

The Shape of Agreement:

Topological Foundations for Cooperative Logistics

Shawn Nevalainen, PhD
Black River Systems
nevalainen.shawn@gmail.com

December 2025

Abstract

Modern logistics architectures are predominantly modeled as Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs), optimizing for linearity and solvability. However, this topological rigidity fails to account for local consensus, feedback loops, and distributed state management in high-entropy environments. In this paper, we propose a novel framework for "Cooperative Logistics" based on Simplicial Homology and Sheaf Theory. We demonstrate that a supply chain is isomorphic to a Simplicial Complex, where data consistency is governed by Sheaf Restriction Maps. We further introduce a metric for systemic inefficiency defined by the First Cohomology Group (H^1), arguing that "waste" is a topological obstruction to global consensus. Finally, we establish a theoretical basis for self-healing networks using the Combinatorial Hodge Decomposition.

Reference Implementation and Documentation: <https://black-river-systems.gitbook.io/the-shape-of-agreement>

1 Introduction

The fragility of global supply chains, exemplified by the cascading failures of the early 2020s, reveals a fundamental flaw in industrial architecture: the reliance on the Line. The Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) enforces a one-way flow of information (Source \rightarrow Sink) that explicitly prohibits feedback loops (cycles). While efficient for critical path analysis, DAGs lack the topological features necessary for homeostasis and distributed repair.

We propose a shift from graph-theoretic models to higher-dimensional topological models. By treating the logistics network as a **Simplicial Complex**, we can model "community" and "trust" not as abstract qualities, but as geometric structures (2-simplices). Furthermore, by equipping this complex with a **Cellular Sheaf**, we can rigorously model data integration and operational friction.

2 The Structural Model: Simplicial Connectivity

2.1 The Simplex as the Atomic Unit

We define the fundamental unit of a cooperative network not as the edge (transaction), but as the simplex (consensus).

Definition 1 (The Simplex). *Let V be a set of agents. A k -simplex $\sigma = [v_0, \dots, v_k]$ is an unordered subset of $k + 1$ agents that possess pairwise connectivity and a shared operational context.*

In our framework:

- A 0-simplex is an Agent (Node).
- A 1-simplex is a Communication Link (Edge).
- A 2-simplex is a Consensus Region (Face).

2.2 The Nerve Theorem and Coverage

To map physical logistics onto this geometry, we invoke the Nerve Theorem. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}$ be the set of "operational ranges" (knowledge domains) of a fleet of agents. The Nerve $N(\mathcal{U})$ is the simplicial complex where a k -simplex exists if and only if $\cap_{j=0}^k U_{i_j} \neq \emptyset$.

This isomorphism allows us to calculate topological invariants, such as Betti numbers (β_k), to detect coverage gaps ($\beta_1 > 0$) in the supply chain layout without requiring centralized geospatial mapping.

3 The Data Model: Sheaf Theory

Geometry provides the structure, but logistics requires the movement of data. We model this using Cellular Sheaves.

Definition 2 (The Sheaf of Local Truth). *A Sheaf \mathcal{F} on a complex K assigns a vector space $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ to each simplex (representing the local database) and a linear map $\rho_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} : \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\tau)$ to each face relation.*

3.1 Restriction Maps as API Contracts

In an engineering context, we identify the Restriction Map ρ with the **API Contract**. It transforms the internal data representation of an agent (e.g., SQL) into the shared interface format (e.g., JSON).

The condition for a global section (valid system-wide state) is given by the glueing axiom:

$$\rho_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}(x_\sigma) = \rho_{\eta \rightarrow \tau}(x_\eta) \quad (1)$$

Failure to satisfy this equation represents *Sheaf Torsion*—a data mismatch that prevents integration.

4 The Metric: Cohomology as Waste

We introduce a rigorous metric for "Systemic Friction" using Cohomology. We construct the cochain complex:

$$0 \rightarrow C^0(K; \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\delta^0} C^1(K; \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\delta^1} C^2(K; \mathcal{F}) \dots$$

Definition 3 (Topological Waste). *The First Cohomology Group $H^1(K; \mathcal{F})$ is defined as:*

$$H^1(K; \mathcal{F}) = \frac{\ker(\delta^1)}{\text{im}(\delta^0)}$$

Operational Interpretation:

- H^0 : The subspace of Global Consensus (Signal).
- H^1 : The subspace of Local Consistency that fails Global Consistency (Waste).

If $\dim(H^1) > 0$, the system contains "Phantom Inventory" or circular inefficiencies that cannot be resolved locally. We propose replacing random auditing with the computational determination of H^1 .

5 Dynamics: Hodge Decomposition

Finally, we analyze the flow of resources using the Combinatorial Hodge Decomposition theorem:

$$C^1 \cong \text{im}(\delta_0) \oplus \ker(\Delta_1) \oplus \text{im}(\delta_1^*) \quad (2)$$

This allows us to decompose any logistics flow into three orthogonal components:

1. **Gradient Flow:** Intent-driven movement (Supply \rightarrow Demand).
2. **Harmonic Flow:** Sustainable circulation (Trade Cycles).
3. **Curl Flow:** Rotational inefficiency (Bureaucracy/Corruption).

6 Conclusion

We have outlined a formal topological framework for logistics that replaces the brittle linearity of DAGs with the resilient geometry of Simplicial Complexes. By operationalizing Sheaf Theory, we provide a method for measuring systemic waste (H^1) and ensuring data consistency across heterogeneous agents. Future work will focus on the algorithmic implementation of these concepts using Large Language Models as dynamic restriction maps.

References

- [1] R. Ghrist, *Elementary Applied Topology*, Createspace, 2014.
- [2] J. Hansen and R. Ghrist, "Toward a Spectral Theory of Cellular Sheaves," *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology*, vol. 3, pp. 315-358, 2019.
- [3] Y. Sheffi, *The Resilient Enterprise: Overcoming Vulnerability for Competitive Advantage*, MIT Press, 2005.