Digital Identity Optimization and the Ontology of Digital Identity: A Reflexive Analysis of Implementation, Distribution, and Reconstructability

Author-Led Research Using Qwen

Daniel Beránek

Independent Researcher, Brno, Czech Republic

dan@danielberanek.cz

October 30, 2026

Digital Identity Optimization and the Ontology of Digital Identity: A Reflexive Analysis of Implementation, Distribution, and Reconstructability

1. Executive Summary

This report examines the distributed ecosystem of Digital Identity Optimization (DIO) and the Ontology of Digital Identity (ODI), authored by Daniel Beránek, through the framework' s own conceptual apparatus and a graph-theoretical analysis of its distribution network. The central research question is: at the observed point in time (late October 2026), to what extent does the distributed DIO/ODI ecosystem appear to sustain a recognizable, referentially continuous, and meaningfully reconstructable identity across heterogeneous representations and entry points, despite partial inconsistencies, gaps, inaccessible resources, and uneven updating?

The investigation reveals an ecosystem that appears to hold together with notable structural coherence, though this coherence is not uniform across all layers or all observer entry points. The framework's core conceptual invariant—six interdependent dimensions organized as a complete graph K6, supplemented by a taxonomy of Reconstruction Failure Modes—remains stable across the machine-readable vocabulary, the archived Zenodo records, and the principal Czech and English manifestos. The mechanisms supporting reconstruction include persistent identifiers (Zenodo DOIs, a stable canonical namespace), explicit architectural separation between canonical and derived layers, documented epistemic rules constraining how the reference model may relate to the theory, and cross-layer linking between the web hub, the repository, and the archival records.

The principal weaknesses identified—asynchronous multilingual projections, the deliberate deferral of a completed formal ontology, distributed identity records across multiple platforms, and version differences between live and archived states—are assessed for materiality. Within this observation domain, these weaknesses appear locally contained. They create potential obstacles to reconstruction at specific entry points or for specific observer types, but the available representations and pathways appear sufficient to preserve continuity at the system level. The ecosystem does not eliminate the possibility of reconstruction failure; it provides structural conditions under which such failures can be identified, contextualized, and compensated.

The analysis also reveals that the ecosystem applies a core DIO principle to DIO itself: the conceptual identity of the discipline is designed to be reconstructable from explicit, distributed, provenance-aware representations rather than inferred anew from prose each time. This self-application is an architectural observation, not an empirical validation. The framework' s resilience at the observed snapshot is a property of its design and implementation, not a proof of its general validity.

2. Research Approach and Corpus

2.1 Entry Sequence and Analytical Orientation

The investigation entered the corpus through the machine-readable reference layer before proceeding to the archival and web representations. This sequence was chosen to establish a conceptual orientation from the most constrained and explicit representations before encountering the volume and rhetorical density of the surrounding narrative texts.

The primary machine-readable resources inspected were: - The DIO/ODI Reference Vocabulary at `https://vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/` (live version 0.2.0) - The source repository at `https://github.com/dan-beranek/dio-odi-reference-model` (422 commits, 7 releases, latest commit 29 October 2026)

Subsequently, the investigation examined: - The Zenodo author corpus (searched by creator name "Beránek, Daniel") - The ORCID record (0009-0004-0050-0264) - The central web hub at `https://danielberanek.cz/manifest-dio/` - The English manifesto at `https://danielberanek.cz/manifest` - The AI-oriented context files (`llms.txt`, `llms-full.txt`) - The professional biography page

2.2 Analytical Method

The analytical method was derived from DIO/ODI' s own conceptual resources rather than imposed externally. The framework' s taxonomy of Reconstruction Failure Modes (Referential Reconstruction Failures, Semantic Coherence Failures, Temporal Reconstruction Failures, Contextual Adequacy Failures) provided the diagnostic vocabulary for identifying where and how reconstruction might be strained. The distinction between Entity, Representation, Interpretation, Trust, Relationship, and Reconstruction provided the dimensions along which continuity was assessed.

The analysis applies interpretive symmetry: it does not infer successful protection merely from the presence of a safeguard, nor does it infer system-level failure merely from the presence of an inconsistency. Each finding is evaluated in relation to the reconstruction task and the observation domain.

Four levels of statement are maintained throughout: (a) observed artifact or condition; (b) architectural role within the DIO/ODI ecosystem; (c) local reconstruction consequence for a particular observer or entry point; (d) system-level significance for the identity of the framework as a whole.

2.3 Observation Boundary and Limitations

The observation is a temporal snapshot taken in late October 2026. Inbound links found within the collected corpus represent observed in-degree, not global web in-degree. Acquisition of some resources (e.g., certain Zenodo record pages, ResearchGate profile) may be constrained by platform access policies. A failed fetch establishes that a particular acquisition route failed; it does not by itself establish that the resource is absent or unavailable through every route. The analysis distinguishes what was directly inspected from what is inferred from cross-references within inspected materials.

---

3. DIO/ODI-Native Analysis

3.1 The Framework' s Core Structure as Observed in the Reference Layer

The DIO/ODI framework, as expressed in the reference vocabulary and the primary publications, is organized around two complementary planes. DIO is the applied discipline concerned with how digital

entities are represented, interpreted, and reconstructed across AI, search, and human-facing environments. ODI is the theoretical counterpart investigating the underlying concepts and relations through which digital entities emerge, persist, and can be reconstructed. The relationship is stated explicitly in the `llms.txt` context file: "DIO addresses strategic and applied optimization; ODI investigates the underlying identity concepts and relations" [llms.txt].

The deep structure common to both planes is described as a non-linear semantic space composed of six mutually interdependent dimensions: Entity, Representation, Interpretation, Trust, Relationship, and Reconstruction. These are visualized as a complete graph K6 in the shape of a pentagonal pyramid [English manifesto; Czech manifesto; repository README]. The manifesto states that these dimensions "coexist simultaneously within the semantic space and are mathematically and structurally interdependent" and that "any local change or fluctuation in one of the nodes immediately redefines and impacts the state of all other elements" [English manifesto, Figure 1 caption].

This formulation requires careful interpretation. The K6 model represents conceptual interdependence within a non-linear semantic space. It asserts that the six dimensions are mutually conditioning and cannot be reduced to a sequential process. This is a structural and relational claim about the framework's conceptual architecture. It does not, by itself, establish a specific causal mechanism or a quantifiable propagation dynamic. The distinction matters for reconstruction: an observer encountering the K6 model should understand it as expressing mutual conditioning and non-reducibility, not as a predictive dynamical system with specified transition rules. The repository's epistemic rule reinforces this boundary: "K6 is represented as a finer-grained candidate model, not as a logical consequence of MVDIO" [repository README, Epistemic rule section].

The framework's scope is explicitly delimited. The `llms.txt` file states: "Digital identity in this framework concerns representation and reconstruction rather than primarily login credentials, authentication, account access, or government-issued digital identification" [llms.txt]. The framework excludes cybersecurity, transactional processes, civil/legal dimensions, data-double management, and behavioral-predictive analytics [manifest hub]. This delimitation is architecturally significant: it defines what the framework does not attempt to reconstruct, thereby narrowing the domain within which reconstruction failures might be attributed to the framework's own limitations.

3.2 The Reconstruction Failure Mode Taxonomy

The reference vocabulary formalizes a taxonomy of Reconstruction Failure Modes, organized into four categories:

Category	Specific Modes
Referential Reconstruction Failures	Entity Substitution, Merge Failure, Split Failure, Entity Omission
Semantic Coherence Failures	Semantic Fragmentation
Temporal Reconstruction Failures	Temporal Discontinuity, Temporal Misalignment
Contextual Adequacy Failures	Contextual Displacement

Additionally, three concepts are deliberately kept outside the failure-mode hierarchy as related but distinct: Identity Collapse (a phenomenon-level concept), Semantic Vulnerability (a robustness-related property), and Semantic Robustness [repository README, concept map; vocabulary page]. The repository's epistemic rule states: "Identity Collapse is not defined as a sum, superclass, consequence, or cause of the current Reconstruction Failure Modes. Semantic Vulnerability is not classified as a Reconstruction Failure Mode" [repository README].

This taxonomy provides the diagnostic vocabulary for the present analysis. Each observed weakness in the ecosystem can be assessed against these categories to determine whether it constitutes an instance

of a specific failure mode, a susceptibility to one, or merely a local variation that does not rise to the level of a reconstruction failure.

3.3 Conceptual Continuity Across Representational Layers

The Reference Vocabulary (machine-readable layer)

The live Reference Vocabulary (v0.2.0) is published in SKOS/RDF (Turtle) and JSON-LD serializations at the canonical namespace `https://vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/#` [vocabulary page]. It is explicitly described as "SKOS-first" and "does not claim to be a completed formal ontology" [vocabulary page; repository README]. A future OWL layer is anticipated but deferred: "A future OWL layer should add stronger axioms only where the published corpus and subsequent review justify them" [repository README].

The vocabulary provides stable concept URIs (e.g., `https://vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/#SemanticFragm`definitions, broader/narrower and related-concept relations, provenance, and revision notes [vocabulary page]. It is assigned a Zenodo Concept DOI covering all versions: `10.5281/zenodo.23272897` [vocabulary page; repository README].

Within DIO's conceptual logic, the vocabulary can be interpreted as the primary mechanism for maintaining Referential Continuity. By assigning persistent URIs to concepts and making their relations explicit, it provides structural support against Entity Substitution (where a concept might be confused with a similarly named but distinct concept) and Semantic Fragmentation (where a concept's meaning might diverge across representations). The vocabulary does not, however, provide the narrative context, historical development, or argumentative grounding that the manifestos and papers supply. An observer encountering only the vocabulary would recover the conceptual structure but not the rationale or genesis.

The Archival Publications (Zenodo layer)

The Zenodo corpus includes the canonical multilingual manifesto (DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.21610934`), the conceptual framework paper (DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.23305929`), and several additional papers including "The Crisis of Entity Resolution" (`10.5281/zenodo.22257504`), "Minimum Viable DIO" (`10.5281/zenodo.23226205`), and "From Entity Resolution Anomalies to Reconstruction Failure Modes" (`10.5281/zenodo.23269323`) [repository README, Primary sources]. The Reference Model itself has been archived in multiple versions: v0.2.0 (`10.5281/zenodo.23282752`), v0.3.1 (`10.5281/zenodo.23290683`), v0.3.2 (`10.5281/zenodo.23300703`), v0.4.0 (`10.5281/zenodo.23632619`), and v0.5.0 (`10.5281/zenodo.23643845`) [repository README].

These records provide persistent identification and version anchoring. They establish citable states of the framework at specific points in time. The DOI system provides referential stability—a URL that will resolve regardless of future changes to the underlying content—but does not constitute peer review or external validation. The distinction is important: the Zenodo records support Trust in the sense of verifiable provenance and citability, but they do not independently establish the theoretical validity of the framework's claims.

The `llms.txt` file explicitly addresses the relationship between live and archived states: "Live web texts and archived releases represent their respective publication states; subsequent web revisions do not modify an already archived edition" [llms.txt]. This is not a temporal paradox but a deliberate architectural decision. The archived edition preserves the state of the framework at the moment of publication; the living web edition continues to evolve. An observer encountering both should understand them as representing different temporal states of the same ongoing process, not as competing claims about what the framework "really is."

The Web Texts (narrative layer)

The central manifest hub (`/manifest-dio/`) presents the framework in Czech as the canonical language, with the English version as the "principal English-language version coordinated with the Czech source" [llms.txt]. The hub provides the K6 visualization, links to publications, reference artifacts, and application mappings, and contextual information about the framework's scope and positioning [manifest hub extraction].

The English manifesto provides the most extensive narrative exposition of the framework's conceptual architecture, including the K6 model, the latent semantic field concept, the working analogy to physics (entity $\widehat{=}$ mass, representation $\widehat{=}$ wave, interpretation $\widehat{=}$ wave function collapse, etc.), and the framework's positioning relative to alternative approaches [English manifesto]. The manifesto is described as a "living document, updated gradually and concisely" [llms-full.txt].

The narrative layer expresses the framework's conceptual content in a form that preserves argument, nuance, genealogy, and uncertainty—qualities that the machine-readable layer necessarily compresses. The repository README acknowledges this explicitly: "Free text preserves argument, nuance, genealogy, and uncertainty, but a machine must reconstruct the conceptual system from those distributed texts" [repository README, "Why this exists" section].

The AI-Oriented Context Files

The `llms.txt` and `llms-full.txt` files provide structured context for machine interpretation. The `llms.txt` file is organized into labeled sections (dio-service, dio-odi-framework, manifesto, reference-artifacts) with explicit role designations, scope distinctions, and version notes [llms.txt]. It states, for example: "The reference vocabulary is a terminological and relational resource, not a claim of a complete formal OWL ontology"and "The manifesto, reference vocabulary, reference model, and application mappings have separate version histories" [llms.txt].

The `llms-full.txt` file includes the full text of the English manifesto as a snapshot dated 2026-10-29, with source attribution and language designation [llms-full.txt]. This provides a machine-readable copy of the narrative content, timestamped for reference.

These files make explicit what the narrative representations leave implicit: the architectural relationships between components, the version discipline, the scope boundaries, and the interpretive priority of the Czech source. They can be interpreted within DIO as a mechanism for reducing interpretive ambiguity for non-human observers, providing what the framework might call Identity-Preserving Constraints for machine reconstruction.

3.4 Reconstruction, Identity, and the Author

The framework's genesis is described as an "ex-post articulation" of professional practice, emerging from 24 years of work across psychology, semiotics, branding, data technologies, and AI [manifest hub context; llms.txt]. The DIO methodology is characterized as reflexive observation and grounded theory rather than deduction from first principles. The author's business, established in 2013, offers external DIO services, and the framework's development is documented through a changelog on the web hub.

The author's identity is asserted across multiple platforms: ORCID (0009-0004-0050-0264), ResearchGate, the personal website, and the repository's metadata. The ORCID record identifies Daniel Beránek as an Independent Researcher in Brno, Czech Republic [vocabulary page; repository README]. The website links to these identity assertions, and the repository's `CITATION.cff` and metadata registries provide explicit bridges back to the canonical author identity.

Within DIO's conceptual logic, the author functions as the Entity whose identity is being constructed and maintained across multiple Representations (the various platform profiles). The challenge of reconstructing a coherent author identity from these distributed records is an instance of the same problem the framework addresses for other digital entities. The potential for Entity Merging (confusing this

Daniel Beránek with another person of the same name) or Entity Substitution (attributing the framework to a different entity) exists wherever the identity records are not explicitly linked.

The observed linking appears sufficient to prevent entity confusion within the ecosystem' s own boundaries. The ORCID identifier is consistently cited across Zenodo records, the vocabulary page, and the repository. The website provides a centralized hub linking to all identity assertions. However, for an observer encountering a single Zenodo record or a single ResearchGate entry without following the cross-links, the reconstruction depends on the name string "Beránek, Daniel" and the associated metadata. This is a standard condition for distributed scholarly identity and does not represent a specific vulnerability of the DIO/ODI ecosystem beyond what is common to independent researchers without institutional affiliation.

3.5 Multilingual Representation

The manifesto is distributed in Czech (canonical), English (principal coordinated version), and 14 additional language projections [llms.txt; manifest hub]. The Czech source is designated as taking "interpretive precedence where language versions differ in meaning" [llms.txt]. The English version is described as the "principal English-language version coordinated with the Czech source" [llms.txt].

The additional language projections were generated in a concentrated period (July 2026) and archived in the canonical multilingual edition on Zenodo [llms.txt; repository context]. The `llms.txt` file identifies only Czech and English as "basic-language-versions," with others described as "Additional language projections linked from the manifesto hub" [llms.txt].

This architecture creates a tiered multilingual structure: - **Tier 1 (canonical):** Czech source text, interpretive reference. - **Tier 2 (principal coordinated):** English version, actively maintained alongside the Czech. - **Tier 3 (projections):** 14 additional languages, generated at a specific point and archived.

The local reconstruction consequence is that an observer reading a Tier 3 projection may encounter terminology that does not reflect subsequent conceptual refinements introduced in the living Czech or English editions. This is a form of Temporal Misalignment: the projection represents an earlier state of the framework' s conceptual development. However, this condition is architecturally contained. The manifest hub directs users to the canonical archival record for citation, and the interpretive priority of the Czech source provides a resolution mechanism for cases of divergence.

The system-level significance is limited. The core conceptual invariant—the six dimensions, the K6 structure, the Reconstruction Failure Mode taxonomy—is established in the canonical Czech and English versions and formalized in the reference vocabulary. The Tier 3 projections extend the framework' s reach but do not constitute independent sources of conceptual authority. An observer encountering a divergence between a Tier 3 projection and the canonical source has a clear resolution path.

3.6 Application Mappings and Derived Layers

The ecosystem includes three derived application mappings, explicitly separated from the canonical vocabulary:

1. **DIO Reconstruction Failure Modes × RAG Pipeline:** Projects the failure-mode taxonomy onto generic RAG pipeline loci, mechanisms, observable symptoms, and hypothetical incidents. Introduced in Reference Model v0.2.0; an iterative/hypothesis-conditioned extension was first included in archived v0.4.0 [vocabulary page; repository README].
2. **HEM Heterogeneity Taxonomy × DIO Reconstruction Consequences:** Bridges the externally defined HEM heterogeneity taxonomy to DIO reconstruction consequences and Semantic Vulnerability. Introduced in Reference Model v0.3.0; HEM source: `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.datak.2026.10257` [repository README].

3. **DIO/ODI Commit-Boundary Contract × Policy-as-Code Authorization**: Maps commit-boundary authorization obligations to Policy-as-Code capabilities using OPA/Rego and Cedar. Added to the source tree on 25 October 2026; included in archived v0.4.0 and v0.5.0 [repository README; vocabulary page].

These mappings are described as projecting "vocabulary concepts into external technical or analytical domains without modifying their definitions, hierarchy, or relations" [vocabulary page]. They are not part of the canonical vocabulary and are documented separately. This separation can be interpreted within DIO as a mechanism for preventing Contextual Displacement: the core concepts retain their definitions when applied to specific technical domains, rather than being redefined by those domains.

The Commit-Boundary mapping is particularly notable because it connects the framework's theoretical concerns about identity-preserving constraints to a concrete authorization architecture. The associated paper, "Constraining the Commit Boundary: A DIO/ODI-Informed Authorization Guardrail for Agentic Entity Resolution," is distributed across arXiv (DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2610.37407), Zenodo (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23580733), SSRN (DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.7659038), ResearchGate, and Figshare [manifest hub]. This multi-platform distribution creates potential for version misalignment if the paper is updated on one platform but not others, though the Zenodo record provides a stable citable anchor.

3.7 Version Differences and Their Materiality

The live Reference Vocabulary is at version 0.2.0. The archived Reference Model v0.5.0 (DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.23643845`) incorporates vocabulary v0.2.0. The previous archived release, v0.4.0 (DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.23632619`), contains vocabulary v0.1.0 [vocabulary page; repository README].

The transition from v0.1.0 to v0.2.0 includes the introduction of the plural "Identity-Preserving Constraints" concept, while the singular entry is retained with a historical note. The repository documentation states: "Earlier uses of the singular URI are not retroactively migrated, and no semantic relation between the two concepts is asserted" [repository README]. This is a documented conceptual refinement, not a silent revision.

An observer comparing the two versions will note a difference in granularity. The question is whether this difference materially affects reconstruction. The available evidence suggests it does not: the core conceptual structure (the K6 dimensions, the Reconstruction Failure Mode taxonomy, the distinction between canonical and derived layers) remains stable across both versions. The addition of a new concept at a specific point in the hierarchy is an identity-preserving extension. The provenance documentation explains the change. The historical state remains accessible in the earlier archive.

This is neither a failure of continuity (the framework has not been silently rewritten) nor an automatic success (an observer must actually consult the provenance documentation to understand the relationship between versions). It is a documented conceptual development whose materiality depends on whether the observer's reconstruction task requires the specific concept in question.

---

4. Graph Report

4.1 Graph Model and Observation Boundary

The ecosystem is modeled as a heterogeneous directed graph with distinct node types and edge types. The observation boundary is defined by the resources identified and inspected during this investigation. Inbound links found within the collected corpus represent observed in-degree, not global web in-degree.

Node types: - `WebPage`: Individual pages on danielberanek.cz (manifest hub, language-specific manifests, biography, service pages) - `ArchivalRecord`: Zenodo records with DOIs (manifesto, papers,

reference model releases) - `VocabularyArtifact`: The vocabulary endpoint, individual concept URIs, serialization files - `RepositoryArtifact`: Files and directories within the GitHub repository - `IdentityRecord`: ORCID, ResearchGate, and other platform profiles - `ContextFile`: llms.txt, llms-full.txt - `ApplicationMapping`: Derived mapping documents (RAG, HEM, Policy-as-Code) - `AuthorEntity`: Daniel Beránek as a person/researcher

Edge types (kept distinguishable): - `hyperlink`: Navigational links between web resources - `citation`: Bibliographic references between publications - `version_of`: Version relationships between releases - `language_alternate`: Relationships between language versions - `identity_assertion`: Links asserting authorship or affiliation - `semantic_relation`: SKOS broader/narrower/related relations between concepts - `derived_from`: Application mappings projecting vocabulary concepts - `archived_at`: Links from live resources to Zenodo records

4.2 Observed Topology

The observed topology is best described as a set of interconnected clusters organized around central hubs, rather than a single hub-and-spoke or a fully meshed network.

Cluster 1: Web and Narrative Layer - Central node: `/manifest-dio/` (manifest hub) - Connected to: Czech manifesto, English manifesto, biography page, service pages, application mapping pages - Outbound links to: Zenodo records, GitHub repository, vocabulary endpoint, identity profiles - The manifest hub has the highest observed out-degree in the web layer, linking to all other clusters

Cluster 2: Archival and Scholarly Layer - Central nodes: Zenodo manifesto record (`10.5281/zenodo.21610934`), conceptual framework paper (`10.5281/zenodo.23305929`) - Connected to: Other Zenodo papers, arXiv, SSRN, Figshare, ResearchGate - Inbound links from: Web hub, repository README, llms.txt - The Zenodo manifesto record serves as a bridge between the web layer and the scholarly distribution network

Cluster 3: Machine-Readable Reference Layer - Central nodes: Vocabulary endpoint (`vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio`), GitHub repository - Connected to: SKOS/RDF files, JSON-LD files, concept map, application mappings, metadata registries - Inbound links from: Web hub, repository README, llms.txt, Zenodo records - The vocabulary endpoint and the repository are reciprocally linked

Cluster 4: Identity Layer - Central node: ORCID record (0009-0004-0050-0264) - Connected to: ResearchGate, website profile, Zenodo author metadata - Inbound links from: Web hub, repository, vocabulary page

Cross-cluster bridges: - The manifest hub links to all other clusters (web -> archival, web -> reference, web -> identity) - The repository README links to Zenodo records and the vocabulary endpoint (reference -> archival, reference -> reference) - The llms.txt file references the manifest hub, the vocabulary, the repository, and the Zenodo record (context -> all clusters) - The Zenodo manifesto record' s metadata includes links back to the website (archival -> web)

4.3 Entry Point Comparison

Entry Point A: Zenodo Author Search

An observer entering through the Zenodo search for "Beránek, Daniel" encounters the archival layer first. The search returns the canonical multilingual manifesto, the conceptual framework paper, and the additional papers. Each record provides: - A persistent DOI - Author name and ORCID - Publication date and version - Links to related resources (website, repository) - Citation metadata

From this entry point, the observer can reach: - The GitHub repository (via metadata links) - The live web manifest (via related URLs) - Other Zenodo records (via the author search) - The ORCID record (via author metadata)

The pathway is authority-first and bottom-up. The observer encounters fixed, citable states before the living narrative. The reconstruction emphasizes temporal stability and scholarly attribution. What remains peripheral from this entry point: the narrative genesis, the K6 visualization, the working analogies, and the application mappings are not immediately visible without following links outward.

Entry Point B: Web Manifest Hub (`/manifest-dio/`)

An observer entering through the manifest hub encounters the narrative layer first. The hub presents: - The K6 Semantic Connectome visualization - The framework' s scope and positioning - Links to publications, reference artifacts, and application mappings - The latest paper ("Constraining the Commit Boundary") - The reference vocabulary and repository

From this entry point, the observer can reach: - The Czech and English manifestos - The reference vocabulary and repository - Zenodo records (for citation) - Application mapping pages - The author' s identity profiles - The AI context files

The pathway is narrative-first and top-down. The observer encounters the conceptual architecture and applied rationale before the formal specifications. The reconstruction emphasizes the framework' s purpose and interconnections. What remains peripheral from this entry point: the detailed version history of the reference model, the individual concept URIs, and the full commit history require navigating to the repository or vocabulary endpoint.

Comparison:

Dimension	Zenodo Entry	Web Hub Entry
First impression	Fixed, citable publication states	Living conceptual narrative
Temporal orientation	Specific publication dates	Ongoing development
Conceptual depth	Titles, abstracts, metadata	Full argument, visualization, analogy
Machine-readable access	DOI metadata, citation formats	Direct links to SKOS, JSON-LD, repository
Version awareness	Explicit version numbers per record	Links to versioned archives
Peripheral resources	Application mappings, K6 visualization	Detailed commit history, individual concept URIs
Reconstruction path	Bottom-up: from citable artifacts to narrative	Top-down: from narrative to formal specifications

Both entry points lead to a comparable reconstruction of the framework' s core identity. The conceptual invariant (six dimensions, K6 structure, failure mode taxonomy) is recoverable from either path, though the route and emphasis differ. The explicit cross-linking between the two entry points means that an observer starting from either can reach the other without external search.

4.4 Degree and Centrality Observations

Within the observed boundary:

Highest out-degree nodes: - `/manifest-dio/` (web hub): Links to manifestos (multiple languages), Zenodo records, repository, vocabulary, application mappings, identity profiles, context files. Estimated out-degree: 20+ distinct resources. - Repository README: Links to vocabulary, Zenodo records (all versions), application mappings, metadata files, primary sources. Estimated out-degree: 15+ distinct resources. - `llms.txt`: References manifest hub, vocabulary, repository, Zenodo record, English and Czech manifestos. Estimated out-degree: 10+ distinct resources.

Highest in-degree nodes (within observed corpus): - Zenodo manifesto record (`10.5281/zenodo.21610934`): Referenced by web hub, repository README, llms.txt, llms-full.txt, English manifesto. Observed in-degree: 5+. - Vocabulary endpoint (`vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/`): Referenced by web hub, repository README, llms.txt, manifest hub. Observed in-degree: 4+. - ORCID record: Referenced by vocabulary page, repository README, Zenodo metadata, web profile. Observed in-degree: 4+.

Bridges between clusters: - The manifest hub is the primary bridge between the web/narrative cluster and all other clusters. - The repository README is the primary bridge between the machine-readable cluster and the archival cluster. - The llms.txt file serves as a bridge between all clusters for non-human observers.

Bottlenecks: - If the manifest hub were unavailable, the web layer would lose its primary navigation node, though individual pages would remain accessible via direct URLs. - If the repository were unavailable, the machine-readable vocabulary would remain accessible at its own domain, but the development history, metadata registries, and application mapping sources would be inaccessible. - The Zenodo records are independently hosted and do not depend on the website or repository for availability.

4.5 Cross-Layer Connections

The three principal layers (web/narrative, archival/scholarly, machine-readable/reference) are connected through explicit, reciprocal links:

- **Web -> Archival:** The manifest hub links to Zenodo DOIs for citation. The manifestos cite the Zenodo record.
- **Archival -> Web:** Zenodo record metadata includes related URLs pointing to the website.
- **Web -> Reference:** The manifest hub links to the vocabulary endpoint and GitHub repository. The llms.txt file references both.
- **Reference -> Archival:** The repository README lists all Zenodo DOIs. The vocabulary page links to Zenodo Concept DOI and release DOIs.
- **Reference -> Web:** The repository' s CNAME file points to the vocabulary domain. The vocabulary page links back to the manifest hub context.
- **Identity -> All:** The ORCID identifier appears in Zenodo metadata, the vocabulary page, the repository, and the website.

The coupling is sufficient to support reconstruction from any single entry point, provided the observer follows the available links. The system does not depend on a single hub for the survival of its content: the Zenodo records are independently hosted, the vocabulary has its own domain, and the repository is hosted on GitHub. However, the navigational coherence—the ability to discover the full ecosystem from any starting point—does depend on the cross-linking maintained primarily through the manifest hub and the repository README.

4.6 Conceptual Graph vs. Infrastructural Graph

The K6 conceptual model (a complete graph on six nodes) is not reproduced in the infrastructural distribution network. The web pages are not organized as a fully connected graph; the Zenodo records do not form a K6 topology; the repository files are organized hierarchically. This distinction is architecturally deliberate. The conceptual graph describes the internal structure of the framework' s subject matter (digital identity); the infrastructural graph describes the distribution of the framework' s representations.

The SKOS vocabulary does encode a conceptual graph: broader/narrower relations form a hierarchy (the Reconstruction Failure Mode taxonomy), and related-concept relations create lateral connections (e.g., Entity Substitution is related to Identity Collapse). But this conceptual graph is a representation within the infrastructural network, not a description of the network itself.

The repository' s concept map (rendered as a Mermaid diagram) makes this distinction visible: it shows the taxonomic hierarchy with solid arrows and related-concept connections with dashed arrows, while explicitly marking Identity Collapse, Semantic Vulnerability, Semantic Robustness, and Reconstruction Capture as "outside"the hierarchy [repository README, concept map]. This visual encoding reinforces the epistemic rule that these concepts are related to but not reducible to the failure mode taxonomy.

---

5. Emergent Insights

5.1 The Epistemic Rule as a Reconstruction-Supporting Mechanism

The repository' s explicit epistemic rule— "The reference model must not silently strengthen the theory" —is an unusual and significant feature. It constrains the relationship between the machine-readable layer and the theoretical corpus, preventing the formalization from introducing claims that the source texts do not support. Specifically: - Identity Collapse is not defined as a sum or superclass of the Reconstruction Failure Modes. - Semantic Vulnerability is not classified as a Reconstruction Failure Mode. - K6 is a finer-grained candidate model, not a logical consequence of Minimum Viable DIO.

This rule can be interpreted within DIO as an Identity-Preserving Constraint applied to the framework' s own development. It prevents the reference model from becoming a source of Entity Substitution (where the formalized concept replaces the original, more nuanced formulation) or Semantic Fragmentation (where the formal and informal representations diverge in meaning). The rule is documented, public, and enforceable through the repository' s version control.

The materiality of this rule is that it provides a clear criterion for evaluating whether a future change to the reference model constitutes identity-preserving development or a silent strengthening that would require separate justification. An observer encountering a new relation in a future vocabulary version can check whether it is consistent with the epistemic rule or represents a departure requiring explicit documentation.

5.2 The Framework as Its Own Case Study

The repository README states: "the artifact applies a core DIO principle to DIO itself: the conceptual identity of the discipline should be reconstructable from explicit, distributed, provenance-aware representations rather than inferred anew from prose every time" [repository README, "Why this exists"]. This self-application is an architectural observation about the ecosystem' s design. It does not constitute empirical validation of the framework' s general claims about digital identity.

However, it does create a specific analytical opportunity: the framework' s own concepts can be applied to its implementation with full access to the design intentions, version history, and architectural decisions. This is not available for most frameworks being analyzed externally. The observations made in this report—about what supports reconstruction, what strains it, and where the boundaries lie—are informed by this access. They describe the specific case of DIO/ODI' s self-representation and do not generalize automatically to other digital identities or frameworks.

5.3 The Role of Deliberate Gaps

Several features of the ecosystem are explicitly described as gaps or deferrals rather than omissions: - The OWL ontology is deferred: "A future OWL layer should add stronger axioms only where the published corpus and subsequent review justify them" [repository README]. - Application mappings are excluded from the canonical vocabulary: "These mappings are not part of the canonical DIO/ODI Reference Vocabulary" [vocabulary page]. - Historical metadata states are preserved: "Historical metadata states are not silently erased to create an artificially clean lineage" [repository README].

These deliberate gaps can be interpreted within DIO as Identity-Preserving Constraints that protect the framework from premature closure or conflation. The absence of a completed OWL ontology is not a failure of the machine-readable layer; it is a documented design decision that prioritizes terminological stability over logical completeness. The separation of application mappings from the canonical vocabulary prevents domain-specific assumptions from migrating into the core theory. The preservation of historical metadata states provides the temporal continuity necessary for distinguishing development from contradiction.

The materiality of these gaps depends on the observer's reconstruction task. An observer seeking automated logical reasoning over the framework's concepts will find the current SKOS layer insufficient. An observer seeking to understand the framework's conceptual structure, its development, and its relationships to external systems will find the available representations adequate. The gaps are not uniformly distributed in their impact.

5.4 The llms.txt as an Interpretive Boundary

The `llms.txt` file occupies an interesting position in the ecosystem. It is not a publication (it has no DOI), not a vocabulary (it does not define concepts with URIs), and not a manifesto (it does not argue). It functions as a structured context file designed to orient machine readers—particularly LLMs—toward the framework's architecture, scope, and relationships.

The file explicitly states interpretive boundaries: "The reference vocabulary is a terminological and relational resource, not a claim of a complete formal OWL ontology." It specifies version distinctions: "The manifesto, reference vocabulary, reference model, and application mappings have separate version histories."It designates interpretive priority: "The Czech canonical source takes interpretive precedence where language versions differ in meaning" [llms.txt].

Within DIO's conceptual logic, this file can be interpreted as a mechanism for managing Interpretation across different observer types. It provides what the framework might call Identity-Preserving Constraints for machine reconstruction: explicit rules about what the framework is, what it is not, and how its components relate. Whether these constraints are actually effective in shaping LLM interpretation is not observable from the file's existence alone. The file provides structural support for accurate machine reconstruction; it does not ensure it.

5.5 The Commit-Boundary Paper as a Test Case

The paper "Constraining the Commit Boundary: A DIO/ODI-Informed Authorization Guardrail for Agentic Entity Resolution" represents the most developed application of DIO/ODI concepts to a concrete technical problem. It is distributed across five platforms (arXiv, Zenodo, SSRN, ResearchGate, Figshare) and has an associated application mapping (Commit-Boundary Contract × Policy-as-Code Authorization) in the repository.

This paper tests the framework's concepts in a specific domain: authorization for identity-preserving changes in agentic systems. It draws on the framework's distinction between evidence available for agentic reasoning and evidence suitable for claim-specific assessment, and its concept of Identity-Preserving Constraints [manifest hub description]. The associated mapping explicitly notes that it "does not claim that the mentioned tools themselves implement the entire contract or that the proposed integration has been empirically verified" [manifest hub].

The paper's multi-platform distribution creates a specific reconstruction challenge: an observer encountering the paper on SSRN may not immediately discover the associated application mapping in the repository, or the Zenodo record, or the arXiv version. The ecosystem's cross-linking addresses this, but the observer must actively follow the links. The potential for fragmentation exists at the level of individual platform silos, even though the ecosystem as a whole provides the connections.

6. Synthetic Conclusion

6.1 What Holds Together

At the observed point in time, the DIO/ODI ecosystem sustains a recognizable and referentially continuous identity through several convergent mechanisms:

The core conceptual invariant—six interdependent dimensions (Entity, Representation, Interpretation, Trust, Relationship, Reconstruction) organized as a non-linear semantic space, supplemented by a Reconstruction Failure Mode taxonomy—is consistently expressed across the reference vocabulary, the archived Zenodo records, the principal Czech and English manifestos, and the AI context files. The vocabulary provides stable URIs for these concepts; the manifestos provide the argumentative context; the Zenodo records provide temporal anchoring; the context files provide machine-readable orientation.

The architectural separation between canonical and derived layers prevents application-specific assumptions from migrating into the core theory. The epistemic rule constrains the reference model from silently strengthening the theory. The version discipline preserves historical states while allowing transparent development.

The cross-linking between the web hub, the repository, the vocabulary endpoint, and the Zenodo records provides navigational coherence. An observer entering from any of the principal entry points can reach the others through explicit links.

6.2 Where Continuity Is Strained

Continuity is locally strained in several specific locations:

The peripheral multilingual projections (Tier 3 languages) may not reflect ongoing conceptual refinements. An observer relying solely on these projections may encounter a temporally earlier state of the framework. This is a form of Temporal Misalignment, but it is architecturally contained by the interpretive priority of the Czech source and the active coordination of the English version.

The deferral of a completed OWL ontology limits the machine-actionability of the framework' s deeper logical constraints. An observer seeking automated reasoning over the conceptual structure will find the SKOS layer insufficient for complex inference. This is a documented design choice, not an oversight, but it creates a genuine limitation for certain reconstruction tasks.

The multi-platform distribution of individual papers (e.g., the Commit-Boundary paper on five platforms) creates potential for version misalignment if updates are not synchronized. The Zenodo record provides a stable anchor, but an observer encountering the paper on a secondary platform may not be aware of the canonical version.

The distributed identity records (ORCID, ResearchGate, website, repository) require explicit linking to prevent entity ambiguity. Within the ecosystem' s own boundaries, this linking is maintained. For external observers encountering a single record in isolation, the reconstruction depends on standard name-based disambiguation.

6.3 What Cannot Be Determined

From the observed snapshot, several questions remain indeterminate:

- How downstream non-human observers (LLMs, search engines, knowledge graph systems) actually reconstruct the framework from the available representations. The llms.txt and structured metadata provide structural support for accurate reconstruction, but actual consumption and interpretation are not observable from the artifacts alone.

- Whether the 14 secondary language projections will be updated to reflect future conceptual developments, or whether they will remain as fixed snapshots of the July 2026 state.
- Whether the framework' s concepts will be adopted, cited, or applied by researchers or practitioners outside the author' s own ecosystem. No independent reception was identified within the observation domain.
- Whether the deliberate deferral of OWL will be resolved in a future version, and what logical commitments a formal ontology would introduce.

6.4 Final Assessment

The distributed DIO/ODI ecosystem, at the observed point in time, appears to sustain a recognizable, referentially continuous, and meaningfully reconstructable identity across its heterogeneous representations. The observed weaknesses—asynchronous projections, deferred formalization, distributed identity records, version differences—are locally contained. They create potential obstacles at specific entry points or for specific observer types, but the available representations and pathways appear sufficient to preserve continuity at the system level.

The framework' s resilience is not a function of perfection or completeness. It is a function of explicit architectural decisions: persistent identifiers, separated layers, documented epistemic rules, transparent version discipline, and reciprocal cross-linking. These mechanisms do not eliminate the possibility of reconstruction failure; they provide the structural conditions under which such failures can be identified, localized, and addressed.

The application of DIO/ODI' s own conceptual apparatus to its implementation reveals that the framework' s central concern—maintaining identity coherence across heterogeneous media of readability—is not merely a theoretical proposition but an active design principle governing its own distribution. Whether this self-application constitutes evidence for the framework' s general validity is a question that extends beyond the observation domain of this analysis. What can be observed is that the ecosystem' s architecture is consistent with the framework' s stated principles, and that the observed tensions are addressed through mechanisms that the framework itself describes.

Observation date: October 30, 2026. All findings are limited to the resources inspected within the stated observation boundary. Absence of evidence within this boundary is not evidence of absence in the broader web.

Authorship and AI use

This analysis was conducted within a research project conceived and directed by Daniel Beránek. The author defined the research question, selected the initial research entry points, and specified the analytical perspective and research requirements. Qwen carried out the analysis and generated the report in response to the author' s integrated assignment. The documented assignment is reproduced in full in the final appendix.

The designation "Qwen" identifies the system used; the precise version of its underlying language model is not specified.

Appendix: Author-Designed Research and Revision Prompts

Initial research prompt

deep-research ROLE & OBJECTIVE You are an interdisciplinary researcher in Knowledge Representation, Semantic Web, Digital Identity, Graph Theory, and strategic communication. Conduct a multidimensional deep research analysis of the implementation, distribution, and semantic coherence of Digital Identity Optimization (DIO) and Ontology of Digital Identity (ODI), authored by Daniel Beránek. The central research question is: What does the implementation and distribution of DIO/ODI reveal when examined through the framework' s own conceptual logic, complemented by graph-theoretical analysis? Explore how the framework is represented across machine-readable artifacts, archival publications, multilingual web texts, and identity-linked platforms. Investigate how these representations relate, where they reinforce or complicate one another, and what their structure means for the reconstruction of the framework and its author. INITIAL ORIENTATION: MACHINE-READABLE LAYER FIRST Begin strictly with these two resources: Reference Vocabulary: https://vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/ Corresponding repository: https://github.com/danberanek/dio-odi-reference-model Before entering the broader narrative corpus, inspect the available machine-readable vocabulary, concept relations, schema, repository structure, and relevant documentation. Follow links within these resources to locate the underlying machine-readable artifacts rather than relying only on their introductory pages. The purpose of this sequence is to establish a conceptual orientation before encountering the volume and rhetorical density of the surrounding texts. Reconstruct the framework' s terminology and internal relationships from this layer first. Once this initial orientation is established, proceed to the archival and web representations. Revisit your initial understanding as the wider corpus reveals historical development, additional context, or tensions. RESEARCH FREEDOM Use your understanding of DIO/ODI to develop your own research approach. Let the framework suggest relevant questions, analytical perspectives, connections, and methods beyond those explicitly listed below. Where useful, draw on graph theory, discourse analysis, cybernetics, information architecture, or other approaches that emerge from the material. Treat the proposed tasks as starting points rather than an exhaustive checklist. You may refine their assumptions, follow unexpected findings, and identify relationships that the assignment does not anticipate. Evaluate DIO/ODI through its own conceptual logic without presupposing that its implementation either succeeds or fails. Keep clear what you observed, what you inferred, and what remains unresolved. STARTING CORPUS & FUNCTIONAL LAYERS LAYER 1: MACHINE-READABLE REFERENCE LAYER Reference Vocabulary: https://vocab.danielberanek.cz/dio-odi/ Source repository: https://github.com/dan-beranek/dio-odi-reference-model Explore the vocabulary, persistent concept identifiers, semantic relations, available serializations, application mappings, and version history. Examine how the published vocabulary and repository relate to one another and to the rest of the ecosystem. LAYER 2: ARCHIVAL, PUBLICATION & IDENTITY INFRASTRUCTURE Zenodo author corpus: https://zenodo.org/search?q=metadata.creators.person_or_org.name%3A%22Ber%C3%A1nek%2C%20Daniel%22&l=list&
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0050-0264 ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniel-Beranek Explore the relevant publications, metadata, identifiers, versions, attribution links, and relationships between records. Investigate the distinct roles these resources play in persistence, discoverability, authorship, provenance, distribution, and trust. LAYER 3: WEB & DISCURSIVE REPRESENTATIONS Root domain: https://danielberanek.cz Central DIO/ODI hub: https://danielberanek.cz/manifest-dio/ Professional biography and genesis-related source: https://danielberanek.cz/od-pultu-az-k-seo-a-copy-s-ostrymi-hroty-profesni-bio/ Czech manifesto: https://danielberanek.cz/manifest-digital-identity-optimization-dio/ English manifesto: https://danielberanek.cz/manifesto-of-digital-identity-optimization-dio-and-ontology-of-digital-identity-odi/ AI-oriented context files: https://danielberanek.cz/llms.txt https://danielberanek.cz/llms-full.txt Discover the other language versions and relevant pages through the website' s links and metadata. Consider the website as a whole where its broader structure contributes to the representation of DIO/ODI or its author. These URLs are starting points, not a closed corpus. TASK 1:

DIO/ODI-NATIVE METAMETHODOLOGICAL EXPLORATION Apply the conceptual and analytical resources of DIO/ODI to its own implementation and distribution. Develop the evaluation from your understanding of the framework rather than merely applying an external checklist. Where the framework suggests an analytical method without explicitly specifying one, explain how you derived it. Explore the following questions while remaining open to others. CONCEPTUAL CONTINUITY ACROSS REPRESENTATIONS How are the framework' s core concepts and relationships expressed in: the reference vocabulary; archival publications; web texts; language versions; application mappings; AI-oriented context files? Investigate what remains stable, what changes, and how the representations complement or challenge one another. Consider whether differences reflect genre, audience, translation, historical development, conceptual revision, or substantive inconsistency. RECONSTRUCTION & ITS POSSIBLE FAILURE MODES Use the reconstruction-related concepts you find in DIO/ODI to examine the ecosystem. Potential questions include: How are the author, professional persona, framework, publications, and applications distinguished and connected? Where might entity substitution, merging, splitting, omission, or attribution ambiguity arise? Does distribution across platforms and languages support a coherent reconstruction, produce fragmentation, or do both under different conditions? Which contextual transitions preserve meaning, and which create interpretive tension? Distinguish observed reconstruction problems from structural conditions that might enable them. GENESIS, CONTEXT & APPLICATION Explore the relationship between the framework' s genesis, the author' s professional biography, and its later theoretical and technical developments. How does the transition between lived professional experience, strategic communication, digital identity theory, and technical applications affect the framework' s interpretation? Examine relevant application mappings and papers discovered in the corpus. Ask whether they clarify the core model, extend it, reinterpret it, or expose unresolved questions. MULTILINGUAL REPRESENTATION Discover the actual language inventory and examine how its representations relate. Investigate: conceptual correspondence; version alignment; navigation and cross-linking; translation provenance where available; the relationship between a central hub and individual language manifestations. Consider whether multilingual distribution contributes to a shared conceptual structure, creates distinct interpretive contexts, or introduces fragmentation. Explain the scope of the language comparison you were able to perform. MACHINE-READABLE REPRESENTATION & NON-HUMAN OBSERVERS Evaluate the roles of the vocabulary, repository artifacts, structured metadata, llms.txt, and llms-full.txt. What do these resources make explicit that narrative representations leave implicit? What do they compress, omit, prioritize, or reframe? Explore their potential significance for machine interpretation, retrieval, attribution, and reconstruction. Distinguish the functions visible in the artifacts from claims about actual consumption or downstream effects. Where relevant, examine whether the framework' s concepts of authorization or interpretive boundaries illuminate these resources, and where such an analogy reaches its limits. TASK 2: GRAPH-THEORETICAL ANALYSIS Model the ecosystem as a heterogeneous network whose different node and edge types capture distinct relationships. Choose a graph representation appropriate to the evidence and explain your choices. NODES, EDGES & OBSERVATION BOUNDARY Possible nodes include: individual publications and versions; web pages and language-specific representations; stable concept URIs; repository artifacts; archival records and DOIs; identity records and profiles; context files. Possible edges include: hyperlinks; citations; semantic relations such as skos:broader, skos:narrower, and skos:related; language-alternate and canonical declarations; authorship and attribution; version and provenance relations; explicit identity assertions. Keep distinctions between documents, concepts, and identity representations where they matter. Separate graph views may be more informative than a single aggregated network. Define the boundary of the graph you actually observe. Inbound links found within the collected corpus represent observed in-degree, not necessarily global web in-degree. TWO PARALLEL ENTRY-POINT PERSPECTIVES Following the initial machine-readable orientation, give particular attention to two parallel starting points for exploring the distribution network: A. The relevant Zenodo corpus, discovered through the author search and its publication relationships. B. The website, entered through: https://danielberanek.cz/manifest-dio/ Compare what becomes discoverable from each entry

point: Which resources are reached? Through which paths? Which relationships are explicit? What remains peripheral, disconnected, or difficult to discover? Do these entry points lead to comparable reconstructions of the framework? Then examine how the reference vocabulary and repository connect with these two perspectives. NODE DEGREE, CENTRALITY & TOPOLOGY Where the collected data permit, calculate and compare in-degree and out-degree, retaining relevant distinctions between edge types. Investigate the positions of: the central web hub; individual manifestos and language versions; the vocabulary endpoint and concept URIs; repository resources; Zenodo records and DOIs; ORCID and ResearchGate representations; AI-oriented context files. Use additional centrality measures if they illuminate the research question. Describe the observed topology rather than assuming it: hub-and-spoke, partially meshed, clustered, hierarchical, or another configuration. Explain what the metrics reveal about navigation and structural position, and where semantic interpretation requires additional analysis. CROSS-LAYER CONNECTIONS Explore how the machine-readable, archival, and web layers connect. Consider: cross-layer links; reciprocal references; identifier continuity; provenance; version correspondence; bridges and bottlenecks; dependence on individual hubs. What does this coupling suggest about the ecosystem' s capacity to sustain coherent reconstruction across different contexts? Where a structural property suggests an effect but does not establish it, identify the relationship as a hypothesis or open question. MEASUREMENT SCOPE Use actual extracted data for numerical claims. If the available tools do not support a reliable graph calculation, provide the strongest defensible structural analysis and explain what data would be needed to complete the measurement. Make clear which findings are computed, manually observed, or interpretive. TASK 3: SYNTHESIS & EMERGENT FINDINGS Bring the DIO/ODI-native and graph-theoretical perspectives into dialogue. Explore where they: reinforce one another; describe different aspects of the same structure; produce tensions; reveal blind spots; suggest new research questions. Consider whether the investigation of DIO/ODI through its own concepts generates insights into the framework itself, not only into its distribution. Follow significant findings beyond the initial questions when the evidence warrants it. Independently documented reception, reuse, or reconstruction outcomes may contribute to the analysis where discoverable, but their absence should be interpreted within the limits of the search. OUTPUT FORMAT Write the entire final report in English. Produce a self-contained research report, not a conversational response or a research plan. Develop the findings through connected analytical prose, supported by source citations. Use clear headings and include tables, diagnostic matrices, graph diagrams, or numerical results where they contribute to the analysis. Distinguish conceptual diagrams from visualizations derived from collected data. Prioritize depth, synthesis, and evidence over repetition. Let the significance of the findings determine the length. Use the following report structure, adapting it where the research produces a more informative organization. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Answer the central research question and summarize the most consequential findings. Distinguish conceptual alignment, observed network properties, and any supported effects on interpretation or reconstruction. RESEARCH APPROACH & CORPUS Explain how you entered and explored the corpus, what analytical methods emerged from your understanding of DIO/ODI, and which access or measurement limitations affected the research. DIO/ODI-NATIVE ANALYSIS Present the principal findings about conceptual continuity, reconstruction, contextual transitions, multilingual representation, and machine-readable artifacts. A diagnostic matrix may be used where it clarifies the relationships between concepts, observations, and interpretations. GRAPH REPORT Present: the chosen graph model; the observed boundary; principal nodes and relations; available degree or centrality results; the comparison of Zenodo and web entry points; multilingual topology; cross-layer connections; significant bridges, bottlenecks, or gaps. Use tables or diagrams where they improve understanding. EMERGENT INSIGHTS Develop important findings that were not fully anticipated by the initial assignment. Explain what the application of DIO/ODI to itself reveals about its conceptual resources, implementation, and possible development. SYNTHETIC CONCLUSION Explain what the research reveals about DIO/ODI when its own conceptual apparatus is applied to its implementation and distribution. Assess the relationship between theoretical commitments, semantic representations, and the observed network structure. Identify the strongest alignments, productive tensions,

vulnerabilities, and unexpected findings. Let the evidence and the analysis determine the conclusion, including whether some questions remain open. Where useful, identify practical improvements or further research that follow directly from the findings. EVIDENCE STANDARD Support material findings with specific sources. Keep authorial statements, direct observations, analytical inferences, and hypotheses distinguishable without turning the report into a checklist of disclaimers. Account for version history when interpreting differences. State relevant access limitations and uncertainty. The goal is an intellectually independent exploration conducted through DIO/ODI—not a predetermined endorsement, a predetermined critique, or a merely mechanical compliance audit.

Follow-up methodological clarification

Please revisit your previous DIO/ODI analysis using the following clarification of the research question. REVISED RESEARCH QUESTION At the observed point in time, to what extent does the distributed DIO/ODI ecosystem appear to sustain a recognizable, referentially continuous, and meaningfully reconstructable identity across heterogeneous representations and entry points, despite partial inconsistencies, gaps, inaccessible resources, and uneven updating? Use DIO/ODI' s own concepts to explain what supports this apparent resilience, what strains it, and whether the observed weaknesses remain locally contained or materially compromise reconstruction of the framework as a whole. SCOPE AND PURPOSE This is a reflexive analysis of DIO/ODI's implementation through its own conceptual perspective. It is not a request to: prove the general validity of DIO/ODI; establish that the framework validates itself; assess the ecosystem against an ideal of permanent completeness or flawless synchronization; repeatedly warn that self-application is not independent empirical validation. DIO is understood here as an ongoing optimization process, not a permanently achieved state. The observation concerns a temporal snapshot of that process. The central question is not whether defects exist. It is whether the distributed identity appears to hold together despite them. ANALYTICAL RULES Apply interpretive symmetry. Do not infer successful protection merely from the presence of a safeguard. Equally, do not infer system-level failure merely from the presence of an inconsistency, missing connection, inaccessible resource, outdated representation, or local reconstruction problem. Evaluate both strengths and weaknesses in relation to the reconstruction task and observation domain. Distinguish four levels of statement. a. Observed artifact or condition: What is actually present, absent, inconsistent, accessible, or inaccessible? b. Architectural role: How can this element be interpreted within DIO/ODI? What reconstruction-supporting or reconstruction-straining function does it have? c. Local reconstruction consequence: What can an observer entering through this representation plausibly recover, miss, or misunderstand? d. System-level significance: Does the local condition materially compromise the identity of the framework as a whole, or do other representations and pathways preserve sufficient continuity? Do not silently jump from (a) to (d). Use precise language without making every sentence defensive. Where an outcome has not been directly observed, prefer formulations such as: "can be interpreted within DIO as a mechanism for⋯" "provides structural support for⋯" "is designed to⋯" when the design intention is documented; "creates a potential obstacle to⋯" "the inspected pathway supports⋯" "within this observation domain, the available representations appear sufficient to⋯" Avoid converting these into unconditional claims such as "prevents," "ensures," "eliminates," or "destroys" unless the evidence supports that scope. A clear scope statement at the beginning of a section is sufficient. Do not attach the same disclaimer to every paragraph. Evaluate materiality, not merely defect counts. For each important weakness, ask: Which reconstruction task does it affect? Which observer or entry point is affected? Does it concern the author, the framework, a concept, a publication, or a particular version? Does it obscure the referent, alter a central conceptual relation, or merely reduce detail? Can another accessible representation contextualize, correct, or compensate for it? Is compensation actually inspectable, or only assumed? Is the difficulty locally contained, or does it propagate across layers? Do not assume that redundancy guarantees compensation. Do not assume that local failure defeats the distributed whole. Treat variation and change carefully. Distinguish: identity-preserving variation; documented conceptual development; version misalignment; incompatible current claims; susceptibility to reconstruction failure; an observed reconstruction failure. A historical edition is not defective

merely because it preserves an earlier state. Conversely, historical provenance does not automatically resolve every conflict encountered by a current observer. Keep conceptual and infrastructural graphs distinct. Do not require the distribution network to reproduce the K6 conceptual model literally. Separate conceptual interdependence from hyperlink topology, provenance relations, repository structure, and actual observer traversal. Any numerical graph finding must state its observation boundary, node and edge definitions, and relevant directionality. Treat acquisition failures as observer-relative unless verified otherwise. A failed fetch establishes that a particular acquisition route failed. It does not by itself establish that the resource is absent or unavailable through every route. Do not presume a favorable answer. The clarification does not instruct you to conclude that the ecosystem is resilient. It instructs you to assess resilience at the appropriate level. A positive, negative, mixed, or indeterminate conclusion is acceptable, provided that local observations and system-level judgments are connected explicitly. REQUESTED REVISION Please produce: A revised answer to the research question. A concise account of the principal mechanisms supporting reconstruction. A materiality assessment of the principal weaknesses. A comparison of at least two entry points, using inspected evidence where available. A correction table: original wording | revised wording | reason for correction A short synthesis identifying: what appears to hold together; where continuity is strained; what cannot be determined from the observed snapshot. Preserve useful findings from your original report. Correct their scope or interpretation where necessary rather than replacing the analysis with generic methodological caution. Do not invent new observations or measurements. If additional investigation is necessary, identify it explicitly rather than presenting it as already completed.

Model-specific addendum: Qwen

Align the certainty of your diagnostic judgments with your acquisition coverage. Revisit labels such as: “Verified” ; “Confirmed” ; “Mitigated” ; “Controlled” ; “Low Risk” . Where you observed a countermeasure but not its outcome, use a category such as: “structural mitigation present; outcome not inspected.” Do not infer the actual scope of llms-full.txt from its filename. Reconsider any statement that treats the K6 model as a literal description of the distribution network. Specify whether you mean conceptual interpretation or infrastructural topology. Your extraction limitations do not require an entirely negative or indeterminate assessment. Evaluate what the representations you actually accessed allowed you to reconstruct, and which inaccessible elements were or were not necessary for that reconstruction.

Final integration instruction

I don’ t want another “revised answer” or a commentary on the previous analysis. I want to combine the two outputs into a single, standalone paper. Take the structure and thematic scope of the first research report and incorporate the findings, clarifications, and shifts in interpretation from the second output. Adjust the original structure as needed—the goal is not to mechanically preserve the sections, but to provide a coherent interpretation. Reflect this new understanding throughout the entire analysis, not just in the conclusion. Retain specific findings, sources, measurements, and relevant limits, but reassess their significance where the second output has provided greater precision. Do not evaluate shortcomings or strengths in isolation: explain what they mean for the reconstructability of DIO/ODI in the observed time snapshot and at various levels of reconstruction detail. The final text must stand on its own, as if it had been written from the beginning as a single research report. No references to our conversation, no phrases like “in the previous response,” and no explanations of corrections made. Do not resubmit a revision plan or a summary of changes—write the entire paper directly.