



An invitation to become a Distributor

North Canterbury · © John Stroh

Version 0.3 · revised 8 September 2026 · [this version as a PDF](#)

We are looking for a small number of independent collaborators, trusted in a region or a sector, to help suitable organisations take up this work.

The pursuit of 'Goodness' in AI — Sovereign agents, and what it takes to trust one with real work

One · The Road ahead

An invitation to explore a Distributor role

My Digital Sovereignty is looking for a small number of independent collaborators who are trusted within a particular region, professional field, or community sector.

We call these collaborators Distributors. The term is practical rather than grand: a Distributor helps suitable organisations understand the Village and related services, decide whether they are a good fit, and adopt them successfully if they choose to proceed.

This is an invitation to explore a possible working relationship. It is not an offer of employment, a franchise, an exclusive territory, or a completed commercial agreement.

 [Ask the Glossary](#)



Separate trunks, overlapping into one canopy, with nothing at the centre.

Why local collaborators matter

The work described in this research is about more than software. Small organisations need technology that fits their actual practices, obligations, relationships, and capacity. That work is rarely solved by a remote sales process or a larger advertising budget.

A Distributor brings something My Digital Sovereignty cannot create from a distance:

- Local or sector knowledge.
- Established professional relationships.
- An understanding of how organisations in that setting make decisions.
- The ability to explain the service in practical terms.
- A realistic view of what customers will adopt, pay for, and support.

The company provides the platform, product development, technical architecture, documentation, training material, and central support. A Distributor provides the local knowledge and trusted relationship needed to introduce the work responsibly.

What a Distributor may do

The role will vary by sector and location, but it may include:

- Identifying organisations for which the Village or governance API may be useful.
- Introducing the service and explaining its practical benefits and limits.
- Helping prospective customers assess whether the service fits their needs.
- Supporting onboarding, adoption, and ordinary customer communication.
- Providing local or sector-specific services where that is useful and separately agreed.
- Feeding practical experience back into product development, documentation, and service design.

A Distributor is not expected to be a software developer or a large technical organisation. The intention is that routine platform operation remains centrally supported, while local technical work — where it is required — can be provided by people already equipped to do it in that area.

What is available now

The Village is a private online environment for a single organisation or community. It brings together functions that many groups currently spread across separate services: member information, announcements, discussions, events, calendars, documents, polls, video meetings, and member communications.

The platform is intended for organisations that want a more private and durable alternative to advertising-funded or externally controlled platforms. Its design priorities include:

- No advertising or sale of member data.
- No engagement-driven feed.
- A clear record of organisational activity and decisions.
- Support for member-controlled access, records, and exports.
- Deployment and operational arrangements designed to reduce unnecessary dependence on large overseas technology platforms.
- A practical approach to AI assistance: the assistant suggests rather than decides, and where the platform does act on its own — sorting and publishing a member's own submissions, for example — it does so within limits the organisation sets and can turn off.

The governance API is a separate offer for organisations that already have their own software but need a structured way to manage proposed actions, approvals, records, and limits. It is not yet generally available: the interface and the records are built, and the engine that would issue live verdicts is not switched on.

Some parts of the platform are operating today. Other parts — including the full distributor programme and aspects of the control-plane design — are still being developed and tested. We will distinguish clearly between the two in any conversation.

How a Distributor relationship might work

The intended model is collaborative rather than extractive. We do not want a Distributor relationship that treats local organisations as leads to be captured by a distant supplier, or that leaves a Distributor dependent on terms they cannot influence.

The broad principles are:

- A Distributor would work within an agreed sector, geography, or cell, rather than receive an indefinite exclusive territory.
- A Distributor could continue to offer other services or platforms where that serves their customers.
- The company would provide the platform, central technical support, product information, and agreed training.
- The Distributor would retain revenue from separately agreed local services.
- Any share of subscription revenue, service obligations, support boundaries, and capacity limits would be agreed explicitly before appointment.
- The relationship would include a practical exit process, so that neither party is left with avoidable operational dependency.

These are design principles, not final terms. The first formal arrangement should be developed with a prospective Distributor who understands the relevant market and can identify what would make the arrangement workable.

What has not been settled

Several matters are deliberately open because they should be resolved with practical evidence rather than assumed in advance:

- The commercial margin or revenue-sharing model.
- The amount of routine support that can be handled centrally and the amount that requires local involvement.
- The most suitable sectors and organisation sizes for the initial programme.
- The service and capacity limits that should apply as the network grows.
- The legal and contractual form of the relationship in each jurisdiction. An earlier internal ruling limits distributors to New Zealand or Canada; later working material contemplates a wider set on tighter data terms. The two have not been reconciled, so ask before you spend time on it.
- The technical and operational requirements for a fully tested distributor exit process.

We will not present these matters as settled when they are not. A serious partnership needs clear terms, a realistic view of costs and responsibilities, and a shared understanding of what the platform can and cannot yet do.

Who this may suit

The role may suit an independent adviser, technology provider, community-network organiser, professional-services firm, sector association, managed-service provider, or other person or organisation that already works closely with small and medium-sized groups.

You may be a good fit if:

- Organisations in a particular field or place already trust your judgement.
- You are interested in privacy, institutional independence, and responsible use of AI.
- You prefer long-term client relationships over one-off software sales.
- You can recognise where a digital system will fit ordinary working practice — and where it will not.
- You want to help shape an early-stage distribution model rather than simply resell a finished commodity product.

Starting the conversation

An initial conversation is exploratory. We would want to understand the organisations you know, the services you already provide, the problems your customers are trying to solve, and whether the Village or governance API is relevant to them.

We would also discuss what you would need in order to represent the work responsibly: product information, technical support, training, commercial clarity, local service boundaries, and a credible way to end the arrangement if it proves unsuitable.

If this work is relevant to the organisations you serve, we would welcome an initial conversation. We can show you what is operating now, explain what remains in development, and discuss whether there is a realistic basis for a Distributor relationship.

An enquiry creates no obligation. Any appointment, commercial arrangement, territory, service responsibility, or revenue-sharing arrangement would be agreed separately and recorded in writing.

To begin a conversation, contact John Stroh at john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital.

Foreword

The foreword below is by John Stroh, written in his own words. It sets out the thinking behind the invitation above; the recap that follows is the essay built around it.

Background as of early September 2026

The search for goodness in AI needs an addendum that cements its proposition in the real world. What matters now is our focus on enhancing the stacks required to deliver Good AI in the distributed structures that the [“Blueprint”](#) calls for. The structures themselves are embedded in the sovereign signed and sealed record, with a timestamp. In just a few months the AI landscape has changed from a focus on LLMs, to Agent and now onward to the governance of the full integrated architecture and agentic organisation that must be harnessed effectively. New engineering skills are emerging from harness engineering to loop engineering and there are other contenders chomping at the bit.

The [Goodness in AI essay series](#) points at the published research material from which the series had evolved. Each of the related articles here was another step into understanding the requirement for Goodness in AI. I would like to summarise those components going back many months. They were indeed discrete steps that lead to deliverables in the Village and its substrates, the evolving API and the Village Agentic Cockpit that is still work in progress.

The complexity

The difficulty in painting a cohesive picture of the road ahead lies not only in the imponderables of how the battle between the China and US, and to a lesser degree the EU, evolves but far more on the speed at which human beings have the capacity to absorb the changes upon us. This in itself is a complex dimension of research I would like to capture here. Speculation on the speed of delivery of the physical components of the emerging hybrid AI human exosphere (research Ben Reid’s work) does not make matters easier. There are other dimensions of the evolving AI landscape that may be too complex to enable full understanding by any single AI researcher and certainly by the majority of readers of an essay like this one. Helping to at least catalogue those complexities is a step towards understanding the road ahead.

The Road ahead

It would be tempting to try and conjure up a timeline of expectations but that would be a distraction. What is important to me now is to provide a roadmap to deliver our version of goodness in AI. Such a roadmap inevitably breaks the boundary of these research pages and lands in a space that is clearly ‘commercial’.

If the niche market for the AI Goodness deliverables we are delivering to a global market can be realised, the solutions we are offering must find replication at scale. I do not claim to have the only valid approach to Goodness in AI - there are many approaches that may have lighter philosophical focus and many that will deliver commensurate 'goodness' by other means. I do not speak for them or to pretend that I have a clear understanding of the emerging field pursuing this world market niche.

Having said that, I can only make my vision a reality if My Digital Sovereignty Ltd. can find Distributors for the Product. The Road ahead section in this essay encapsulates our vision of a Distribution network and how the relationship with distributors might evolve. Read this section in the essay as a proposal to work with me.

John Stroh My Digital Sovereignty Ltd john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital

Research: <https://agenticgovernance.digital> Platform: <https://mysovereignty.digital>

Two · How this came about

The research published on this site asks what it would take for an organisation to use AI and digital infrastructure without giving up practical control over its data, its authority, its records and its ability to leave. Six documents set out the argument, and each is short enough to read on its own.

- **What has to be settled first** — whether a system is safe, fair or accurate contains a blank that only the organisation answerable for it can fill.
- **Who actually holds the controls** — paying for an agent is not the same as governing it, and five questions will tell you which you have.
- **How much it may do unsupervised** — “human in the loop” does not answer the question; naming a level does, because an undeclared level cannot be audited.
- **The four properties underneath** — an identity that is not borrowed, a capability that is not ambient, authority that narrows rather than widens, and a record someone who was not there can rely on.
- **What you can actually require** — twelve requirements a buyer can write down, eight of which nothing currently obliges anyone to meet.
- **What nobody has measured yet** — the four questions this work cannot answer, published as questions rather than filled with figures.

My Digital Sovereignty Limited is building the Village platform and related governance infrastructure as one practical response. John Stroh is both the author of the research and the director of the company. That creates a commercial interest, and readers should take it into

account.

The research proposes standards that any arrangement should meet. The company's platform is one attempt to meet some of them. Neither validates the other, and either may be wrong independently of the other. The evidence, the limitations and the open questions are set out in the six documents above and in the sources page for each.

The platform is not presented as finished or independently assured. Some services are operating; others remain in development. There has been no independent penetration test, and questions remain about portability, governance, capacity, and the form a sustainable operating model should take.

One practical conclusion is already clear enough to act on. Technology alone will not determine whether an organisation can adopt this work well. Adoption depends on people who understand a sector or a place, have standing with the organisations in it, and can help them judge whether the change is worth making.

That is why My Digital Sovereignty is exploring a network of independent Distributors, and why the invitation above is an invitation rather than an offer.

How you would know this is wrong

First, if organisations take this up as readily on their own as through someone they already trust, then the case for Distributors is our need dressed as a finding. It should be withdrawn, not restated. The comparison is simple enough: how do organisations fare arriving directly, against arriving by introduction?

Second, if stating the commercial interest changes nothing a reader does, then the disclosure is a courtesy rather than a correction. The effort belongs where it changes an outcome.

Third, if a Distributor cannot get straight answers about who holds their data, what we can change without asking them, and how they would leave, then this work will have set a standard and built something that fails it. Those answers should be demonstrable rather than promised. The first attempt to check them should find something.

Related

- [What has to be settled first](#) — why the prior questions are prior
- [Who actually holds the controls](#) — five questions establishing whether an authority to act actually exists

- How much it may do unsupervised — five levels of permitted autonomy
- The four properties underneath — four properties a delegation must carry
- What you can actually require — twelve requirements, and what currently requires each of them
- What nobody has measured yet — four open questions, and the observations that would settle them
- The blueprint — what a group of small organisations builds together, and what it has to do
- Someone picks up — what the arrangement does on an ordinary Tuesday

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Leslie Stroh — my big brother, a product philosopher, and a magnificent role model. He helped me find my way to a vision of goodness in AI.

►DISCLAIMER

How this was made. The version number counts drafts of the text. It does not measure the inquiry behind it, which has run over days and across several AI systems, with argument between those systems and within them, directed, refused and repeatedly redirected by the author. The source material was AI-generated, and then adversarially and iteratively refined across a range of tools — systems built by different companies in different jurisdictions, set against each other and against the author. No one of them produced this text, and no one of them reviewed it alone. **The plurality is deliberate rather than incidental.** A single model carries a single set of priors about which sources are authoritative, and this series argues that an evidence base narrowed in exactly that way is how a contested question comes to look settled. Using one model to investigate that claim would have been the claim refuting itself. To name a single model on it would credit that model with work that was neither its own nor done in a single pass. **The plurality was also necessary, and the record should say why.** In drafting, the assisting model repeatedly led with United States institutional sources — a national laboratory, an industry association, a market study nineteen years old — and presented conclusions drawn from them as the state of knowledge. On one occasion European measured data contradicting those conclusions was present in the same research return and was placed below them. Framings were proposed that would have argued against this series' own position using that evidence base, and offered as rigour. Each was refused by the author and the material rebuilt. That is the mechanism these documents describe, occurring in their own making, and it is recorded because a series arguing that evidence bases narrow without anyone deciding to narrow them cannot credibly claim its own production was exempt. The framing, the corrections and the judgements are the author's, and so are the errors.

Cite this version

An invitation to become a Distributor, version 0.3 (September 2026).
agenticgovernance.digital/downloads/become-a-distributor-v0-3.pdf

Licensed CC BY 4.0. Reuse is free, including commercially, provided the author is credited and the reuse does not suggest that the author endorses it.

Version 0.3 was revised in place. Version 0.3, 7 September 2026: the essay was shortened to a recap and an invitation. Version 0.2 tried to do too many jobs at once — explain the role, defend the research, declare unresolved technical limits, pre-negotiate commercial terms and anticipate every objection — and the result read as a constitutional audition rather than a proposal to work together. It is now a plain account of what a Distributor does, what is available today, what a relationship might look like, and what has not been settled. The lock-in argument and the three-structure revenue table were removed to a partner pack, along with the two diagrams that drew them; detail that belongs in due diligence is no longer in the invitation. Nothing that bears on a reader's decision was softened: the programme is early, parts of the

platform are still in development, and no terms exist until they are agreed in writing. Anyone holding an earlier copy of this version should treat [/become-a-distributor](#) as authoritative.

PREVIOUS

What nobody has measured yet

[Series contents](#)

Alongside: [questions and answers](#) · [sources and provenance](#) · [slides](#)

Share this

[Mastodon](#)

[Email](#)

[Copy link](#)

Found something wrong?

This piece names what would show it is wrong. If you have that — a figure, a source, an argument — it is worth more to us than agreement. Tell us which claim and why.

Which section, if you know it

for example: 2. Four properties

The claim you are responding to

quote it, or describe it

What is wrong with it

Your email, only if you want an answer

Used to reply to you and nothing else. No list, no newsletter, never passed on.

Send this