

Digital Ownership as Infrastructure

Applying Digital Ownership to Enterprise, Government and Industry

Wayne Glass
Auctoritas Systems
September 2026

Working Paper

Abstract

This paper considers digital ownership as shared infrastructure capable of complementing existing enterprise, governmental and industrial systems. Each new sector is reached by adding a connector rather than rebuilding the core — the behaviour, this paper argues, of infrastructure rather than of an application.

This paper describes a working, source-verified implementation. The specification was extracted from the code, not the code derived from it.

Note on method: several application domains described in earlier versions of this paper as future directions are, in the reference implementation, already present as working adapters and engines. This version distinguishes what is demonstrated from what remains aspirational. The specification was extracted from the implementation; the implementation was not derived from the specification.

1 Introduction

DOP-P100 introduced a constitutional model for digital ownership.

DOP-P200 described the engineering methodology used to realise that model within the Digital Ownership Protocol.

This paper considers the practical implications of those ideas beyond the protocol itself.

Many sectors already maintain sophisticated digital infrastructure.

Enterprise systems.

Manufacturing.

Government.

Healthcare.

Supply chains.

These systems rarely require replacement.

They frequently require a more consistent method of expressing ownership, evidence and provenance across organisational boundaries.

This paper examines how constitutional digital ownership may complement existing infrastructure while preserving established operational systems and institutional practices.

Rather than proposing another technology platform, it explores digital ownership as a foundational capability capable of supporting diverse industries through a common constitutional model.

2 Infrastructure Problem

Modern organisations rarely operate within a single software platform.

Enterprise systems.

Government services.

Manufacturing.

Supply chains.

Digital identity.

Compliance.

Each frequently maintains its own representation of ownership, authority and historical evidence.

Although these systems individually perform valuable operational functions, interoperability often requires significant integration effort because constitutional relationships are represented differently.

The challenge therefore extends beyond exchanging data.

It concerns preserving ownership, evidence and provenance consistently between otherwise independent systems.

This paper explores whether constitutional ownership provides a common foundation capable of complementing existing infrastructure while reducing architectural fragmentation.

3 Background

Digital transformation has connected an increasingly diverse collection of organisations, industries and public institutions.

Manufacturing now exchanges information with logistics.

Healthcare increasingly relies upon interoperable digital records.

Governments continue expanding digital public services.

Supply chains require growing levels of transparency and traceability.

These developments have significantly improved operational efficiency.

They have also increased the importance of preserving ownership, authority and provenance consistently across organisational boundaries.

This paper considers whether digital ownership itself should become a shared infrastructural capability rather than remaining an application-specific concern.

4 Proposed Infrastructure Model

This paper proposes that digital ownership may be considered an infrastructural capability rather than a domain-specific application feature.

Under this interpretation, ownership, evidence and provenance become shared constitutional services capable of supporting existing enterprise, governmental and industrial systems.

Rather than replacing established infrastructure, constitutional ownership complements it by providing a consistent foundation for digital relationships across organisational boundaries.

The sections that follow examine several representative application domains.

Where the reference implementation already provides a mechanism for a domain, this is noted, so that demonstrated capability is not confused with aspiration.

5 From Aspiration to Demonstration

Earlier versions of this paper described several sectors as future directions.

Continued implementation has advanced some of them from aspiration to early demonstration.

The reference implementation now includes an integration layer for the personal domain that connects to external identity providers through recognised standards, and to external health-record systems through recognised clinical standards.

It includes a product-passport capability that represents a manufactured item's identity, claims and provenance in a structured form.

It includes a physical-carrier capability that resolves scanned tags — through recognised supply-chain identifier standards — to the digital record of the item they represent.

It includes a retail commerce engine and an institutional settlement engine, the latter capable of producing sealed, independently verifiable evidence of a run of settlements.

These capabilities are presented here not as production deployments, but as evidence that the constitutional model extends into these domains in practice and not only in principle.

That this coverage is partial is intentional, and it is the point.

Infrastructure is not built end to end for every use case that might rest upon it.

Roads are not constructed to the door of every possible destination.

A shared foundation is built once, and individual uses are reached through a small number of connections to it.

The relevant evidence is therefore not that every sector has been fully implemented, but that reaching each new sector required only a further adapter rather than a change to the core.

A model that extends to a new domain by adding a connection, rather than by revising its foundation, is behaving as infrastructure behaves.

The partial coverage described here is not an unfinished system.

It is a demonstration that the foundation is sufficient, and that completeness in any given sector is the responsibility of that sector's own integration rather than of the protocol itself.

6 Foundational Concepts

Infrastructure is commonly understood as the collection of shared capabilities upon which many independent systems rely.

This paper considers whether digital ownership may be interpreted in a similar manner.

Rather than viewing ownership as an application feature, the proposed model treats ownership, evidence and provenance as common infrastructural capabilities capable of supporting many different industries and organisational environments.

This interpretation allows individual operational systems to remain independent while sharing a common constitutional foundation.

The reference implementation reinforces this interpretation through a consistent structural pattern.

Each external domain is integrated through an adapter that plugs into a stable interface, so that the constitutional core never depends upon any particular external system.

Providers may therefore be added or replaced without disturbing the constitutional foundation they build upon.

7 Ownership Beyond Applications

Many digital systems already maintain sophisticated operational capabilities.

Commerce.

Manufacturing.

Healthcare.

Government.

Research.

These systems frequently differ in purpose while sharing remarkably similar constitutional relationships concerning ownership, authority and historical evidence.

This observation suggests that ownership itself may represent a shared infrastructural capability rather than an application-specific concern.

Individual industries remain free to implement their own operational requirements while relying upon common constitutional principles.

In the reference implementation this is expressed as a single ownership core serving many operational domains through one boundary, rather than a distinct ownership model reimplemented within each domain.

8 Observed Behaviour

Review of representative application domains suggested that many industries express similar constitutional relationships despite significant operational diversity.

Ownership.

Evidence.

Authority.

Historical continuity.

These relationships consistently appeared beneath otherwise unrelated business processes.

This observation motivated investigation of digital ownership as a shared infrastructural capability capable of complementing existing systems rather than replacing them.

The early domain integrations present in the reference implementation appear consistent with this observation, though further practical deployment will be required to evaluate it fully.

9 Implications

Interpreting digital ownership as infrastructure encourages a different approach to interoperability.

Rather than requiring every participating system to adopt identical technologies, interoperability may instead emerge from preserving common constitutional relationships.

Operational systems remain free to evolve independently.

Shared constitutional capabilities provide continuity across those systems.

The adapter pattern observed in the reference implementation suggests one practical route to this outcome, allowing diverse external systems to participate through a common constitutional interface without adopting a common technology.

This perspective therefore complements existing institutional structures while supporting continued technological evolution.

10 Limitations

The application domains discussed throughout this paper illustrate possible uses of constitutional digital ownership.

They should not be interpreted as exhaustive or universally applicable.

Where this paper notes that a domain is already implemented, this refers to the presence of working adapters and engines within a reference implementation operating against a test network.

It does not imply production deployment, regulatory approval or operational maturity within any specific industry.

Different industries operate under distinct legal, regulatory and operational requirements.

Consequently, practical adoption will depend upon appropriate integration with existing institutional frameworks rather than replacement of those frameworks.

Future deployments will provide additional evidence concerning the practical applicability of the proposed infrastructure model.

11 Future Research

Future investigation should examine constitutional digital ownership within additional practical environments.

The early integrations already present — in identity, health records, product passports, physical supply-chain carriers, retail commerce and institutional settlement — provide a foundation upon which longitudinal, sector-specific studies may now be constructed.

Research should also evaluate integration with existing institutional, technical and regulatory frameworks while preserving constitutional independence.

Longitudinal studies based upon practical deployments will provide valuable evidence concerning adoption, operational behaviour and long-term architectural evolution.

These investigations will contribute to a broader understanding of digital ownership as shared infrastructure.

12 Conclusion

This paper has considered digital ownership as a shared infrastructural capability capable of complementing existing digital systems.

Rather than replacing established technologies or institutional frameworks, constitutional ownership offers one possible foundation upon which diverse operational systems may continue evolving.

The reference implementation suggests that this foundation already extends, in early form, into several of the domains this paper describes.

Future implementation and practical deployment will determine the extent to which this interpretation proves valuable across different industries and organisational environments.

The broader question therefore remains.

Could digital ownership become part of the infrastructure upon which future digital systems are built, rather than another capability implemented independently within each of them?