shift from clicking through menus to having a conversation or allowing an agent to act based on inferred intent. This suggests that the ”Deliver” phase of the framework may, in the future, focus less on designing screens and more on designing conversations, agentic behaviors, and robust systems of intent.

Ultimately, the very concept of a fixed, named design process like the ”Double Diamond” or even the ”Orchestrated Diamond” may be a transitional artifact. An advanced agentic AI could one day analyze a specific design challenge and dynamically construct a bespoke process on the fly, tailored perfectly to the problem, the team, and the available resources. It would create its own ”diamond.” Therefore, the framework proposed in this paper can be understood as a necessary scaffold—a structured model to help humans learn the principles of how to think about and orchestrate human-AI collaboration. Its ultimate success may be its own obsolescence, once humans have fully internalized these principles and AI has become capable enough to co-create not just the solution, but the process itself.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Summary of Contributions

This paper has sought to bridge the growing chasm between established design methodologies and the transformative capabilities of modern Artificial Intelligence. In doing so, it has made several key contributions to the discourse on design theory and practice.

First, it provided a comprehensive critique of the seminal Double Diamond process, synthesizing disparate criticisms to identify its core architectural flaw: a rigid, sequential structure that creates a temporal disconnect between problem-finding and solution-building, rendering it ill-suited for the iterative and complex demands of contemporary development.

Second, it formalized the popular but informal "AI Sandwich" metaphor, grounding it in established Human-Computer Interaction theory and placing it within a broader **Spectrum of Agency**. This taxonomy, which clearly delineates between AI-in-the-Loop, Human-in-the-Loop, and Mixed-Initiative collaboration models, provides the rigorous theoretical foundation necessary for building structured, AI-integrated workflows.

Third, based on this foundation, the paper proposed **The Orchestrated Diamond**, a novel framework that resolves the Double Diamond's deficiencies by reconceptualizing its phases as distinct modes of human-AI collaboration. This model provides a practical, phase-specific guide for leveraging the right kind of AI partnership for the right design task.

Fourth, the framework was validated through a multi-faceted analysis. Its benefits in overcoming the DD's flaws were articulated, its inherent challenges related to bias, data, and skills were addressed with mitigation strategies, and its principles were grounded in reality through strong parallels with empirical case studies across multiple industries.

Finally, the paper offered a forward-looking discussion on the profound implications of this new paradigm, arguing for an evolution in terminology from "augmentation" to "orchestration" and outlining the critical shift in the designer's role from a hands-on creator to a strategic orchestrator of a human-AI team.

7.2 Final Statement: The Future of Design as Collaborative Orchestration

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into the creative process does not herald the obsolescence of the human designer; on the contrary, it elevates the role to one of unprecedented strategic importance. The future of design innovation lies not in the autonomous capabilities of AI alone, nor in the unassisted intuition of the human, but in our ability to skillfully, thoughtfully, and ethically orchestrate a new, synergistic partnership between human creativity and machine intelligence. The most valuable products, services, and systems of the coming decades will be born from this collaboration. The Orchestrated

Diamond provides the first comprehensive map for navigating this exciting and transformative new landscape, offering a structured path for design teams to harness the power of AI not just to design things right, but to discover and develop the right things to design.

References

[1] *5 AI Case Studies in Education*. 2025. URL: https://www.vktr.com/ai-disruption/5-ai-case-studies-in-education/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[2] adam23gray. *Why the double diamond isn't enough*. 2025. URL: https://uxdesign.cc/why-the-double-diamond-isnt-enough-adaa48a8aec1 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[3] *AI enters the classroom as law schools prep students for a tech-driven practice*. 2025. URL: https://nationaljurist.com/prelaw/ai-enters-the-classroom-as-law-schools-prep-students-for-a-tech-driven-practice/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[4] *AI in the Loop vs Human in the Loop: A Technical Analysis of Hybrid Systems*. 2025. URL: https://community.ibm.com/community/user/blogs/anuj-bahuguna/2025/05/25/ai-in-the-loop-vs-human-in-the-loop (visited on 07/27/2025).

[5] *AI Workflow*. 2025. URL: https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/ai-workflow (visited on 07/27/2025).

[6] Johnny Bilotta. *Model Context Protocol: Taming the AI Beast Without a PhD*. 2025. URL: https://johnnybilotta.com/post/250515-mcp-taming-the-ai-beast/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[7] *Boosting Mixed-Initiative Co-Creativity in Game Design: A Tutorial*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377435724_Boosting_Mixed-Initiative_Co-Creativity_in_Game_Design_A_Tutorial (visited on 07/27/2025).

[8] *Collaborative Intelligence - How Humans & AI Work Together?* 2025. URL: https://invozone.com/blog/collaborative-intelligence/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[9] *Collaborative Intelligence: A Scoping Review Of Current Applications*. 2024. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08839514.2024.2327890 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[10] *Combining Design Thinking and Generative AI Technologies in The Classroom: A Project-Based Learning Approach*. 2025. URL: https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/read/combining-design-thinking-and-generative-ai-technologies-in-the-classroom/section/52735f7f-8a08-4690-8926-a08ba5e8cf73 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[11] *Defining human-AI teaming the human-centered way: a scoping review and network analysis*. 2025. URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10570436/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[12] *Design GenAI-Powered Experiences Responsibly*. 2025. URL: https://www.forrester.com/blogs/design-genai-powered-experiences-responsibly/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[13] *Design implications for Designing with a Collaborative AI*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318900744_Design_implications_for_Designing_with_a_Collaborative_AI (visited on 07/27/2025).

[14] *Design Thinking and AI: A New Frontier for Designing Human-Centered AI Solutions*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362317934_Design_Thinking_and_AI_A_New_Frontier_for_Designing_Human-Centered_AI_Solutions (visited on 07/27/2025).

[15] *Design Thinking with AI*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381977036_Design_Thinking_with_AI (visited on 07/27/2025).

[16] *Developing a design thinking artificial intelligence driven auto-marking/grading system for assessments to reduce the workload*. 2024. URL: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2024.1512569/pdf (visited on 07/27/2025).

[17] *Double Diamond (design process model)*. 2025. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Double_Diamond_(design_process_model)#:~:text=Double%20Diamond%20is%20the%20name,B%C3%A1n%C3%A1thy. (visited on 07/27/2025).

[18] *Double Diamond (design process model) - Wikipedia*. 2025. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Double_Diamond_(design_process_model) (visited on 07/27/2025).

[19] *Double Diamond Is Not How Most Companies Work*. 2025. URL: https://smart-interface-design-patterns.com/articles/double-diamond-process/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[20] *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. 2025. URL: https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics (visited on 07/27/2025).

[21] *Exploring Human-AI Collaboration in Creative Industries*. 2025. URL: https://smythos.com/ai-trends/human-ai-collaboration-in-creative-industries/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[22] *Forrester Report: Agentic AI Turns Generative AI Words into Action*. 2025. URL: https://www.nice.com/resources/forrester-report-with-agentic-ai-generative-ai-is-evolving-from-words-to-actions (visited on 07/27/2025).

[23] *Generative AI: What Is It, Tools, Models, Applications and Use Cases*. 2025. URL: https://www.gartner.com/en/topics/generative-ai (visited on 07/27/2025).

[24] *Here's how designers are using AI in product design*. 2025. URL: https://blog.logrocket.com/ux-design/how-designers-use-ai-product-design/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[25] *History of the Double Diamond*. 2025. URL: https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-resources/the-double-diamond/history-of-the-double-diamond/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[26] *How AI Is Transforming Sustainable Architectural Design In The USA*. 2025. URL: https://theaecassociates.com/blog/ai-sustainable-architectural-design/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[27] *Human-AI collaboration by design*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380658063_Human-AI_collaboration_by_design (visited on 07/27/2025).

[28] *Human-in-the-loop or AI-in-the-loop? Automate or Collaborate?* 2025. URL: https://arxiv.org/html/2412.14232v1 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[29] *Innovation by Design - Evolving the Double Diamond*. 2025. URL: https://www.equalexperts.com/blog/our-thinking/innovation-by-design-evolving-double-diamond/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[30] *Introducing ChatGPT agent: bridging research and action*. 2025. URL: https://openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-agent/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[31] *Mixed-Initiative Systems for Collaborative Problem Solving*. 2025. URL: https://ojs.aaai.org/aimagazine/index.php/aimagazine/article/view/2037 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[32] *On Mixed-Initiative Content Creation for Video Games*. 2025. URL: https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/38005/1/On_Mixed-Initiative_Content_Creation_for_Video_Games.pdf (visited on 07/27/2025).

[33] Dan Ramsden. *The limitations of the Double Diamond*. 2023. URL: https://danramsden.com/2023/07/26/the-limitations-of-the-double-diamond/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[34] *The Double Diamond design process — still fit for purpose?* 2025. URL: https://medium.com/design-council/the-double-diamond-design-process-still-fit-for-purpose-fc619bbd2ad3 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[35] *The double diamond is overrated and breeds unfeasible solutions, change my mind*. 2025. URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/UserExperienceDesign/comments/ts32yw/the_double_diamond_is_overrated_and_breeds/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[36] *The Double Diamond Process: From Problems to Solutions*. 2025. URL: https://maze.co/blog/double-diamond-design-process/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[37] *The Evolution of Automation in IT Operations: From Basic Scripts to AI-Powered Solutions*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388910312_The_Evolution_of_Automation_in_IT_Operations_From_Basic_Scripts_to_AI-Powered_Solutions (visited on 07/27/2025).

[38] *The Impact of AI on Team Development*. 2025. URL: https://instituteprojectmanagement.com/blog/the-impact-of-ai-on-team-development/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[39] *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Design: Enhancing Creativity and Efficiency*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384953179_The_Impact_of_Artificial_Intelligence_on_Design_Enhancing_Creativity_and_Efficiency (visited on 07/27/2025).

[40] *The Intersection of Design Thinking and AI: Enhancing Innovation*. 2025. URL: https://www.ideou.com/blogs/inspiration/ai-and-design-thinking (visited on 07/27/2025).

[41] *The Rise of AI and Automation in Enterprise System Functionality - Enhancing Operations for the Future*. 2025. URL: https://cogleus.com/the-rise-of-ai-and-automation-in-enterprise-system-functionality-enhancing-operations-for-the-future/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[42] *The Role of AI In Product Development: A Detailed Analysis*. 2025. URL: https://www.mindinventory.com/blog/ai-in-product-development/ (visited on 07/27/2025).

[43] *The state of AI: How organizations are rewiring to capture value*. 2025. URL: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai (visited on 07/27/2025).

[44] *Triple diamond framework (source: authors) - Download Scientific Diagram*. 2025. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Triple-diamond-framework-source-authors_fig1_347731659 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[45] Eddi Weinwurm. *Symbiotic Intelligence: The Future Where Humans and AI Unite*. 2025. URL: https://medium.com/@weinwurm/symbiotic-intelligence-the-future-where-humans-and-ai-unite-0e64eaec6ea1 (visited on 07/27/2025).

[46] *What is AI Orchestration?* 2025. URL: https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/ai-orchestration (visited on 07/27/2025).

[47] *What is Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) in AI & ML*. 2025. URL: https://cloud.google.com/discover/human-in-the-loop (visited on 07/27/2025).

[48] *Where did the interface go*. 2025. URL: https://www.sap.com/design/stories-resources/where-did-the-interface-go (visited on 07/27/2025).