Global Subsidiarity Index Framework

Version 3.0: A Universal Metric for Governance Architecture

Björn Kenneth Holmström • February 2026
https://svensksubsidiaritet.se

The Global Subsidiarity Index (GSI) Framework v3

A Universal Metric for Measuring Governance Architecture in the 21st Century

Executive Summary

The **Global Subsidiarity Index (GSI)** is a diagnostic and benchmarking tool that quantifies the match (or mismatch) between governance structures and societal complexity. Building on the 10-system analysis performed by the Svensk Subsidiaritet project and cybernetic principles, the GSI provides nations, regions, and municipalities with a standardized way to measure their "decision distance," "knowledge inclusion," and "resilience architecture" across critical systems.

Core Proposition: Governance quality in the 21st century is not about left vs. right, but about **centralized vs. distributed** —and the GSI makes this measurable, comparable, and actionable.

This version 3 incorporates critical revisions to address feedback on v1, including enhanced proxy metrics for objectivity, multi-dimensional complexity adjustments to resolve the "Singapore Trap," a new Cohesion and Integration dimension to prevent fragmentation, anti-gaming protocols, improved dashboard visualizations, a pattern library for best practices, refined pilot protocols, a Global Subsidiarity Council for legitimacy, and a phased rollout plan. These ensure the framework is scientifically rigorous, politically robust, and resistant to bias or manipulation while maintaining all core elements from previous versions.

---

1. Theoretical Foundation

1.1 Cybernetic Basis: Ashby's Law Operationalized

> *"Only variety can destroy variety. To control a system, the regulator must have at least as many internal states as the system it attempts to regulate."*

GSI Translation: The Index measures the **ratio** between:

- **Societal Variety** (complexity, diversity, dynamism of the governed population)
- **Governance Variety** (flexibility, adaptability, differentiation of the governing system)

1.2 Three Universal Governance Pathologies

1. **Decision Distance:** Administrative layers between problem and decision-maker
2. **Knowledge Exclusion:** Whose knowledge counts in policy design
3. **Resilience Deficits:** Single points of failure in critical systems

---

2. The GSI Framework: Four Dimensions, Sixteen Indicators

DIMENSION 1: DECISION PROXIMITY

How close are decisions to those affected?

Indicator	Measurement	Scale (0-10)	Data Sources
1.1 Administrative Distance	Average layers between citizen and decision-maker across 5 domains	0 (Household) - 10 (Supranational)	Gov. org charts, policy tracing
1.2 Fiscal Sovereignty	% of local budget controlled locally vs. mandated from above	0 (0% control) - 10 (100% control)	Budget analyses, grant tracking
1.3 Regulatory Autonomy	Ability to adapt national rules to local conditions	0 (No adaptation) - 10 (Full adaptation)	Legal analysis, opt-out provisions
1.4 Emergency Response Latitude	Local authority during crises	0 (Centrally directed) - 10 (Locally determined)	Emergency protocols, crisis case studies

DIMENSION 2: KNOWLEDGE INCLUSION

Whose intelligence informs decisions?

Revised Indicator	Measurement	Scale (0-10)	Data Sources & Verification
2.1 Expert vs. Experiential Balance	% policy inputs from experts vs. citizens	0 (All expert) - 10 (Balanced)	Public committee records, parliamentary transcripts, budget documents
2.2 Participatory Mechanism Quality	Quality of citizen involvement in decision-making	0 (Token) - 10 (Co-design)	Municipal records, participation demographics, follow-up reports
2.3 Indigenous/Local Knowledge Integration	Recognition of traditional ecological/community knowledge	0 (Ignored) - 10 (Formally integrated)	Land management agreements, official ceremony records, court rulings
2.4 Feedback Loop Efficiency	Time from problem to policy adjustment	0 (Years) - 10 (Days/Weeks)	Emergency declarations database, policy revision logs, ombudsman reports

DIMENSION 3: RESILIENCE ARCHITECTURE

How systems handle disruption and diversity

Indicator	Measurement	Scale (0-10)	Data Sources
3.1 Critical System Redundancy	Backup mechanisms in 10 key systems	0 (Single point) - 10 (Fully distributed)	Infrastructure audits, system mappings
3.2 Adaptive Capacity	Speed of response to shocks	0 (Rigid) - 10 (Agile)	Crisis response data, innovation indices
3.3 Diversity Resilience	Handling of cultural/ethnic/regional differences	0 (Homogenizing) - 10 (Inclusive)	Policy impact assessments, diversity metrics
3.4 Long-term Sustainability	Balance of short vs. long-term planning	0 (Reactive) - 10 (Foresightful)	Planning documents, scenario exercises

DIMENSION 4: COHESION AND INTEGRATION (New in v2)

How distributed systems maintain unity without fragmentation?

Indicator	Measurement	Scale (0-10)	Data Sources
4.1 Inter-Level Coordination	Effectiveness of protocols linking local to national	0 (Silos) - 10 (Seamless)	Coordination agreements, joint exercises
4.2 Shared Value Alignment	Degree of common principles across levels	0 (Conflicting) - 10 (Harmonized)	Value surveys, constitutional analyses
4.3 Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	Speed and fairness in resolving disputes	0 (Adversarial) - 10 (Collaborative)	Dispute logs, resolution outcomes
4.4 National Solidarity Metrics	Resource sharing between regions	0 (Zero-sum) - 10 (Mutual support)	Transfer payments, solidarity funds

3. The Complexity Adjustment Factor (CAF)

Problem Addressed: Small, homogeneous nations naturally have lower "optimal" decision distance than large, diverse federations (the "Singapore Trap").

Enhanced CAF v2.0: Multi-Dimensional Complexity Scoring

Formula: `CAF = (G × E × D × T) ÷ C`

Where:

- **G = Geographic Diversity Score** (0-10)

    - Climate zones × terrain types × ecological regions
    - *Example:* Canada scores 9.8, Singapore scores 1.2

- **E = Ethnolinguistic Diversity Score** (0-10)

    - Effective number of languages × ethnic fractionalization index
    - *Weighted for:* Historical tensions, recognition status

- **D = Development Disparity Score** (0-10)

    - Gini coefficient × regional GDP variance × urban-rural divide metrics
    - *Example:* Sweden scores 2.1, India scores 8.7

- **T = Threat Environment Score** (0-10)

    - Climate vulnerability × border conflicts × disaster frequency

- **C = Central Capacity Score** (1-10)

    - Institutional strength × corruption index × tech infrastructure
    - Prevents over-penalizing capable central systems

Application: Raw scores adjusted by CAF (e.g., high CAF nations get leeway for more distribution; low CAF for more centralization).

Contextual Targets: Each nation gets CAF-derived "optimal ranges" for indicators, avoiding one-size-fits-all.

---

4. Scoring and Aggregation Methodology

- **Indicator Scoring:** 0-10 scale, with clear thresholds
- **Dimension Scores:** Average of indicators
- **Overall GSI:** Weighted average of dimensions (equal weights default; adjustable per context)
- **Resilience Multiplier:** Final score × (1 + Resilience Bonus) where bonus = average shock response in last 5 years

Anti-Gaming Protocols (New in v2):

1. **Data Triangulation:** Require 3+ independent sources per indicator
2. **Anomaly Detection:** AI flags unusual patterns (e.g., sudden jumps)
3. **Citizen Validation Panels:** Random 1,000-citizen surveys to confirm scores
4. **Transparency Mandates:** All raw data public; blockchain for key metrics

---

5. The Resilience Architecture Dashboard

Interactive online tool for visualizing GSI results.

Enhanced Visualization (v2 Additions):

- **Component 1: The Subsidiarity Heatmap**

    - Color-coded nation/regional map showing decision distances
    - Drill-down to municipal level

- **Component 2: Knowledge Inclusion Radar Chart**

    - Multi-axis visualization of inclusion metrics
    - Overlay with demographic data

- **Component 3: The Transition Pathway Simulator**

    - Interactive tool: "If we move decision X to level Y, how does our GSI change?"
    - Shows tradeoffs: Efficiency vs. Resilience, Speed vs. Inclusion

- **Component 4: The Peer Comparison Matrix**

    - Compare across similar CAF nations
    - Highlight best practices from comparable contexts

---

6. Data Sources and Validation Protocols

- **Primary Sources:** Government reports, budgets, legal texts
- **Secondary:** Surveys, case studies, international databases
- **Tertiary:** Citizen crowdsourcing, satellite verification

Verification Layer (from v2): Crowdsourced Validation Protocol

- Citizens can flag discrepancies between official reports and lived reality
- Blockchain-anchored verification for critical metrics (transparent, immutable)
- Satellite/street-view verification for infrastructure claims

6.1 The "Red Team" Stress Test: Addressing the Data Availability Nightmare

One persistent vulnerability in any global index is the **Data Availability Nightmare**: many of the most critical indicators —such as **2.3 Indigenous/Local Knowledge Integration** or **1.4 Emergency Response Latitude**—rely on information that opaque or authoritarian regimes simply do not collect, do not publish, or actively misreport. Even in more transparent nations, administrative records may be incomplete, outdated, or inaccessible.

To prevent this from undermining the credibility or coverage of the GSI, v3 introduces a **Data Confidence Tier** system displayed prominently in the dashboard and country profiles. This tier signals the reliability of the underlying evidence for

each indicator (or the national aggregate score), allowing users to interpret results with appropriate caution and preventing false equivalence between high-confidence and low-confidence assessments.

Data Confidence Tiers:

- **Tier 1 (Gold)** — Highest confidence: Verified by at least three independent sources (e.g., government data + NGO/academic assessment + citizen panel validation) plus crowdsourced triangulation where possible.
  Example: Sweden or Switzerland, where public records, parliamentary transcripts, and participatory mechanisms provide robust cross-verification.

- **Tier 2 (Silver)** — Moderate confidence: Government/official data corroborated by at least one independent NGO, academic, or multilateral check, with partial citizen or proxy validation.
  Example: Many OECD or emerging democracies where some administrative opacity exists but external scrutiny is feasible.

- **Tier 3 (Bronze)** — Low confidence: Estimated via proxy inferences due to absent, unreliable, or contradictory primary data. Proxies are drawn from closely related, more observable metrics (e.g., high budget centralization as a proxy for limited administrative distance; low number of co-management agreements as a proxy for weak indigenous knowledge integration).
  Example: Nations like China, Saudi Arabia, or North Korea, where direct data is systematically withheld or manipulated.

Recommendation for Opaque Nations: The Index explicitly allows **Proxy Inferences** for Tier 3 countries to maintain global coverage and prevent strategic data suppression from "breaking" the model. When proxies are used, the dashboard clearly labels them (e.g., "Estimated via proxy: budget centralization"), shows the confidence tier, and provides the inference logic and margin of uncertainty. This approach mirrors best practices in established global indices (e.g., World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators, which use margins of error and multiple sources to handle data gaps).

By surfacing confidence tiers rather than excluding low-data nations, the GSI remains comprehensive while protecting integrity: users can compare Gold-tier Sweden directly with Bronze-tier peers only with full awareness of the evidentiary gap. Over time, the existence of the Index itself may incentivize better data collection and transparency in participating nations.

---

7. Applications and Impact Pathways

For Policymakers:

- **Diagnostic:** "Where are we overcentralized?"
- **Roadmapping:** "How do we distribute power wisely?"
- **Monitoring:** "Are our reforms increasing resilience?"

For Citizens and Civil Society:

- **Advocacy tool:** "Our GSI shows we need local control over X"
- **Organizing framework:** "Let's build parallel systems where distance is highest"

- **Education resource:** Understanding governance architecture

For Researchers:

- **Comparative data:** Testing subsidiarity hypotheses across contexts
- **Longitudinal studies:** Tracking governance evolution
- **Intervention testing:** Measuring reform impacts

For International Organizations:

- **Better aid allocation:** Funding distributed capacity, not just central projects
- **Conflict prevention:** Addressing root governance architecture, not just symptoms
- **Climate adaptation:** Supporting bioregional rather than national-only approaches

Pattern Library for Best Practices (New in v2):

- Curated database of 200+ interventions, tagged by dimension, CAF level, and outcome
- Searchable: "Show cohesion mechanisms for high-D CAF nations"
- Community-contributed, peer-reviewed

---

8. Pilot Implementation Plan

Pilot Refinement Protocol (Enhanced in v2): Before Full Rollout: Rigorous Testing in 5 Archetypes

Pilot Nation	Role	Specific Test
Singapore	Low-CAF, High-Efficiency	Can GSI recognize legitimate centralization needs?
Switzerland	Medium-CAF, Federated	Baseline for successful distribution
India	High-CAF, Developing Federal	Testing CAF adjustments at scale
Rwanda	Post-Conflict, Centralizing	Transition pathway validation
Sweden	High-Trust, Overcentralized	Reform roadmap testing

Each Pilot Gets:

1. **Full GSI assessment** with all proxy metrics
2. **"Blind" citizen validation** (do scores match lived experience?)
3. **Policy response simulation** (if we act on findings, what changes?)
4. **Iterative refinement** of metrics based on local feedback

---

9. Potential Criticisms and Responses

Criticism	Response
"One-size-fits-all metric"	GSI has complexity adjustments and contextual adaptations
"Too quantitative for qualitative reality"	Balanced with participatory assessments, citizen panels
"Could be gamed by governments"	Civil society validation, transparency in data; anti-gaming protocols with triangulation and anomaly detection
"Ignores cultural differences"	Cultural dimension explicitly included in knowledge inclusion
"Another burdensome index"	Integrates with existing assessments, adds unique architecture focus
"Soft Data" Bias	Replaced subjective measures with objective proxies
"Singapore Trap"	Multi-dimensional complexity scoring with contextual targets

10. Governance & Legitimacy Enhancement

New Structure: The Global Subsidiarity Council

Composition (to ensure legitimacy):

- 30% National governments (rotating regional representation)
- 30% Local/municipal governments (direct experience)
- 20% Civil society & indigenous representatives
- 10% Academic/technical experts
- 10% Private sector (infrastructure providers)

Functions:

1. **Methodology stewardship** (regular updates based on evidence)
2. **Dispute resolution** (challenges to scores)
3. **Knowledge curation** (pattern library management)
4. **Capacity building** (helping nations improve)

Funding Model:

- Tiered membership fees (by GDP)

- Philanthropic support for civil society participation
- No single funder >20% to prevent capture

---

11. Phased Rollout with Built-In Learning

Phase 0: Foundation (2026)

- Finalize proxy metrics with academic partners
- Develop verification protocols
- Secure 5 pilot nation commitments

Phase 1: Alpha (2027)

- Pilot assessments with manual verification
- Initial dashboard prototype
- First "State of Global Subsidiarity" report

Phase 2: Beta (2028-2029)

- Expand to 30 nations
- Automated data collection where possible
- Begin integration with UN SDG reporting

Phase 3: Global (2030+)

- Full coverage (150+ nations)
- Real-time dashboard with quarterly updates
- Institutional integration (World Bank, IMF, UNDP)

---

12. Conclusion: Toward a Science of Governance Architecture

The Global Subsidiarity Index represents a paradigm shift in how we assess governance: **from evaluating policies and politicians to analyzing system architecture itself.**

Why this matters now:

1. **Polycrisis demands resilience** → Distributed systems are inherently more resilient
2. **Digital enables coordination without centralization** → New possibilities for governance
3. **Democratic legitimacy requires proximity** → Distant decisions breed distrust
4. **Complexity cannot be governed centrally** → Cybernetic law, not opinion

Sweden's unique contribution: By measuring our own centralization so meticulously, we provide the **proof of concept and methodology** for global application. The GSI transforms Sweden's national diagnosis into humanity's diagnostic toolkit.

Final vision: Within a decade, nations will report their **GSI score alongside GDP**, recognizing that governance architecture matters as much as economic output for wellbeing in an age of disruption.

Summary of Key Improvements (from v2):

1. **Hardened Metrics:** Replaced subjective measures with objective proxies
2. **Sophisticated CAF:** Multi-dimensional complexity scoring with contextual targets
3. **Added Cohesion Dimension:** Prevents fragmentation risks
4. **Anti-Gaming Protocols:** Triangulation, anomaly detection, citizen validation
5. **Enhanced Visualization:** Interactive, contextual, actionable dashboards
6. **Legitimate Governance:** Multi-stakeholder council structure
7. **Phased Validation:** Rigorous piloting before scale

Appendices (Available Separately)

1. **GSI Technical Manual** (detailed measurement protocols)
2. **Country Adaptation Guidelines** (context-specific frameworks)
3. **Digital Platform Specifications** (dashboard architecture)
4. **Pilot Nation Case Studies** (Sweden, Germany, Canada, Rwanda, South Korea)
5. **Research Validation Papers** (academic foundations)
6. **Implementation Roadmap**
7. **Training and Capacity Building Framework**
8. **Legal and Ethical Framework**

Next Steps:

1. Form international consortium to refine framework
2. Secure pilot nation commitments
3. Develop digital prototype
4. Launch at UN High-Level Political Forum 2027
5. Begin annual Global Subsidiarity Report

The Global Subsidiarity Index Framework is offered as a contribution to 21st-century governance innovation, developed from Swedish experience but designed for global application.