

# Briefing for Te Kāhui Māori Atamai Iahiko

---

Tractatus research + Village platform — what the architecture offers Māori

**Online meeting · 19 June 2026**

John Stroh · Director, My Digital Sovereignty Ltd

[john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital](mailto:john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital) · M +64 27 241 8020

Research: [agenticgovernance.digital](https://agenticgovernance.digital) · Platform: [mysovereignty.digital](https://mysovereignty.digital)

---

Full brief with deep-linked sources: [agenticgovernance.digital/docs.html?doc=kahui-maori-briefing-june-2026](https://agenticgovernance.digital/docs.html?doc=kahui-maori-briefing-june-2026)

# Background

---

## Offered in good faith.

- **The conversation is moving** from "*How capable can the next model be?*" to "*How does an agent behave when it is doing work in someone's name?*" — agentic performance, governance of agent behaviour, and attribution are where serious AI governance work now lives.
- **A way to use AI safely in your communities exists today.** The architecture I have developed — sovereign records, polycentric governance, kaitiaki as a structural property — is implemented in the Village.
- **I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with you. With respect.**

---

→ [Aotearoa NZ Agentic AI Framework v1.2](#)

# 1 · Sovereign-Record Architecture — the governance foundation

---

**Every record carries its own governance** — provenance signature, **kaitiaki** attribution, and federation envelope are properties of the record itself, not of the database around it.

- **Governance is architectural, not policy.** Rules are encoded in the record at design time. Policy can be relaxed by a determined operator; provenance cannot.
- **Governance travels with the record.** A federation hand-off carries kaitiaki and consent into the receiving village. The receiver cannot fork the governance off the record.
- **For Māori communities:** kaitiakitanga over taonga held in the system is a structural property of every record — the same mechanism that refuses a rogue admin refuses a rogue agent.
- **Future agentic capability inherits the refusal.** Adversary **A7 — misattribution-via-aggregating-agent** — is named *before* any agentic surface ships. The refusal is a design-time invariant, not a remedial patch when autonomy arrives.

---

→ [SRA v4 §3.6 — CARE Principles](#) · [§4.1 — Adversaries](#) · [Village agentic overlay — companion article](#)

## 2 · Federation — of Villages **and** of their AI

---

**Federation is signed-envelope exchange under bilateral consent — not a shared substrate other parties can pivot through.**

- **Two installations exchange data only through signed, consent-bound, scope-limited envelopes** — no shared platform an attacker can pivot through.
- **The same channel carries AI consultation.** Village-to-village SLM queries use the same envelope mechanism, not a separate AI-only path.
- **Iwi-to-iwi, hapū-to-hapū federation** by the same mechanism. Revocation is immediate; exit without penalty.
- **Forward commitment.** The federation API specification will be published under EUPL-1.2 — any Aotearoa AI project (Papa Reo, kahu.code, Kete AI, Māori Lab, hauora services, university research) can federate with Village situated models on the same envelope.

---

→ [comms-constitution §4.5 — Federation protocol](#) · [SRA v4 §7 — Bilateral federation in production](#)

## 3 · Polycentric steering authority over AI behaviour

---

The platform is substrate, not steering authority. Iwi, community trust, and platform are co-equal — each publishes signed steering packs from its own registry.

- **Tino rangatiratanga over AI behaviour is an architectural commitment**, not a feature the platform offers.
- **When an iwi pack is withdrawn, the platform cannot substitute its own.** The SLM falls back to silence, not to a platform default.
- **A marae worked example in §5 traces the concrete withdrawal mechanics** — what changes for the SLM's responses the moment the pack is revoked.
- Proposals offered as starting points, not settled designs — the Taonga-Centred Steering Governance paper is draft awaiting Māori peer review.

---

→ [Taonga-Centred Steering Governance v0.2 §3.2, §5, §8](#) · [Steering Vectors and Mechanical Bias v1.1](#)

## 4 · Records carry **kaitiaki** as a structural property

---

**Kaitiakitanga is not metadata or a label — it is a cryptographically signed field on every sovereign record.**

- **Encoded in the data architecture**, not annotated next to it: a signed field on the origin object, not a policy header on a database table.
- **Proof chain on every sovereign record:** `author_id`, `kaitiaki_id`, `tikanga_under_which_shared`, `provenance_hash` (Ed25519).
- **Attribution survives federation**, cannot be operator-modified, is bound cryptographically to the record.
- **When the operator publishes for a community:** `author_id = null`, `kaitiaki_id = operator` — explicit refusal to claim authorship of community kōrero.
- **13 sovereign content models signed** (Story, Comment, Media, Album, Poll, Event, Deliberation, Correspondence, NewsPost, Resource, CommunityResource, ResourceBooking, ChatMessage).

---

→ [SRA v4 §5.2 — Sovereign-record metadata schema](#) · [Whakapapa/tikanga schema \(pattern document\)](#)

## 5 · Situated language models — and the Village runtime that wraps them

---

The model is one component. **The five-gate runtime that wraps it** is what makes the SLM safe in a Māori context:

1. **Policy gate** (PolicyInheritanceEngine) — tighten-only, fail-CLOSED on unrecognised scope
2. **Inference gate** (InferenceRouter) — sovereign infra only; *no US endpoint exists in code-route*
3. **Situated-model dispatch** — `villageai-14b-whanau-v1` etc., per village type
4. **Guardian Agents** — six governance services per inference
5. **Editorial queue** — no auto-publish; every emission clears on human instruction

**Schema, not translation overlay:** whakapapa, taonga, tikanga, marae, whenua as **first-class content classes**. Training discipline forbids aspirational training, web-scraping, synthetic generation, platform-side retraining without community authority.

---

→ [Sovereign-SLL Synopsis §3 — The weight-modification stance](#) · [SRA v4 §6 — Architectural implementation](#)

## 5.5 · Skill evolution — where Village sits in the optimizer landscape

---

**A line of frontier research is converging on the same substrate Village uses. The substrate is shared. The gate is not. That is the entire structural question.**

- **The shared substrate.** Frozen base model. Evolving text artifact carrying the agent's instructions. Automated validation gate. Stanford's TextGrad and GEPA; the 2026 skill-evolution cluster — SkillOpt (Microsoft + SJTU / Tongji / Fudan), Trace2Skill, EvoSkill.
- **Where the optimiser landscape stops short.** The gate is a benchmark score. No kaitiaki on the artifact. No iwi mandate on the trajectory. No community-defined boundary tested at the moment outputs are produced. The community is beneficiary or victim of where the gate pulls, never constitutive of the gate.
- **What Village holds in place.** Polycentric steering authority (§3) puts the gate where the optimiser landscape leaves it open. Iwi-signed steering packs determine what the artifact may pursue. Cultural-boundary checking gates outputs against Mead's Tikanga Test at runtime. The benchmark sits under the kaitiaki, not above.
- **Not a feature gap — a different theory of authority.** The optimiser frame has no notion of community as a constitutive locus of authority. Village does. The architectural commitment is to where the gating sits.

---

→ Source material: [\*Held in kōrero, not collapsed to a number — plural values, living organisations, and AI\*](#)

→ [SkillOpt arXiv:2605.23904](#) · [GEPA arXiv:2507.19457](#) · [TextGrad arXiv:2406.07496](#) · [Trace2Skill arXiv:2605.21810](#) · [EvoSkill arXiv:2603.02766](#)

## 6 · Aotearoa-sovereign substrate, NZ-partnership commons path

---

### Sovereign infrastructure by absence-of-route, not by code-review trust.

- **No US-cloud in the production path.** No code path exists through which a request can reach a US-controlled endpoint. Vendor prohibition enforced by the absence of the route.
- **Inference on Catalyst Cloud NZ**, with home-eGPU failover.
- **Tractatus framework EUPL-1.2** on [Codeberg](#); Village platform completing per-module migration to EUPL-1.2.
- **Modest funding** — a \$1,000/month Catalyst Cloud grant currently allocated to the substrate. Sovereignty does not require frontier-scale funding.
- **Forward path:** NZ-based partnerships to extend the commons — governance framework, federation protocol, vocabulary system, AI-governance pipeline released for NZ-based developers and Māori-led teams to fork and extend.

---

→ [Tractatus framework](#) — [Codeberg](#) · [About](#) — [agenticgovernance.digital](#)

## 7 · Documented engagement with Māori-AI governance discipline

---

The engagement is on paper, in code, and in an immutable audit trail.

- **In papers:** Dr Taiuru's Te Tiriti governance duty (SRA v4 §3.6) and his counsel that tikanga compliance is far easier to build in from the beginning than to retrofit (§4.1) — cited by author and section.
- **In the public record:** When your 20 September 2025 critical analysis identified Te Mana Raraunga as superseded for AI work, the Aotearoa Framework's references pivoted to Te Kāhui Raraunga's Māori AI Governance Framework the same day.
- **In code:** `CulturalBoundaryChecker` implements Mead's Tikanga Test as a service at every record's editorial gate — cultural-boundary checking is a runtime check, not a policy aspiration.
- **In the audit trail:** Framework-consultation logging records every architectural decision against the six governance services into immutable storage.

---

→ [SRA v4 §3.6 — CARE Principles](#) · [§4.1 — Adversaries](#) · [Aotearoa Framework v1.2 §0 — Philosophical Foundations](#)

## 8 · The governance trajectory — the undertaking

---

**My Digital Sovereignty Ltd. (MDSL)** has a documented destination: a **largely Māori Board of Trustees of a Trust**, based in Aotearoa, with authority over the platform's policy, constitution, and architectural decisions.

Revenue from the franchise distribution layer funds the agentic infrastructure that supports that body.

**The Board, when constituted, is the operator's commitment to ensuring that authority sits where it should — over the platform itself, not just over its uses.**

I come to this in a co-governance posture, with no firm lines on ownership, financial interests, governance roles, or succession. Those are conversations to have with the right Māori authority — not positions for me to walk in with.

---

→ Distribution Licensing Model — "The Long View"

## 8 · A possible governance trajectory

---

Three items toward the largely-Māori-Board endpoint where Māori authority — not the operator — is the gating factor:

- **Taonga-Centred Steering Governance paper** — draft awaiting Māori peer review
- **Whānau-village situated language model** — training-corpus authority is not the operator's to claim
- **Whakapapa/tikanga schema** — awaiting cultural-reviewer refinement

Beyond shared multi-tenancy, the EUPL-1.2 licence and the federation design support fully self-hosted instances — iwi, hapū, or marae infrastructure; community-trained models; community-governed federation. Bespoke today; turnkey packaging in development.

The platform continues on its own track. These items will land when the right Māori authority engages with them.

## 9 · Tuakana/teina — an existing training ground

---

**The panel operates a tuakana/teina scheme** to ensure succession of Māori AI governance expertise to rangatahi.

The Village's mutual-support infrastructure — its help widget evolved into a cross-community support service in which villages help each other — is a **working environment in which AI governance review happens daily**.

The two patterns fit.

---

→ [From help widget to global services — Village communities support each other](#)

## 9 · Tuakana/teina — what rangatahi could engage with

---

Rangatahi participating in the panel's succession scheme could, if useful:

- Review real Guardian Agent decisions and the framework consultations behind them
- Observe policy-gate decisions, federation manifests, and editorial-queue holds in live tenants
- Contribute to whānau-village deployments under kaitiaki mentorship
- Build practical fluency in the Te Kāhui Raraunga Māori AI Governance Framework as applied in a working platform

**No ask attached.** Mentioned because the operative Village pattern fits the panel's stated succession discipline.

# Ngā mihi

---

The full briefing with deep-linked sources and per-section feedback:

[agenticgovernance.digital/docs.html?doc=kahui-maori-briefing-june-2026](https://agenticgovernance.digital/docs.html?doc=kahui-maori-briefing-june-2026)

Architectural papers on agenticgovernance.digital · Operating platform on mysovereignty.digital · Framework code on [codeberg.org/mysovereignty/tractatus-framework](https://codeberg.org/mysovereignty/tractatus-framework)

John Stroh · Director, My Digital Sovereignty Ltd · [john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital](mailto:john.stroh@mysovereignty.digital)