

Step 6 - Bumping again into the GSC Model

3:50pm 30 August 2025

Ok - I really can't spend a lot more time on this, but as it has already been fun, I'd like to try and put a bit more effort into generating some simple and hopefully 'rich' decoherence options for folk to consider. The assumption is that people will largely be coherently indifferent, as always. The big question to answer for anyone who is in such a state is "So what?". This is the coherent indifference engine everyone is running at all times within their perceptual networks, or their internal maps of meaning, or within whatever other abstracted informational environment they might be casually or consciously attenuated toward. If I can poke them to snap out of this fugue state with a "Wait. What?" then perhaps the informational payload I've prepared might make it somewhere within their own complex mesh of highly entangled "meh".

...

First up, I will need a video that I'll have to record. That is probably a good end point to have in mind.

It will also work if I put all this stuff on a website, such as <https://opendata.ly>, as I did with the Global Data Barometer project and the [Constructor S-57 submission](#).

Oh, and I am meant to use a dataset... I mean, I probably can't just say that the data is already ingested into my co-constructors such as Gemini and Claude... I mean, folks will want me to use a dataset or two from data.gov.au or elsewhere.

So... I think I need to look at other challenges and see if I can perhaps loop in a dataset, then generate something of some minor remark from this, with the context of the steps 0-5 as a background... then, I can probably do some more 'AI magic', then pump out a website or infographic, then maybe some audio or a javascript driven slide deck. I can then record myself going through the slide deck and once again make all this 'self referential' to the emergent construct of this more informationally rich selection. I can throw in a bit more of the Karl Popper stuff, or perhaps something more about the Constructor Theory oriented approach that led to the GSC Model...

Anyhoo - I just need to keep remembering that the process itself is the submission, and stay cool. Don't get too caught up in the normalised background void of the environmental expectations.

So... sheesh, this all sounds like too much work for 4pm on a Saturday. Let's do another prompt and see what Gemini can ping back.

##begin

Gemini, as per the progress update above, I'm happy with the main submission for the challenge that was originally rated as a 5 out of 5 for a look via the GSC Model lens. I'd like you to consider the bigger self-referential picture now and help me submit my project over a few additional challenges, or perhaps just the main 'international' one by the InfoSys sponsors. Yes, let's do the main international one, which I have provided in full below.

I obviously have some prior work that is related to the Objective Observer Initiative, which is what led me to develop the GSC Model. The concept of using agreements and then having an evidence grid that is monitored via an 'objective observer' was always about deprecating trust and installing 'verifiable honesty'

in its place. However, with the GSC Model I've now realised that maintaining coherent indifference requires this indeterminacy to operate as it is a computationally easy state to maintain. The trigger for evoking a cascade and a 'reckoning' via the verifiable honesty mechanism would be analogous to ensuring that when and if things go wrong there is a certain 'just fate' that can be employed within our systems.

I'd like you to look at the challenge below and fully consider how to respond. I've actually looked at the full response to this in the past, which was via the use of the 'Link Digital Construct Framework' and the broadly decentralised platform I'm keen to build via opendata.ai, opendata.ly and a third pillar of employing open source contributors with strict contribution guidelines to maintain opendata.ai especially.

I have uploaded some documents that were developed before I established the GSC Model as these can give you an idea of the way I was planning to move ahead.

Some more recent thinking on this area was written up in the form of 'info-logical' actors and identifying agents that are working on coherence vs those seeking to cause decoherence within society to promote their own 'low informational complexity' niche outcome.

Anyway - take a look at everything above, below and uploaded with this prompt and suggest a deep research approach for addressing this international challenge via the GSC Model lens plus the mechanisms of opendata.ai, opendata.ly, etc.

##ends

Digital Confidence: Tools for Safe Online Participation

Jurisdiction: International

#Navigating-the-digital-seas

How can communities, governments and organisations enhance digital safety and trust to protect vulnerable populations and enable secure, meaningful engagement with digital platforms and data?

Digital technologies are the backbone of modern society, enabling communication, services, governance, and innovation. However, this growing reliance comes with increasing risks:

- Cyber threats such as fraud, phishing, identity theft, and ransomware are more sophisticated and widespread.
- Misinformation and disinformation are undermining public trust, eroding social cohesion, and influencing decision-making.
- AI-enabled harms, from deepfakes to automated scams, amplify risks by making attacks faster, cheaper, and harder to detect.

- Vulnerable populations (children, elderly, minority groups, digitally inexperienced) face disproportionate risks in navigating digital ecosystems

Your challenge is to develop strategies, tools, and frameworks that foster digital trust, enabling people and organisations to navigate online environments confidently and safely. Trust is the foundation for meaningful participation: without it, uptake of digital government, online services, and community engagement will continue to be fragmented.

Some key areas to consider are:

- Detection & protection: How can we better distribute information on and mitigate cyber threats, fraud, and AI-enabled harms in real time?
- Trust & integrity: Are there mechanisms to uphold information authenticity and prevent the spread of misinformation and disinformation?
- Inclusion & protection of vulnerable groups: Do solutions exist to safeguard high risk groups and enable inclusive and equitable access e.g., children, elderly, digitally disadvantaged?
- Governance & responsibility: What frameworks can balance accountability between governments, platforms, and individuals?
- Digital literacy & empowerment: How can communities and organisations be equipped with the knowledge and tools to navigate online spaces confidently?

Teams taking up this challenge should aim to produce practical, innovative, and scalable solutions that address one or more of the above questions.

In particular, you are expected to produce

- A practical plan that is implementable whilst addressing accessibility, ethical, privacy or trust concerns
- A way to use at least one Government dataset or finding
- Specific examples or simulations to illustrate the effectiveness and potential impact of your proposed solutions. Ideally, you should demonstrate how your solution can be scaled or adapted to a range of scenarios
- A presentation summarising your solution

Eligibility: Open to all. Your solution will be measured against its relevance to the theme, practicality and scalability, whether it follows ethical and inclusive design, and its innovation. You must use at least one Government dataset.

Entry: Challenge entry is available to all teams in Competition 2025.

--- Gemini's resultant 'research suggestion' below

Of course. Based on the international challenge "Digital Confidence: Tools for Safe Online Participation" and the context you've provided, here is a proposed deep research approach that integrates the GSC Model with your prior work on the Objective Observer Initiative and the [opendata.ai](#) platform.

This plan treats the challenge not as a problem to be solved, but as an opportunity to construct a more coherent and informationally rich digital environment.

A Deep Research Approach for the "Digital Confidence" Challenge

This approach reframes the challenge from a defensive posture of "protecting" users to a constructive one of "empowering" them to maintain a state of coherent indifference. It posits that online harms like misinformation and cyber threats are low-information decoherence events designed to fragment the social substrate. The goal is to build a socio-technical framework that increases the "computational cost" of such malicious acts and fosters a high-trust, verifiably honest ecosystem.

(1) Reframe the Challenge through the GSC Lens: From Digital Safety to Informational Coherence

- **Initial Analysis:** Begin by deconstructing the challenge's premise. Instead of viewing "digital safety" as the mitigation of risks (the Popperian, problem-solving view), frame it as the construction and maintenance of a coherent, non-local informational substrate.
- **Redefine "Harms":** Characterize cyber threats, misinformation, and AI-enabled harms not as "problems" but as deliberate, low-information decoherence events. These are attacks designed to degrade social trust (a key "natural qualia") and force individuals out of a state of functional, coherent indifference into a state of high-energy anxiety and suspicion.
- **Define the Objective:** The objective is not to build "tools for protection" but to design "constructors of coherence." The aim is to create a digital environment so resilient and transparent that users can mindlessly and effortlessly navigate it, trusting the substrate itself, thus achieving a higher state of functional blindness to the vast majority of low-level threats.

(2) Synthesize Pre-GSC Frameworks with GSC Principles

- **Integrate LDCF/SDCF:** Position your pre-GSC work on the Link Digital Construct Framework (LDCF) and Self Digital Construct Framework (SDCF) as early attempts to create the "recipes" for these constructors of coherence. The GSC Model now provides the fundamental physical justification for
- *why* these explicit, non-local agreements are the most effective way to build an informationally rich system.
- **Operationalize the OOI:** Frame the Objective Observer Initiative (OOI) and its foundational USER Constitution as the primary "constructor" for establishing the "coherent void" of verifiable honesty. This is the ethical and operational anchor required for any high-trust system to emerge within the chaotic "filament" of the broader internet.

(3) Design the Core Deliverable: The "Verifiable Honesty Construct" (VHC)

- **Conceptualization:** Propose the creation of a tangible, machine-readable "Verifiable Honesty Construct" (VHC). This would be a standardized, LDCF-based artifact that any online entity (organization, platform, individual) can publish to declare its commitment to digital trust.
- **VHC Components:** The VHC would include a Theory of Value (e.g., "to foster a safe environment for vulnerable users"), a Theory of Management (e.g., "we manage user data according to GDPR and provide transparent moderation reports"), and an Evidence Grid where claims can be tested against real-world data. This VHC acts as a public "info-logical rating" for that entity.

(4) Select and Analyze the Government Dataset as the "Informational Substrate"

- **Dataset Selection:** Utilize the Australian Institute of Criminology's "**Cybercrime in Australia 2024**" report and its associated downloadable dataset. This dataset provides a rich, empirical picture of the current informational environment.
- **Analysis:** Analyze this dataset through the GSC lens. The statistics on fraud, online abuse, and identity crime are not just numbers; they represent the measurable decoherence events currently fragmenting the digital social fabric. The analysis will identify the most prevalent patterns of harm,

which will directly inform the design of the VHC. The VHC's evidence grid must be structured to address the specific threats quantified in this data.

(5) Outline the Socio-Technical Implementation via opendata.ly and opendata.ai

- **The Social Justice Track (opendata.ly):** Use opendata.ly as the community hub for the ODSx "Data Justice Movement". This is where the moral and ethical "why" is established. The community will co-design the VHC, debating its principles and ensuring it addresses the needs of vulnerable populations identified in the challenge and the AIC data.
- **The Technocratic Track (opendata.ai):** Use the opendata.ai platform as the "social physics lab" to operationalize the VHC.
 - **Constructs:** The VHC is formalized and published on constructs.opendata.ai.
 - **Experiments:** An experiment is designed on experiments.opendata.ai to test the VHC's effectiveness. For example, a simulation could show how a browser extension displays VHC ratings for websites, and then measure whether this information helps users avoid sites with patterns of behavior linked to the cybercrime data.
 - **Evidence:** The results of this simulation—user interactions, feedback, and outcomes—are published as evidence packets to data.opendata.ai. This creates a transparent, verifiable feedback loop for refining the VHC.

(6) Propose a Self-Referential "A priori-Mortem" as the Submission

- **The Submission as an Experiment:** Frame the entire GovHack submission as a self-referential application of the proposed framework. The submission itself is a "construct" designed to introduce a "high-information decoherence event" into the GovHack ecosystem.
- **Deliverables:**
 - **Practical Plan:** The phased roadmap (Foundation, Expansion, Influence) outlined in your ODSx market research.
 - **Simulation:** A detailed walkthrough of the VHC concept, using the AIC cybercrime data to populate a hypothetical evidence grid for a major digital platform.
 - **Presentation:** A narrative-driven presentation (e.g., a javascript slide deck) that explains this entire GSC-based approach, designed not just to inform the judges but to shift their entire paradigm from "problem-solving" to "reality construction."
 - **The A priori-Mortem:** The submission itself serves as the second premortem required by the original challenge. By analyzing its own potential pathways to success (coherent persistence) or failure (decoherence via misinterpretation), it performs a live demonstration of the GSC model's analytical power.

5:45pm 30 August 2025

Note: Took the dog for a walk and read the report when it was ready. The result was mostly ok, but clearly didn't have the full benefit of integrated reference documents, given that I fed it pre- GSC Model solution architectures, some initial frameworks for agreements and some fairly broad ideas about the nature of international 'data justice' that is ready for the right movement to take hold.

The full response will be on the next tab, and will maybe represent something that someone within the Dept of Home Affairs might blink at more than twice. It suggest I might use the cyber crime data but I won't really have time to do much more than just wave generally in the area of such data. I want to move this to 'done' and get on to other work I need to complete this week 😊

The neat thing is that I now have two proper, Karl Popper-esque, premortems, or four if you are counting them like me. Maybe five if you count the 'overall' decoherence from the GovHack substrate of problem-solution dynamics. Or, $n+$ whatever, should anything else cascade into a full-on causal set history where the GSC Model becomes used as an analysis lens for whatever else...

Anyhoo - next tab is the doc and the one after will be the 'low energy' stuff to try and give folk some eye candy to pull them softly out of their natural state of coherent indifference.