

THE INTERNATIONAL DATA SOVEREIGNTY INDEX

METHODOLOGY, EDITION 1.0

Issued under the auspices of
**THE FREEDOM NATION SOVEREIGNTY
INITIATIVE**

Custodian: Qosil, Ltd.
Astana International Financial Centre, Republic of Kazakhstan

2026

1. Foreword

The International Data Sovereignty Index (the “Index”, or “IDSI”) is the annual instrument by which the Custodian discharges its mandate under Article 12 of *The International Data Sovereignty Charter of 2026* (the “Charter”). The Index is published as the *Report on Data Sovereignty Progress* and is the principal vehicle by which the international community — citizens, States, institutions, and investors — may understand which Signatory States are actively advancing the principles of the Charter and at what pace.

This methodology document is the public reference for how the Index is constructed. It describes the pillars and indicators, the data collection process, the scoring approach, the annual cycle, and the rules that govern publication. The methodology is published prior to the first edition of the Index, and any revisions are versioned and published in advance of the cycle to which they apply.

The Index draws methodological inspiration from established international instruments — the United Nations Human Development Index, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Index, the World Bank Logistics Performance Index, the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators, the World Health Organization Global Health Observatory, the World Intellectual Property Organization Global Innovation Index, the Network Readiness Index, and the Government AI Readiness Index. Where useful conventions exist in the international-index practice, the Custodian has adopted them. Where the Charter’s specific commitments require departure from convention, the Custodian has departed and explained the departure in this document.

2. Purpose and Mandate

2.1 What the Index measures

The Index measures the *advancement* of each Signatory State along five pillars of data-sovereignty practice, each pillar derived from the Articles of the Charter. The Index is *progress-oriented*: it captures movement toward the principles of the Charter, recognizing that no State is expected to begin its accession at the same starting point.

2.2 What the Index does not measure

The Index does not measure compliance, since the Charter creates no binding obligations and admits of no breach (Charter Article 8.5). The Index does not measure absolute attainment, since the Charter explicitly invites States to advance at their own pace (Charter Articles 7.1, 8.1). The Index does not rank States from “best” to “worst”, since the Charter forbids the publication of adverse signals beyond the absence of mention (Charter Article 12.3).

2.3 The non-ranking design choice

This is the most consequential methodological choice in the Index, and it is required by the Charter. Conventional international indexes typically publish a country leaderboard. The IDSI does not. Instead:

- Numerical scores per pillar and an overall composite score are computed for each Signatory State. These scores are used internally for analysis and are shared in confidence with the National Authority of the State to which they pertain.
- Public output identifies States by name *only* in the context of recognition for notable progress, named best-practice spotlights,

or aggregate inclusion (e.g., “of the Signatory States that have designated a National Authority, fifteen are...”).

- Public output does not include a comprehensive ranked leaderboard.
- Public output does not identify by name any State as failing or non-progressing. The absence of mention is the only adverse signal the Index conveys.

This design preserves the Charter’s *invitation-by-attraction* posture while still giving the international community a useful, neutral, and transparent picture of progress.

3. The Five Pillars

The Index is structured around five pillars, each derived from one or more Articles of the Charter. Pillars are weighted equally at twenty percent each in Edition 1.0. Weights are subject to review at each annual cycle and any change is published prior to the cycle in which it applies.

Pillar I — Constitutional and Legal Foundation (20%)

Charter mapping: Articles 2, 4, 11.

The legal recognition, in domestic law, of the rights of the Data Owner and the limits on State authority over private data. This pillar measures whether the principles of the Charter are present in the constitutional, statutory, or framework law of the State, and whether the legal mechanisms necessary to vindicate those rights are available.

Pillar II — Technical and Operational Safeguards (20%)

Charter mapping: Article 3.

The presence in operational practice of the four inviolable protections: encryption at rest, owner-permissioned access, owner retrievability, and owner retraction. This pillar measures whether the principles operate in fact in the State's public services, regulated industries, and reference systems.

Pillar III — Universal Identifier and Agent Provenance (20%)

Charter mapping: Articles 5, 6.

The presence of a Universal Identifier framework consistent with Charter Article 5, and the presence of a regime for the registration and accountability of Autonomous Agents under Article 6. This pillar measures whether the State has established the technical and legal scaffolding for cryptographic attribution of human and non-human action.

Pillar IV — Sovereign Haven Infrastructure (20%)

Charter mapping: Article 7.

The presence of the physical, policy, and operational conditions for the State to function as a Sovereign Data Haven within the meaning of Article 1.4 — including stated national-government policy on extraterritorial demands, data-center capacity, sustainable cooling and power infrastructure, and trained security capacity for critical data infrastructure.

Pillar V — Ecosystem, Education, and Implementation (20%)

Charter mapping: Articles 8, 10.

The presence of the institutional and educational infrastructure that supports long-term implementation of the Charter — National Authority designation, legislative work in progress, Sovereign Compute Pilots, higher-education curricula, civil-society engagement, and Annual Survey participation.

4. Indicators and Sub-Indicators

Each pillar contains a set of sub-indicators. Each sub-indicator is scored on a 0–10 scale. The pillar score is the unweighted mean of its sub-indicators. The overall composite score is the weighted mean of the five pillar scores, on a 0–100 scale.

4.1 Pillar I sub-indicators

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
1.1	Data Sovereignty recognized in constitutional or framework law	Art. 2.1
1.2	Data Owner rights codified in statute	Art. 2.2, 2.3
1.3	Limits on State authority over data codified	Art. 4.1, 4.2
1.4	Capital-crime exception narrowly framed and procedurally guarded	Art. 4.3
1.5	Stated national-government policy refusing extraterritorial demands	Art. 4.4
1.6	Public registry of access requests under the capital-crime exception	Art. 4.3(d)
1.7	Right of erasure with cryptographic verification codified	Art. 3.4

4.2 Pillar II sub-indicators

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
2.1	Encryption-at-rest standard applied to sensitive data in public services	Art. 3.1

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
2.2	Owner-permissioned access architecture in public services	Art. 3.2
2.3	Owner retrievability via accessible portal or interface	Art. 3.3
2.4	Owner retraction with cryptographic verification of destruction	Art. 3.4
2.5	Open-source or standards-based reference implementations available for public use	Art. 8.2
2.6	Conformance assessment, certification, or testing regime in operation	Art. 10.1

4.3 Pillar III sub-indicators

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
3.1	Universal Identifier framework — legal	Art. 5.1
3.2	Universal Identifier framework — technical	Art. 5.1
3.3	Privacy and pseudonymity protections in identifier use	Art. 5.2(a), 5.2(b)
3.4	Identifier portability across instruments and platforms	Art. 5.2(c)
3.5	Autonomous Agent registration framework	Art. 6.1, 6.2
3.6	Agent-owner liability attribution clear in domestic law	Art. 6.3

4.4 Pillar IV sub-indicators

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
4.1	Stated national-government policy refusing	Art. 7.2(a)

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
	extraterritorial demands	
4.2	Domestic data-center capacity (MW deployed; foreign-Owner share)	Art. 7.2(d)
4.3	Sustainable cooling and renewable-power capacity for data infrastructure	Art. 7.2(d), 7.3
4.4	Trained security capacity for critical data infrastructure	Art. 7.2(d)
4.5	Inter-haven coordination engagement (memberships, joint working groups)	Art. 7.3
4.6	Open posture toward foreign Data Owners hosting in jurisdiction	Art. 7.4

4.5 Pillar V sub-indicators

Code	Sub-Indicator	Charter mapping
5.1	National Authority designated and operational	Art. 8.1(a)
5.2	Legislative or regulatory work initiated	Art. 8.1(b)
5.3	Sovereign Compute Pilot launched at an institution of higher learning	Art. 8.1(d)
5.4	Higher-education curriculum on data sovereignty in operation	Art. 8.1(d), 8.4
5.5	Civil-society engagement and public consultation in the State's domestic process	Art. 11.2
5.6	Annual Survey participation	Art. 12.2

The total number of sub-indicators is thirty-one (31) in Edition 1.0 (Pillar I: 7; Pillars II-V: 6 each).

5. Data Collection

5.1 Three sources of data

- 1. Self-reported data from the National Authority.** Each Signatory State receives, once per cycle, an Annual Survey from the Custodian. The survey is the same for all States and is the principal data-collection instrument. Per Charter Article 12.2, the survey requests only such information as the State chooses to share, is returnable in any form, and imputes no negative inference to non-response.
- 2. Open-source verification by the Custodian.** The Custodian maintains a public legal-and-policy tracker that monitors the legislative, regulatory, and policy work of each Signatory State as reflected in publicly available sources — official gazettes, parliamentary records, government websites, public registries, and press releases of National Authorities. This tracker provides a non-burdensome supplement to self-reported data and a basis for comparing year-over-year movement.
- 3. Voluntary third-party attestation.** Where a Signatory State chooses to invite an independent observer — an academic institution, a civil-society organization, or a peer State acting in collaboration — to attest to elements of the State’s progress, that attestation may be entered into the data-collection file at the State’s request. Third-party attestation is always voluntary.

5.2 The data-collection file

For each Signatory State, the Custodian maintains a *Data-Collection File* containing:

- The State’s signed copy of the Charter and any subsequent communication.

- The State’s annual survey responses (once received).
- Open-source verification entries with citations.
- Voluntary third-party attestations (if any).
- The State’s internal review notes (per Article 12.5).
- Year-over-year scoring history.

The file is held in confidence, accessible only to the Custodian’s staff and to the State to which the file pertains. Aggregate analysis derived from the file is published; the file itself is not.

5.3 Languages

The Annual Survey and the methodology document are issued in English in Edition 1.0. The Custodian commits to translation of the Annual Survey into the official language of each Signatory State that requests it. Responses are accepted in any language; the Custodian assumes the cost of translation for analysis.

6. Scoring Methodology

6.1 Sub-indicator scoring (0-10 scale)

Each sub-indicator is scored against a published rubric. The rubric for each sub-indicator describes the conditions under which a State scores 0, 5, and 10, with intermediate values interpolated.

The scoring scale is divided into five bands:

Band	Score Range	Description
Pioneer	9.0 - 10.0	The State has established the indicator in law or operation in a form that exemplifies the principle and offers a reference for peers.
Advanced	7.0 - 8.9	The State has implemented the indicator substantively, with refinements remaining.
Building	4.0 - 6.9	The State has begun the work; implementation is partial or in development.
Aligning	1.0 - 3.9	The State has expressed alignment in principle and has commenced preliminary work.
Not yet visible	0.0 - 0.9	No public evidence of work on this indicator at the present time.

6.2 Pillar score and overall composite

- **Pillar score** = unweighted arithmetic mean of the sub-indicator scores within the pillar, expressed on a 0-10 scale.
- **Overall composite score** = weighted mean of the five pillar scores, with each pillar weighted at 0.20 in Edition 1.0, expressed on a 0-100 scale (multiplied by 10 to convert from the 0-10 pillar scale).

6.3 Year-over-year movement

For each Signatory State after its first complete cycle, the Index records the year-over-year change in pillar scores and overall composite, expressed in absolute index points and as a percentage of prior-year score. The Custodian’s narrative analysis identifies States with notable positive movement.

6.4 Score interpretation guidance

Index scores are not measurements of national worth, citizen freedom, or government quality in any general sense. They are technical measurements of advancement on the specific principles of the Charter. A State with a low score in Edition 1 may simply be a State that has only recently signed and has not yet had an opportunity to advance. A State with a high score has, in the Custodian’s reading of the available evidence, advanced materially on the Charter’s specific principles.

6.5 Treatment of missing data

Where a sub-indicator cannot be scored due to absence of evidence and absence of self-reported data, the sub-indicator is recorded as **NA** (not assessed). The pillar score is then calculated as the unweighted mean of the available sub-indicators within that pillar. The overall composite is reported only if at least three of the five pillars have at least half their sub-indicators scored. Otherwise, the overall composite is reported as NA, and the available pillar scores are reported individually with the indication that the composite has not been computed.

6.6 Quality assurance

- All sub-indicator scores are entered by at least two members of the Custodian’s analysis team.
- Disagreements of more than two points on a 0-10 scale are reviewed by a third analyst.
- Final scores are reviewed by the Custodian’s Head of Methodology before draft publication.
- The State’s National Authority is invited, per Charter Article 12.5, to review its draft scores and provide commentary or correction prior to public release.

7. The Annual Cycle

The Index follows a calendar-aligned annual cycle. Cycle start dates and milestones are published at the close of the prior cycle.

Phase	Indicative Timing	Activity
Phase A — Survey distribution	Q1	Annual Survey transmitted to each Signatory State’s National Authority.
Phase B — Response window	Q1 - Q2	National Authorities respond at their convenience. The window is open and is not closed until publication.
Phase C — Open-source verification	Q1 - Q3	Custodian completes legal-and-policy tracker entries for each Signatory State.
Phase D — Scoring	Q3	Custodian’s analysis team completes preliminary scoring; double-entry quality assurance is performed.
Phase E — National Authority review	Q3 (late)	Each National Authority receives its State’s draft scores and one-page narrative; submits commentary or correction within four weeks.
Phase F — Final compilation	Q4 (early)	Custodian incorporates Authority feedback; compiles final report.
Phase G — Publication	Q4 (mid)	Annual Report published; National Authorities receive the public copy in advance of public release per Article 12.5.

If a Signatory State does not respond to the Annual Survey, the Custodian uses open-source data alone, without inference of failure. Non-response is treated as a request for the Custodian to rely on public information for that cycle.

8. Publication Standards

8.1 Structure of the Annual Report

Each Annual Report follows a stable structure to enable year-over-year comparison:

- **Cover and front matter.** Edition number, year, Custodian identification, and methodology reference.
- **Foreword from the Custodian.** Brief reflection on the year and the state of the movement.
- **Executive summary.** The headline findings of the year.
- **Methodology in brief.** A two-page summary of this methodology document, with reference to the full version.
- **State of Data Sovereignty.** The narrative analysis of the year — what has changed, what has accelerated, what remains aspirational.
- **Notable Progress recognitions.** Named recognition of Signatory States making notable progress, by pillar or overall.
- **Aggregate findings.** Statistical summary of progress across the Signatory body — without identifying laggards.
- **Country profile spotlights.** One-page profiles of Signatory States that have consented to public profiling. States not consenting are not profiled.
- **Charts and tables.** Anonymized aggregate analysis. Country-level data appears only in the consented spotlights.
- **Closing.** Custodian’s reflection on the coming year.
- **Annexes.** Methodology revision history, list of Signatory States as of publication, sample survey instrument, contact for the Custodian.

8.2 What is published

- Aggregate trends.
- Number of Signatory States advancing on each indicator.
- Notable Progress recognitions (named States with State consent).
- Country profile spotlights (named States with explicit State consent).
- Aggregate score distribution (anonymized).
- Year-over-year movement at the aggregate level.

8.3 What is not published

- Comprehensive State-by-State leaderboards.
- Identification of any State as the lowest or as failing.
- Specific scores of any State without that State's consent.
- Narrative criticism of any specific State by name.
- Confidential survey content beyond what the State has agreed to share.

8.4 Consent regime for country profiles

A State's National Authority may, in its annual survey response, indicate that the State consents to the publication of a country profile in the Annual Report. The profile will then be drafted by the Custodian and shared with the National Authority for review prior to publication. The State retains the right to withdraw consent at any point prior to publication, including after seeing the draft.

9. Quality Assurance and Independence

9.1 Independence

The Custodian, Qosil, Ltd., performs the monitoring function in service of the Charter and not as an instrument of any State or commercial interest. Per Charter Article 10.3, the Custodian acts in good faith, without commercial self-interest in the recognition function. Per Charter Article 12.4, the monitoring function is funded by the Custodian and requires no contribution from any Signatory State.

9.2 Conflicts of interest

The Custodian publishes, on or before the first anniversary of the Charter, a Code of Conduct governing custodial functions, including specific provisions on conflicts of interest, transparency in funding, and accountability to the Signatory body (Charter Article 10.6).

9.3 Method changes

Material changes to the methodology will be:

- Documented in a published change-history annex;
- Published prior to the cycle in which they apply;
- Accompanied by a transition-year analysis showing scores under both the old and new methodology, where feasible.

9.4 Right of correction

A Signatory State that disputes a published score or characterization of its work may request correction. The Custodian's correction process is published in an annex of each Annual Report.

10. Reference Implementations and Tools

10.1 Reference implementations

The Custodian recognizes the system known as **bRRAI**n — including the **bRRAI**n ID Registry at id.brrain.io for cryptographically-attributed personal and agent identifiers — as a reference implementation of the technical principles of Articles 3 and 5 of the Charter. It is made available by Qosil, Ltd. The Charter does not require any State to adopt the system; it is offered as a reference against which States may benchmark domestic implementations or which States may, at their option, deploy directly.

10.2 Survey-submission portal

The Annual Survey will, beginning with Edition 2 of the Index, be available for submission via an online portal operated by the Custodian. The portal accepts uploads of completed surveys, supporting documentation, and any voluntary attestations the State chooses to include. Submission is on a voluntary basis and the portal observes the same rules of confidentiality, consent, and non-burden as the paper-based survey.

11. Reading the Index Responsibly

The Custodian makes the following requests of those who read and use the Index:

- **Read it as a measure of progress, not of worth.** A low score reflects, in most cases, a State that has signed recently and has not yet had time to advance. It does not reflect a judgment on the State's character.
- **Read aggregate findings as the primary signal.** The headline movement of the Charter community as a whole is a more robust signal than any individual data point.
- **Consult the methodology before drawing conclusions.** The Index is a deliberate construction with deliberate exclusions. Its silences are informative.
- **Respect the consent regime.** The Custodian publishes only what States have agreed to have published. Inferences drawn from absence are inferences the Charter explicitly forbids the Custodian from making, and the Custodian asks readers to extend the same respect.

12. Glossary

Annual Report — The principal published output of the Index; the Custodian’s annual *Report on Data Sovereignty Progress* under Charter Article 12.1.

Annual Survey — The instrument by which Signatory States voluntarily provide information for the Index, per Charter Article 12.2.

Charter — *The International Data Sovereignty Charter of 2026*, the foundational instrument issued under the auspices of the Freedom Nation Sovereignty Initiative.

Composite Score — The weighted mean of the five pillar scores, expressed on a 0-100 scale.

Custodian — Qosil, Ltd., the organization holding the Charter and maintaining the Index, per Charter Article 10.

Data Owner — As defined in Charter Article 1.2.

Index — The International Data Sovereignty Index.

National Authority — The entity within a Signatory State responsible for the State’s engagement with the Charter, per Charter Article 8.1(a).

Pillar — One of the five top-level categories into which the Index is structured.

Signatory State — A State that has signed the Charter, per Charter Article 1.8.

Sub-Indicator — A measured item within a pillar.

13. Methodology Revision History

Edition	Date	Summary of change
1.0	2026	First publication. Five pillars, thirty-one sub-indicators, equal weighting, 0-100 composite, positive-recognition-only publication regime.

The Custodian welcomes correspondence on this methodology. All requests for clarification, correction, or proposed revision should be addressed to the Office of the Custodian, Qosil, Ltd., Astana International Financial Centre.