Innovation Platform Capital

2026

LEADERSHIP PERSPECTIVE

We Knew This Was Coming.

Most of Us Just Chose Not to Build for It.

On Compound Sovereignty, the Restructuring of Global Industry, and Why the Window to Matter Is Closing Faster Than Anyone Is Willing to Admit

AUTHORS

Gursharan (Gursh) S. Kundan
Managing Partner & Chairman, Global | Innovation Platform Capital

Pradeep (Deep) Karatgi
Managing Partner & CEO, Healthcare | Country Head, India & GCC | Innovation Platform Capital

ADDITIONAL AUTHORS Edsa Cabrera · Juraj Barus · James Eadie Colter

ADVISORS Claudia Kundan · Dominic Bruynseels

CONTRIBUTORS Jovan Phull · Angela Hanc

This perspective was developed by the leadership of Innovation Platform Capital (iPC), a Luxembourg-headquartered multi-vertical investment and platform development group with active platforms across green energy, digital infrastructure, healthcare, and sovereign manufacturing.

Abstract

The global industrial architecture constructed over the post-war decades, organised around the logic of sectoral specialisation, geographic concentration of production, and the primacy of efficiency over resilience, is undergoing a structural transformation whose depth and simultaneity distinguish it from the cyclical disruptions to which incumbent frameworks have historically adapted. This essay argues that the convergence now underway across energy transition, digital sovereignty, industrial manufacturing, and healthcare resilience does not represent four parallel and coincidentally contemporaneous challenges, but four expressions of a single underlying mechanism we term the Compounding Sovereignty Effect: the way in which a country's, or a platform's, sovereign capability in one domain becomes the foundation that makes sovereign capability in the next domain cheaper, faster, and more bankable to build, in a manner that compounds non-linearly over time rather than accumulating in a straight line.

We examine the technological, policy, and capital-market dimensions of this compounding effect, which together produce what we call Compound Sovereignty as an emergent condition; the gap between announcement and execution that continues to characterise each domain; the specific institutional capabilities required to operate at the platform level where the most significant value creation, and the most durable sovereign partnerships, are now being established; and the principal ways this thesis could prove wrong, addressed directly rather than dismissed. Where the evidence is incomplete or contested, we say so, because a thesis of this kind earns its credibility through the rigour of its qualifications as much as the force of its claims. The analysis concludes that the window in which foundational positions in this compounding system can be established at current entry terms is finite, and that the organisations, investors, and governments that engage before the consensus has formed will define the competitive and strategic landscape for the generation that follows.

Keywords: Compound Sovereignty; Compounding Sovereignty Effect; green hydrogen; digital sovereignty; industrial restructuring; sovereign infrastructure; platform capital; energy transition; development finance institutions; healthcare resilience

Introduction

There is a particular kind of conversation that tends to occur in rooms that do not make the news: in the offices of national think tanks working through what their countries' industrial futures actually look like, in the quiet sessions where development finance institutions are trying to reconcile mandates written for a different world with the opportunities now in front of them, in the project rooms where sovereign governments and private capital are negotiating frameworks whose implications will likely outlast the careers of everyone in the room. The authors of this essay have been sitting in versions of that conversation for years, across geographies as different as the Gulf, the industrial corridors of India, and the coastline of Canada, and what strikes us most is not the complexity of the problems being worked through, though the problems are genuinely complex, but how consistent the underlying recognition has become across contexts that would otherwise seem to have very little in common.

People working at the frontier of energy transition, digital sovereignty, industrial restructuring, and healthcare resilience are converging, independently and from very different starting points, on the same uncomfortable conclusion: the world they are trying to build requires a kind of integration, a willingness to hold multiple things at once and design across boundaries rather than within them, that the institutions and frameworks they inherited were specifically designed to prevent. We give this convergence a name in the pages that follow, the Compounding Sovereignty Effect, not because the phenomenon needs a label to be real, but because naming the mechanism precisely, rather than just describing its symptoms, is what allows it to be analysed, tested, and acted upon, rather than gestured at.

This essay is an attempt to describe that mechanism honestly, not as a market opportunity packaged for a roadshow, and not as an academic analysis of structural forces held at a comfortable distance, but as a genuine account of what is happening, why it has taken so long to become visible to the people who should have seen it earliest, where this argument is most exposed to being wrong, and what it actually demands of those who want to help build what comes next rather than arrive late to something that others have already shaped.

I. The World We Built, and the Costs We Agreed Not to Count

The industrial architecture of the twentieth century was not designed in any deliberate sense. It evolved through the accumulation of millions of individual decisions by companies, governments, and investors, each responding to the incentives and information available at the time, none bearing personal responsibility for the systemic vulnerabilities that their individually rational choices were quietly assembling into a structure the next century would find very expensive to inhabit. That is not an excuse for what was built. It is a description of how complex systems accumulate fragility without anyone choosing it, a process worth understanding because it is still happening, inside the institutions now meant to be responding to the reckoning that has arrived.

The logic of the post-war system was specialisation taken to its natural conclusion, sector by sector, decade by decade, until the walls between the domains of industrial life were as tall and as apparently permanent as they had ever been in history. Energy companies understood energy, and the suggestion that they might learn something from healthcare logistics or digital infrastructure would have seemed, not so long ago, somewhere between eccentric and professionally unwise. Healthcare companies understood medicine and the regulatory environments governing it, and the idea that the supply chain disciplines of manufacturing or the platform economics of technology might be relevant to them was, at best, a topic for consultants rather than a genuine strategic priority. Technology companies understood computation and the markets they served, and infrastructure was, in the dominant view of the era that produced the cloud computing revolution, simply a cost to be minimised and abstracted into a service. Governments largely accepted that their role was to set the framework and step back, that markets would allocate industrial capacity more efficiently than policy could, and that the resulting global supply chains, however concentrated and however dependent on uninterrupted international cooperation, were evidence of the system working rather than a vulnerability quietly being built.

For a long time, in many ways, this was true. Specialisation produced genuine expertise. Globalised supply chains produced genuine efficiency gains. The cost reductions in manufactured goods, medicines, energy, and digital services that the system generated were real, and they improved the lives of more people than almost any previous economic arrangement had managed. The people who designed and defended this system were not

wrong about what it could do within the conditions for which it was built. They were wrong about how permanent those conditions were, and about whether the risks they were accepting in exchange for efficiency would remain manageable indefinitely.

The warnings were not absent, and the slowness to act on them was not entirely innocent. Climate scientists had been clear about the consequences of fossil fuel dependency since at least the 1980s, and for four decades the system absorbed those warnings, produced studies and commitments and the occasional policy gesture, and largely continued as before, because the cost of changing was immediate and the cost of not changing appeared to belong to the future. Supply chain analysts had documented the risks of concentrating critical manufacturing in single geographies well before any pandemic made the consequences impossible to ignore, but the efficiency gains were real and measurable while the catastrophic scenarios remained probabilistic, so concentration deepened rather than diversified. Security researchers had warned about digital infrastructure dependency for years before geopolitical competition and the rise of artificial intelligence turned it into front-page politics, but the commercial case for centralised cloud infrastructure was compelling enough that governments accepted the dependency without fully reckoning with what they were trading away.

The people whose job it was to see these risks saw them and said so. The system heard them and kept building the same way, because the incentives for continuing remained stronger than the incentives for changing, right up until the point where the cost of not changing became impossible to absorb and expensive to explain.

II. The Compounding Sovereignty Effect

What is happening now is not the consequence of bad luck or an unfortunate coincidence of crises arriving together, though it can feel that way from inside any single one of them. It is the consequence of structural pressures that have been building for decades finally reaching the point where the systems designed to manage them are no longer adequate, alongside a recognition, sudden for some and painful for others, that the response required is not a repair of the existing structure but a redesign of it, and that the redesign must happen across domains the previous era treated as separate precisely because the fragility was never sector-specific. It was systemic.

We call the mechanism behind this redesign the Compounding Sovereignty Effect, and the condition it produces Compound Sovereignty. The core idea borrows, deliberately, from the logic of compound interest: a small advantage in one period becomes the base on which the next period's gain is calculated, so that the effect builds non-linearly rather than accumulating in a straight line. Sovereign capability works the same way across the domains this essay describes. A country, or a platform, that secures genuine energy sovereignty, reliable, domestically anchored, renewable power, does not just solve an energy problem. It lowers the cost and the risk of building sovereign digital infrastructure on top of that power, because reliable, owned energy is the single largest cost and risk variable in a data centre's economics. Sovereign digital infrastructure, once established, in turn lowers the cost and the risk of building sovereign industrial manufacturing, because the monitoring, logistics, and AI-driven optimisation that modern manufacturing increasingly depends on now has a domestic, trusted foundation to run on. And sovereign industrial capability, once established, becomes the foundation that makes sovereign healthcare manufacturing, the API plants, the diagnostics infrastructure, the cold chains, faster and cheaper to build, because the underlying industrial base, the skilled workforce, and the government relationships already exist.

Figure 1. The Compounding Sovereignty Effect: each domain becomes the financed, de-risked foundation for the next.

Each domain compounds into the next. That is the mechanism, not a metaphor for it. We use this term deliberately, rather than the more familiar language of convergence alone, because convergence describes an outcome, things ending up in the same place, while compounding describes the process that produces it, and it is the process, not just the outcome, that we believe institutional investors, governments, and multilateral bodies are currently underpricing. A framework that cannot be named precisely is difficult to fund, difficult to regulate, and difficult to hold accountable. What follows is an attempt to define this mechanism precisely enough that it can be tested, including against the possibility that we are wrong about it.

Understanding why the sectors are dissolving into one another, and compounding into each other in this way, matters because the instinct of most institutions, confronted with a systemic problem, is to respond within their existing structure: to fix the energy problem with energy policy, the healthcare problem with healthcare policy, the digital problem with technology regulation. That instinct reproduces the fragmentation rather than resolving it, and it forfeits the compounding effect entirely, because compounding only works when the gains from one

domain are deliberately reinvested into the next, not ring-fenced inside separate ministries and separate mandates. The reason working across boundaries is not merely strategically interesting but operationally necessary has to do with convergences at the level of technology, policy, and capital that are dissolving those boundaries from the inside, whether or not the institutions governing each domain are ready to acknowledge it.

II.1 Technological Compounding

At the technology level, the compounding effect is the most concrete and the most underappreciated. The engineering knowledge defining each sector under the deepest restructuring, energy, digital infrastructure, industrial manufacturing, healthcare, was genuinely distinct for most of the twentieth century, to the point where a specialist who had mastered one had little to offer the others and no particular incentive to try. What has changed over the past two decades is that a layer of enabling technologies, advanced power electronics, precision materials science, digital control systems, semiconductor-based sensing and logic, and the software platforms built on top of them, has matured from being expensive, specialised capabilities confined to the sectors that pioneered them into general-purpose tools that flow freely across every domain that requires them, which turns out to be all of them at once.

The power electronics governing a large-scale electrolyzer for green hydrogen production are close engineering relatives of the thermal management systems inside a hyperscale data centre. The materials science that drove the dramatic cost reductions in solar photovoltaics over the past decade is the same science advancing the battery chemistries that grid-scale storage requires and the structural composites that medical equipment depends on. The digital control platforms managing renewable energy grids share fundamental architecture with the systems managing pharmaceutical cold chains and hospital supply networks. These are not analogies built to support an argument. They are literal technological overlaps, and they are now visible in the way capital actually moves: the same engineering and project-finance teams inside the large infrastructure funds that built renewable power platforms over the last decade are, in 2026, the teams being redeployed to lead green hydrogen, sovereign data centre, and advanced manufacturing mandates, because the underlying technical diligence, much of it concerning power electronics, thermal systems, and grid interconnection, turns out to be largely the same discipline wearing a different label. This is the first compounding layer: capability built in one domain transfers, almost for free, into the next.

II.2 Policy Compounding

At the policy level, the compounding effect is equally striking, though it operates through a different mechanism. Governments pursuing energy transition, digital sovereignty, and healthcare manufacturing independence appear, from the outside, to be working on three separate problems with three separate ministerial portfolios and three separate lines in the national budget. But the underlying objective, observed directly in the strategic deliberations of governments across multiple geographies and political traditions, is singular and consistent: how does a country retain genuine operational autonomy in a world where the systems it depends on most critically are controlled by actors over whom it has no sovereign authority, and whose interests may not align with its own at the moments that matter.

A country that imports its primary energy, runs its financial and governmental systems on foreign-controlled digital infrastructure, and sources the medicines its population depends on from manufacturing clusters it cannot influence is not meaningfully sovereign in the ways that matter most when things go wrong. The governments that have arrived at this recognition, which by now is most of them, though by different routes and at different speeds, are not working on three separate problems. They are working on the same compounding problem from three angles, and the policy frameworks that will actually solve it are the ones built to reinvest the sovereignty gained in one domain into the next, rather than treating each domain's sovereignty as a separate, self-contained achievement.

II.3 Capital Compounding

At the level of capital, the change is the least dramatic in appearance and the most consequential in what it makes possible. The most sophisticated pools of long-horizon money, sovereign wealth funds with the mandate and time horizon to think in decades, development finance institutions built specifically to catalyse investment that commercial capital alone will not make, pension systems genuinely accountable for what the world looks like in thirty years because that is when their obligations come due, have been quietly rewriting the logic through which they evaluate large-scale investment. The shift moves from a framework asking whether a specific asset generates adequate risk-adjusted returns over its operating life, to a framework asking the more ambitious question of whether an integrated system of assets delivers the bundle of compounding strategic outcomes, energy security feeding industrial capacity feeding digital independence feeding healthcare resilience, that a sovereign government is willing to underwrite for thirty years because its population genuinely needs it.

This is not a hypothetical shift. The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank's own 2025 Partnerships Report and Corporate Strategy update describe the institution's objective in almost these exact terms, framing its mission explicitly around “building platforms, not just projects,”[1] and setting a target to double annual financing to USD 17 billion by 2030 while positioning private capital mobilisation as central rather than peripheral to its mandate. Abu Dhabi's Mubadala became the world's most active sovereign investor in 2024, deploying USD 29.2 billion across fifty-two transactions, a 67 percent increase on the prior year that pushed it past Saudi Arabia's Public Investment Fund and accounted for roughly 21 percent of the USD 136.1 billion deployed by sovereign wealth funds globally that year.[2] In one of the clearest illustrations of platform-level thinking applied to digital infrastructure specifically, a consortium backed by Abu Dhabi's MGX, the Kuwait Investment Authority, and Singapore's Temasek has been reported to be assembling a controlling position in Aligned Data Centers at a valuation in the region of USD 40 billion, treating data infrastructure not as a commercial real estate position but as a strategic national capability to be co-owned at sovereign scale.[3] The answer that this second, more integrated question produces opens a category of investment the first question cannot even formulate, and the investors who have learned to ask it are finding opportunities that their peers, still running the earlier framework, are not seeing at all. This is the third compounding layer, and the one in which the effect becomes visible as price: technology that transfers capability for free, policy that reinvests sovereignty across domains, and capital that has begun, unevenly but unmistakably, to value the compound rather than the parts.

III. What Is Actually Happening: The Story Behind the Announcements

There is something important to say before going further, because the temptation when writing about large structural shifts is to remain at the level of the shift itself, describing forces and direction and implication without making contact with the considerably messier reality of what it takes to turn those forces into infrastructure that actually operates. The distance between announcement and reality in the sectors discussed here is large, and the most honest account of it is that the distance is not primarily a technology gap, a capital gap, or even a policy gap, though it is all three to some degree. It is a capability gap: the specific, hard-won, largely unteachable ability to hold every piece of a complex sovereign infrastructure investment together at once and move them forward in the same direction. Understanding that gap matters

as much as understanding the opportunity sitting in the middle of it, and it is precisely the gap that determines whether the Compounding Sovereignty Effect actually compounds for a given platform, or stalls at its first domain.

III.1 Green Hydrogen: The Gap Between Vision and Molecule

The story of the energy transition told most often is one of extraordinary technological success: solar costs down by more than ninety percent in a decade, wind following a similar trajectory, electric vehicles moving from expensive novelty to mainstream product faster than almost any analyst predicted. That story is true and genuinely remarkable. What gets told less often, and matters more for anyone trying to see where the next two decades of energy investment lead, is that renewable electricity, for all its progress, cannot on its own decarbonise the parts of the global economy where the emissions problem is most structurally embedded and most resistant to the solutions that have worked so well in power generation and light transport.

Steel production, cement manufacturing, long-distance shipping, commercial aviation, and the fertiliser synthesis that underpins the agricultural systems feeding eight billion people together account for roughly a third of global greenhouse gas emissions, and what they share is a need for energy in forms that direct electrification cannot cost-effectively replace at industrial scale and reliability. For these industries, decarbonisation runs through a molecule: green hydrogen, and its derivative carriers, green ammonia and green methanol, which allow it to be moved across intercontinental distances and reconverted at its destination into the energy and chemical building blocks that hard-to-abate industries require.

What this means geographically deserves emphasis. Countries endowed with exceptional renewable resources, consistent high-irradiance solar, reliable wind, land at the scale competitive green hydrogen production requires, and coastlines capable of handling export infrastructure, are sitting on a structural cost advantage with no real historical precedent except the one petroleum geology gave the Arabian Peninsula in the middle of the last century. The east coast of Canada, the Gulf states, parts of South Asia, the coastal regions of the Middle East and North Africa, and select locations in South America and Australia are not merely interesting destinations for renewable investment. They are potentially the nodes around which the global green molecule trade system organises itself for the next fifty years, and, in the language introduced above, the foundational domain from which compounding sovereignty in digital, industrial, and healthcare infrastructure becomes possible.

A similar pattern is taking shape in the United Arab Emirates, where several green ammonia and green iron developments now under active study have been designed, from the first feasibility work onward, around solar generation capacity sized not just for hydrogen electrolysis but for the direct reduction of iron ore using that hydrogen, producing a decarbonised iron feedstock aimed squarely at export markets that are themselves moving toward carbon border adjustment regimes. What the comparative techno-economic work on these projects has found is that configurations pairing firmed, dispatchable renewable power with on-site iron reduction can reach commercial viability without ongoing government subsidy, which is a materially different proposition from the earlier generation of solar-only hydrogen projects that needed continuous public support simply to stay bankable. The specific economics here will keep moving, and should be read as a snapshot rather than a verdict, but the structural choice underneath them, designing the energy asset and the industrial offtake asset together rather than building the power plant first and looking for a use for it afterward, is the part of the example that actually bears on the argument made in this essay.

> *It is equally important, in the interest of intellectual honesty, to state plainly where this thesis still meets resistance from the numbers. India's own green hydrogen production currently costs between roughly USD 4.6 and 6.7 per kilogram, against grey hydrogen at USD 1.5 to 2.5 per kilogram, and as of February 2026 the country had commissioned only about 0.16 percent of its 2030 production target.[4] The geography of advantage is real, but the cost curve has not yet closed the gap that bankability requires, and any serious treatment of this opportunity has to hold both of those facts at once rather than letting the more flattering one stand alone. Where the foundational domain of the compound is not yet self-financing, the entire chain that depends on it is delayed, not just the domain itself.*

The gap between a compelling green hydrogen investment thesis and a green hydrogen project that is actually built, financed, and commissioned sits almost entirely in the domain of system integration rather than in the technology itself. The barrier is the complexity of anchoring large-scale electrolysis to a renewable power supply reliable enough for industrial offtakers, of connecting that production to creditworthy long-term buyers through contract structures that development finance institutions will commit senior debt to, of navigating land acquisition, environmental clearance, grid interconnection, and the regulatory timelines of sovereign governments managing their own institutional pressures, and of doing all of this while keeping a diverse set of equity investors, development finance partners, and sovereign counterparties

aligned around shared milestones and a shared understanding of risk. A further dimension of this integration challenge, increasingly central to the commercial logic of green hydrogen projects, is the industrialisation of hydrogen systems to up-value raw materials into inputs for steel, fertiliser, and cement production, anchoring domestic demand alongside export offtake in a way that meaningfully improves project-level economics. That capability bears no relationship to the volume of announcements being made about green hydrogen ambitions, and investors who have learned to evaluate organisations on that capability, rather than on the elegance of their presentations, occupy a categorically different position from those who have not.

III.2 Digital Sovereignty: The Reckoning That Commercial Logic Deferred

For the better part of two decades, decisions about where digital infrastructure was located and who operated it were treated as commercial questions with commercial answers. The argument was not unreasonable, and for a while it produced outcomes genuinely difficult to dispute. The democratisation of computational capability through cloud services was a real and significant achievement, built and maintained to standards that no domestic alternative in most countries could have matched at the time.

What it also produced was a world in which the financial systems, healthcare records, governmental communications, emerging artificial intelligence capabilities, and critical infrastructure dependencies of most major economies came to rest on compute and storage owned by a handful of companies incorporated in a single country, subject to that country's legal frameworks, and accessible under certain conditions to that country's intelligence services, all while the geopolitical relationship between that country and several other major powers moved in a direction that made the word dependency feel less like a neutral description and more like a vulnerability someone might eventually choose to exploit.

The policy responses are now well documented and dated. The European Commission published its Cloud Sovereignty Framework on 20 October 2025, defining eight sovereignty objectives, weighted from 5 to 20 percent each, and a five-tier Sovereignty Effectiveness Assurance Level scale that now governs how EU institutions procure cloud services; the Commission applied the framework for the first time in a EUR 180 million tender awarded in April 2026.[5] India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act, the Reserve Bank of India's localisation requirements for payment system data, and sector-specific localisation rules for banking, telecom, and insurance have built a layered domestic framework over the past several years.[6]

China's Personal Information Protection Law requires critical infrastructure operators to store personal data domestically and to pass security assessments before any cross-border transfer.[7] The details of these frameworks differ considerably, but the direction is the same: the infrastructure that a country's financial system, health system, government operations, and AI capability depend on increasingly needs to sit within sovereign territory, governed by domestic law, operated by entities the relevant government can hold accountable.

This pattern is visible in more than one geography, and it is the ordinariness of it, rather than any single dramatic case, that makes it worth describing. In parts of southern India, state-level planning around a renewable energy and green hydrogen corridor has, over the past two years, stopped treating power generation and hyperscale data centre development as separate proposals moving through separate regulatory tracks, and started treating them as a single planning exercise: the same land parcels, the same grid interconnection studies, and the same environmental clearance process serving both purposes at once, because the surplus generation that makes the hydrogen project viable is also what makes the adjacent data centre project viable, and a regulator who has already evaluated one has done most of the work needed to evaluate the other. A comparable logic is being applied independently in parts of the Gulf, where national cloud and AI infrastructure mandates are increasingly being sited deliberately alongside dedicated renewable generation and green industrial zones, rather than wherever land and power happen to be cheapest, precisely so that the sovereignty argument for the energy and the sovereignty argument for the data can be made, financed, and defended to the same set of stakeholders at once. Neither case is unique, and that is the point: once a government has internalised that energy independence and digital independence are the same underlying problem, co-locating the infrastructure that delivers both stops being a planning convenience and starts being the obvious way to build.

> *A hyperscale data centre co-located with domestic renewable energy, structured as the backbone of a national AI and financial-system resilience agenda, anchored by government-linked tenancy driven by sovereign necessity rather than commercial preference, is not merely a well-located real estate asset with a government tenant. It is an asset whose competitive position is protected by the fact that the government cannot afford to let it fail, and that protection carries an economic value that purely commercial valuation models consistently fail to capture. The further opportunity to co-locate such infrastructure with industrial manufacturing and power generation as a single sovereign objective is the Compounding Sovereignty Effect made physical: one piece of ground, three compounding layers of strategic value.*

III.3 Manufacturing: The Pandemic's Lasting Lesson

It would be unkind, and inaccurate, to describe the globalisation of manufacturing as a mistake. The efficiency gains it produced were real, the living standard improvements across the developing world were substantial, and the people who designed and defended it were working from a genuine theory of comparative advantage with strong empirical support. What is accurate is that the version of globalisation that actually developed, in which manufacturing concentration in the lowest-cost locations created single points of failure across multiple critical supply chains simultaneously, went considerably further than the comparative advantage argument required, into territory where the efficiency gains were real but the risk accumulation was systemic, and the decision to accept that risk was made implicitly, by no one in particular, and therefore by everyone collectively.

The lesson learned at the level of heads of government, finance ministers, and national security establishments, the level at which decisions that actually change industrial geography get made, was not the lesson the supply chain resilience literature had been recommending for years. It was simpler: a country without domestic manufacturing capability in the things it most critically needs is not, in any meaningful sense, industrially sovereign, and that sovereignty matters in ways the efficiency arguments of the previous era had taught policymakers to undervalue.

The scale of the response now underway is no longer abstract, even if the pace of delivery still lags the pace of announcement, sometimes considerably. More than USD 3 trillion in reshoring investment has been announced by firms across sectors since the start of 2025 alone, according to public company filings tracked through the US government's own reshoring disclosures, though that figure deserves scrutiny: an independent tracker compiled from verified SEC filings and company disclosures put the real total closer to USD 1.8 trillion as of June 2026, and separate analysis by Bloomberg Economics found that of a related, broader USD 9.6 trillion White House investment tally, only around USD 7 trillion represented what could reasonably be considered genuine investment pledges, a gap between announcement and verification that is itself evidence for, rather than against, the pattern this essay describes throughout. Kearney's own 2026 Reshoring Index, the thirteenth annual edition of the industry's most established benchmark, found the index still in negative territory as of its April 2026 release, with US manufacturing investment having roughly tripled over four years while domestic capacity grew by only 1.5 percent, a gap the report's authors describe candidly as a reality check rather than a trend reversal.[8] The semiconductor sector illustrates both the scale of the commitment and the difficulty of executing it: the United States has committed over USD 52 billion in direct federal incentives under the CHIPS and Science Act, attracting individual project commitments such as TSMC's USD 65 billion Arizona fab cluster and Micron's announced USD 200 billion domestic investment programme, a figure that itself includes roughly USD 120 billion first committed back in 2022 rather than entirely new investment, even as the same projects have run years behind their original timelines.[9] India's own semiconductor and critical mineral strategy follows the identical logic in a different register: Micron's USD 2.75 billion assembly and test facility in Gujarat, under construction since September 2023, opened and began commercial production in February 2026, the Bharat Semi compound semiconductor plant is scheduled for 2027, and India's National Critical Minerals Mission, launched in response to Chinese export restrictions on gallium, germanium, and antimony, set out to secure critical mineral supply chains through domestic exploration and international partnerships, though independent analysis suggests its stockpiling framework remains less developed than its exploration and partnership components.[10] Energy access has replaced labour cost as the primary locational driver for the most energy-intensive industries of the next era, electrolyzer manufacturing, battery production, green steel, green ammonia synthesis, because these industries depend so heavily on the cost and reliability of power supply that countries offering

renewable energy at scale and competitive cost hold a structural advantage no labour arbitrage can overcome in the long run, an advantage that, in compounding terms, only exists because the energy domain was secured first.

III.4 Healthcare: The Choices Behind the Vulnerability

The more complete version of the story of global pharmaceutical supply chains requires acknowledging that the concentration of active pharmaceutical ingredient manufacturing in a small number of geographic clusters was not an accident of market forces. It was the result of procurement decisions, regulatory frameworks, and investment priorities that consistently rewarded cost minimisation over supply chain resilience, year after year, in reasonably full awareness of the trade-off being made, because the scenario in which resilience would matter was probabilistic and the cost of building it was certain and immediate.

What the pandemic exposed was not theoretical. The United States Food and Drug Administration identified specific drugs, including the sedation drug midazolam, as being in active shortage due to COVID-related disruption, and flagged roughly twenty further drugs as vulnerable.[11] India, the source of a large share of the world's generic API supply, imposed export restrictions on active pharmaceutical ingredients early in the pandemic specifically because of the disruption, restrictions that rippled into over-the-counter and generic drug availability in multiple importing countries.[12] Independent research on pharmaceutical supply chain reliability has since documented average drug shortage durations of fourteen months, with some extending past three years, patterns that were already known before the pandemic and that the pandemic simply made impossible to ignore.[13] We do not claim a precise mortality figure attributable to these disruptions, because no rigorous, peer-reviewed estimate of that kind currently exists, and asserting one would be irresponsible. What can be said with confidence, and should be said plainly, is that patients who needed medicines could not always get them, healthcare systems that needed equipment could not always source it, and the diagnostic and treatment capacity that might have managed the outbreak more effectively was, in specific and documented instances, simply not available where it was most urgently needed. Naming this plainly is not an exercise in blame allocation. It is a recognition that the choices producing the vulnerability were made by real people operating within real incentive structures, and that the incentive structures were wrong.

The response now taking shape across India, the Gulf, Southeast Asia, and parts of Africa is architectural in a way earlier responses to pharmaceutical supply chain disruption were not, driven by the conviction of governments that they cannot afford to be in the same position again. Regionally integrated healthcare platforms, combining domestic API manufacturing with formulation and packaging capability, diagnostic infrastructure built for surge volumes, digital health systems providing the data and logistics management an integrated system requires, and the cold chain and last-mile distribution networks that make any of it functional at the point of care, are being developed as a category of sovereign infrastructure investment rather than as a commercial real estate play, and represent, in the framing of this essay, the domain in which the compound finally pays out in human terms rather than only in strategic or financial ones. The capital that understands this distinction is accessing returns and partnerships that the capital which does not understand it is passing by.

IV. Capital's Slowness, and the Cost of Being Last to Adjust

The hierarchy that has governed infrastructure investment for three decades, risk-free returns in developed sovereign bonds as the baseline, developed market infrastructure carrying a modest premium for illiquidity and complexity, emerging market infrastructure carrying an additional premium to compensate for assumed political and execution risk, was not constructed arbitrarily. It reflected genuine differences in institutional stability, regulatory predictability, and the depth of capital markets across geographies. What it cannot accommodate is the combination of two simultaneous shifts that together have made the old hierarchy a significantly misleading guide to where risk-adjusted value in infrastructure investing actually sits today: the compression of developed market infrastructure returns to levels that often no longer adequately compensate for the illiquidity and governance complexity they carry, and the genuine improvement in institutional frameworks, sovereign partnership structures, multilateral development finance mechanisms, and execution capability now available in the markets where sovereign infrastructure platforms are being built at scale with the kind of strategic backing that changes the actual risk profile of the investment relative to what the traditional premium assumes.

> *Several of the largest sovereign allocators have already adjusted their frameworks in ways that are publicly documented rather than merely asserted. Gulf sovereign wealth funds collectively deployed a record USD 82 billion in 2024, a ten percent increase year over year, with infrastructure, energy, and technology among the leading sector allocations.[14] Saudi Arabia's Public Investment Fund alone has directed the majority of its recent activity toward domestic infrastructure, even as its overall internationa*
> *l deal volume declined in 2024.[15] Across the sovereign wealth fund sector more broadly, co-investment alongside private equity sponsors has become an increasingly common transaction structure for the largest deals, a pattern that reflects the kind of platform-level, multi-party structuring this essay describes rather than the single-asset project finance of the previous era.[16] The traditional institutional capital of Western Europe and North America, the pension funds, insurance companies, and endowments, i*
> *s moving with more characteristic reluctance, constrained by internal incentive structures built to reward caution over foresight and by investment committees built to evaluate opportunities within categories that the most interesting opportunities of the current moment stubbornly refuse to fit.*

The window between genuine risk-adjusted opportunity and widely priced opportunity, the window that exists precisely because frameworks have not yet caught up to reality, is where the most consequential positions in any asset class are established, and it does not stay open indefinitely. The entry points available in sovereign infrastructure markets today will not be available once consensus among institutional allocators has formed, and consensus, as anyone who has watched it form in previous cycles knows, tends to arrive faster than the institutions that will constitute it expect. Structuring platform-scale sovereign infrastructure with staged liquidity points, partial refinancing at construction completion, partial at commercial operation, partial at scale, rather than the binary, single-exit logic of conventional project finance, is one practical way this gap is beginning to close, though the instruments to do this reliably at scale are still more often discussed than deployed, and the institutions that work out how to structure them will have solved a problem the rest of the market is still naming.

V. Why Seeing the Compound Changes Everything

Everything described so far could be read as five separate investment themes that happen to be emerging at the same time: green energy, digital sovereignty, industrial restructuring, healthcare resilience, and the reorientation of capital. The instinctive response of institutions trained on sector specialisation is to pick the theme that looks most attractive given their

mandate and existing analytical capability, and allocate accordingly. That is a reasonable response to the information as presented, but it misses the most important insight available to those working across all of these simultaneously rather than within any single one, which is precisely what the Compounding Sovereignty Effect is intended to capture as a single, coherent mechanism rather than five coincidental trends.

These themes are not parallel stories that happen to share a publication date. They are sequential compounding stages of a single system whose interdependencies are real, consequential, and generative of value at the platform level that no single component can capture alone. Renewable energy deployed at the scale required to make green hydrogen economically competitive generates surplus low-cost power that sovereign digital infrastructure needs in order to operate without competing against commercial users for grid capacity at peak times, and without the geopolitical exposure that comes from depending on energy imports controlled by suppliers with their own interests. Green hydrogen production at volumes relevant to decarbonising hard-to-abate industries generates the manufacturing demand, for electrolyzers, compression and storage equipment, handling infrastructure, that anchors a new generation of advanced industrial platforms in the geographies that produce it. Those manufacturing platforms, operating alongside the digital infrastructure that sovereign AI and data requirements are generating, create the supply chain complexity that integrated digital platforms are positioned to manage in ways fragmented point solutions cannot, and the healthcare platforms built atop all three inherit a foundation none of them could have built alone.

> *A platform built on Compound Sovereignty occupies a position qualitatively different from anything any single component can offer, and the difference is not simply about scale or diversification in the conventional investment sense. It is about how sovereign governments engage with entities delivering against their integrated, compounding strategic agenda rather than against any one piece of it, which is to say, as partners rather than as vendors.*

Building at this level of integration requires capabilities that are specific, demanding, and genuinely difficult to develop. Technical credibility across multiple engineering domains, not general familiarity but the ability to evaluate a technology partner's actual capability against their claimed capability, and to structure an offtake agreement or financing instrument that reflects technical reality rather than the optimistic case, is the price of entry for sovereign counterparties and development finance institutions that have been burned by technically

unsophisticated investors before. The relationship capital with sovereign governments that creates access to the most significant platform opportunities is a multi-year investment that cannot be shortcut by capital alone. And the operational discipline to close the gap between an investment narrative and a commissioned platform, in markets where land acquisition takes longer than the model assumed, where grid interconnection agreements require more iterations than the project plan allowed, and where regulatory approvals depend on relationships that take time to build and cannot simply be demanded, is built only by doing the work, at cost, repeatedly. None of this is abstract to us. Securing the land, the grid interconnection sequencing, and the state-level approvals for a single integrated green hydrogen and data infrastructure corridor in South Asia took longer, and required more iterations with more layers of government, than any financial model anticipated at the outset, and the lesson generalises well beyond that one project: the timeline that makes a platform investment look attractive on paper is rarely the timeline the platform actually requires to reach the point where the compound actually starts to work in its favour.

VI. What If We Are Wrong

A thesis that cannot be challenged is not a thesis. It is a slogan. The argument advanced in this essay rests on observable trends, but trends are not destinies, and intellectual honesty requires naming the specific ways the Compounding Sovereignty Effect could fail to hold, rather than offering only the version of events that supports it. We consider three here, because they are, in our judgement, the most serious.

VI.1 Green hydrogen never reaches cost parity

The first and most immediate risk is that green hydrogen simply does not get cheap enough, fast enough, to displace the incumbent grey hydrogen and fossil-derived alternatives at the scale this essay assumes. If the foundational domain of the compound never becomes self-financing, the entire chain that depends on it, digital, industrial, healthcare, is delayed or stalled with it. This is not a hypothetical concern. As Section III.1 makes clear, India's own green hydrogen costs remain two to three times higher than grey hydrogen as of early 2026, and commissioning against the country's 2030 target stands at a fraction of one percent. If electrolyzer costs plateau rather than continuing to fall, if renewable power prices rise rather than fall in the geographies that need them lowest, or if the long-term offtake agreements that make projects

bankable simply fail to materialise at scale, the entire green molecule thesis weakens substantially, and the compounding effect this essay describes loses its first and most load-bearing link.

Our reason for believing this risk, while real, is unlikely to be fatal to the thesis is that the cost trajectory of green hydrogen to date has followed, with a lag of roughly a decade, the same learning-curve dynamics that drove solar photovoltaic costs down by more than ninety percent. That precedent is not a guarantee. But it is evidence that capital-intensive energy technologies with strong policy backing and growing manufacturing scale have, in the recent past, defied conservative cost projections rather than confirmed them, and the same policy backing, in the form of carbon border mechanisms and national hydrogen missions, is now in place for green hydrogen in a way it was not in place for solar a decade earlier in its own cost curve.

VI.2 Artificial intelligence compute centralises rather than sovereignises

The second risk runs directly against the digital sovereignty argument in Section III.2, and against the second link in the compound. It is possible, and arguably already visible in parts of the market, that the economics of frontier AI compute favour ever-greater centralisation in a small number of hyperscale providers rather than the distributed, sovereign-controlled infrastructure this essay describes. If the capital intensity, the chip supply concentration, and the specialised talent required to operate frontier AI infrastructure continue to favour a handful of dominant global providers, sovereign digital infrastructure investments risk becoming a second tier of capacity, useful for data residency and basic compliance, but strategically peripheral to where the most consequential AI capability actually resides, and disconnected from the compounding effect that energy sovereignty was supposed to feed into.

This is a genuine tension, and we do not think it is fully resolved by the evidence available today. What can be said is that the policy direction of every major government discussed in this essay, the EU's Cloud Sovereignty Framework, India's localisation regime, the Gulf states' national cloud mandates, points toward governments treating this risk as unacceptable rather than accepting it as inevitable, and committing real capital and regulatory power to prevent it. Whether that political will translates into infrastructure that is genuinely competitive at the frontier, rather than merely sovereign and second-best, is the central open question of digital

sovereignty policy over the next five years, and the Compounding Sovereignty Effect, as a thesis, depends in part on governments succeeding at a task whose difficulty should not be understated.

VI.3 Governments revert to globalisation once supply chains stabilise

The third risk is the most structurally important, because it questions whether the entire premise of this essay reflects a durable shift or a temporary, crisis-driven overcorrection that will fade as memories of pandemic-era shortages recede and the next generation of policymakers, facing fiscal pressure and the genuine cost advantages of concentrated production, reverts toward the efficiency-first globalisation of the previous era. There is real precedent for this pattern; supply chain resilience commitments made in the aftermath of previous shocks have, historically, often eroded once the acute crisis passed and budget pressure reasserted itself. If governments lose the political will to keep reinvesting sovereignty gains from one domain into the next, the compound simply stops compounding, and reverts to four disconnected, individually rational, individually mediocre policy programmes.

Kearney's own 2026 Reshoring Index, cited earlier in this essay, is itself evidence that this risk is not merely theoretical: despite record reshoring investment announcements and a tripling of US manufacturing capital expenditure over four years, the index remained in negative territory in 2026, with imports from low-cost manufacturing regions still rising faster than domestic capacity. This is, on its face, uncomfortable evidence for our own thesis, and we present it because a framework that only cites evidence in its favour is not a serious one. Our judgement, however, is that the gap Kearney identifies is a gap in execution and capacity build-out timing, not a reversal of underlying intent, and that the structural drivers, energy security, AI compute sovereignty, and pandemic-era healthcare vulnerability, are more deeply embedded in the strategic calculus of governments than the trade policy shocks of previous decades were. That judgement could prove wrong. We hold it because the alternative, dismissing inconvenient data rather than engaging with it, would make this essay considerably less useful to the people who actually have to decide where to put capital.

VII. What Honest Engagement with This Moment Looks Like

The temptation, closing a piece of this kind, is to offer recommendations ambitious enough in framing and diplomatic enough in detail that no reader feels genuinely challenged. We would rather resist that and describe, as plainly as the evidence allows, what this moment asks of the actors with the most influence over whether this compound actually compounds, or stalls.

VII.1 For Institutional Investors

For many institutional investors, the limiting factor is not identifying which sector or geography looks most interesting; the analytical work on that question is, at this point, reasonably mature. The more material question is whether the organisational and mandate structures within which capital is managed are capable of deploying it into opportunities that do not fit the categories those structures were designed to evaluate, and capable of recognising compounding value across domains rather than only the standalone value of each one. The most consequential infrastructure investments of the next decade will arrive as integrated sovereign platforms with complex multi-stakeholder structures, multi-decade time horizons, and strategic value to governments that does not show up in any conventional valuation model. Investors who build the capability to evaluate that value properly, or who find and structure their involvement through partners who already have it, are likely to establish positions in an asset class that the evidence suggests will become considerably more competitive, and more expensive to enter, within five years.

VII.2 For Governments and Policy Institutions

Coordination is the principal constraint here, and the single biggest threat to the compounding effect this essay describes: coordination across institutional boundaries that have been maintained for decades and are defended, with understandable tenacity, by people whose careers and institutional identities are organised around them. Energy security, digital sovereignty, industrial resilience, and healthcare autonomy are not four separate problems to be solved by four separate ministries on four separate timelines and assembled afterward into national capability through the hope of interministerial coordination. They are four sequential stages of Compound Sovereignty, and the governments that structure their engagement with private capital, multilateral finance, and international technology partners around that

integrated, compounding reality, rather than the fragmented institutional map that has historically governed each piece of it, appear, on the evidence reviewed here, to attract a different quality and scale of partnership than piecemeal engagement does.

VII.3 For Development Finance Institutions

The challenge documented in this essay runs deeper than whether to engage with sovereign platform investments. The project finance instruments, sector-specific mandates, and risk frameworks of the previous era were built for a world of discrete, categorisable assets evaluated within a single sectoral lens and financed through a single instrument type. The evidence suggests they are poorly suited to the integrated, compounding platforms this moment is generating, not because the people running these institutions lack creativity or commitment, but because the institutional constraints within which they operate reflect the world for which they were designed rather than the world they now find themselves in. AIIB's own move toward platform-level financing, its explicit doubling of annual lending targets, and its growing portfolio of blended and innovative finance instruments suggest that this institutional adaptation is already underway in parts of the system, even if unevenly.[17] The institutions that build on this and develop genuine flexibility in mandate, instrument design, and risk framework are positioned to play a defining role in the infrastructure formation of the next era.

VII.4 For Those Actually Doing the Building

The window for establishing foundational positions in the infrastructure of the next era is finite, and narrowing, in ways that are easy to underestimate from inside the process of building, where every project tends to take longer than planned and every relationship takes longer to develop than the timeline demands. The cost curves that make green industrial platforms viable are moving along a trajectory that reduces first-mover advantage at each successive entry point. The policy frameworks underpinning sovereign digital and healthcare infrastructure are solidifying around organisations already engaged, creating barriers for late arrivals that are relational and reputational as much as financial. The sovereign partnerships that underpin bankability in large platform investments are being formed in this cycle, and the trust and track record that make those partnerships available are built over years of showing up, delivering, and absorbing the cost of the relationship during the periods before the compound starts to pay out. What gets built in the next three to five years is likely to define the competitive positions that shape this industry for the generation that follows.

Conclusion

Looking back at the major transitions in industrial history, the electrification of manufacturing in the early twentieth century, the build-out of global telecommunications networks in the decades after the war, the emergence of the internet and the platform economy that grew from it, what is most striking in retrospect is not how obvious the transitions were but how unevenly their implications were distributed among the actors present at the time. In every case, the positions that turned out to matter most, the ones that defined competitive landscapes for decades, were established by a relatively small number of actors who engaged before the transition was legible to mainstream capital markets, before analytical frameworks had been updated to accommodate it, and before competition for the best positions had driven prices anywhere near their eventual strategic value.

The Compounding Sovereignty Effect described in this essay is, on the evidence reviewed here, visible with unusual clarity for something still in its early stages, because the forces driving it are structural rather than speculative, and the evidence is accumulating across enough geographies and domains simultaneously that no single piece of it can be dismissed as a regional phenomenon or a temporary dislocation. We have tried, in Section VI, to be equally clear about where this argument is most exposed, and we do not think intellectual honesty and conviction are in tension here; if anything, naming the risks precisely is what gives the underlying thesis whatever durability it has.

We did not arrive at this framework as outside observers. Across the platforms iPC has built, in green hydrogen and integrated data infrastructure in South Asia, in green iron and ammonia in the Gulf, in regional healthcare manufacturing, the sequence described in this essay, energy sovereignty enabling digital sovereignty enabling industrial sovereignty enabling healthcare resilience, was not a theory we applied afterward. It was the order in which these platforms had to be built, because each one was, in practice, financed and de-risked by the sovereignty already secured in the one before it. Naming the Compounding Sovereignty Effect, in that sense, is less an act of forecasting than an act of description of the path we and others were already on, written down precisely enough that it can now be examined, tested, and, where it is wrong, corrected.

The infrastructure of the next fifty years is being designed in the decisions being made now, in the actual commitments of land, capital, relationships, and institutional credibility, not in the announcements that accompany them. We have offered our reading of where the evidence

points. Readers will, and should, reach their own conclusions about whether Compound Sovereignty is the right way to understand what is happening, and about where, in Section VI, we may ourselves be wrong.

Citations and Sources

References are listed in order of first appearance in the text. Primary institutional and governmental sources are cited directly with links; figures drawn from aggregated industry or press reporting are marked accordingly. All sources reflect publicly available information as of June 2026.

1. Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, "Building Connectivity, Creating Solutions: How Partnerships and Smart Finance Can Meet Asia's Infrastructure Needs," 2025 Partnerships Report; see also AIIB, "AIIB Unveils Updated Growth-Focused Strategy to Tackle Global Challenges," 2025.

2. Global SWF, 2024 Annual Report on sovereign wealth fund activity, as reported in The National, "Mubadala Emerges as Top Global Sovereign Investor in 2024," 1 January 2025, and corroborating coverage in Semafor and Khaleej Times, January 2025.

3. Press reporting on the AI Infrastructure Partnership (MGX, Kuwait Investment Authority, Temasek) and its reported acquisition of a controlling stake in Aligned Data Centers, financial press coverage, 2025–2026. This transaction is reported but not yet confirmed by all parties at the time of writing.

4. Industry and government reporting on India's green hydrogen production costs and National Green Hydrogen Mission commissioning progress, as of February 2026.

5. European Commission, Cloud Sovereignty Framework, Version 1.2.1, October 2025; European Commission, "Commission Advances Cloud Sovereignty Through Strategic Procurement," 17 April 2026.

6. Government of India, Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023; Reserve Bank of India, payment system data localisation requirements and related sectoral rules for banking, telecom, and insurance.

7. People's Republic of China, Personal Information Protection Law, cross-border data transfer and critical infrastructure provisions.

8. Kearney, The Kearney 2026 Reshoring Index: Why US Manufacturing Imports Hit a Four-Year High Despite Record Investment and Tariffs, 13th edition, April 2026; White House reshoring investment tracker, 2025–2026; for independent verification of headline reshoring figures, see IndustrialSage, "US Manufacturing Investment Tracker," June 2026, and Bloomberg, "Trump's $21 Trillion Investment Boom Is Actually Short Trillions," November 2025.

9. US CHIPS and Science Act federal funding disclosures; TSMC Arizona investment announcements; Micron Technology domestic semiconductor investment announcements; CSIS, "Can Semiconductor Reshoring Prime a U.S. Manufacturing Renaissance?" 2025.

10. Micron Technology and Government of India joint facility disclosures; Computer Weekly, "Micron Opens $2.75bn Chip Assembly Plant in India," March 2026; Bharat Semi and US Space Force project announcements, 2024–2025; India National Critical Minerals Mission disclosures; IEEFA, "Building Critical Mineral Stockpiles: A Key Priority for India," 2026.

11. US Food and Drug Administration, COVID-19–related drug shortage disclosures, including midazolam and related vulnerable drug list, as reported in pharmaceutical industry press, 2020–2022.

12. Reporting on India's API export restrictions during the early COVID-19 pandemic and downstream effects on generic and over-the-counter drug availability, Pharmaceutical Technology and related industry press, 2020.

13. Published research on pharmaceutical supply chain reliability and average drug shortage duration, including academic analyses of API supply chain disruption, 2020–2025.

14. Global SWF, 2024 Annual Report on Gulf sovereign wealth fund deployment, as reported in Economy Middle East and related Gulf business press, January 2025.

15. Public Investment Fund disclosures and related coverage on shifting allocation toward domestic infrastructure, 2024–2025.

16. Industry analysis of sovereign wealth fund co-investment transaction structures, 2025, drawing on aggregated deal data from sovereign wealth fund tracking services.

17. Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, AIIB Corporate Strategy, 2025 update, and associated disclosures on blended and innovative finance instruments.

For partnership discussions related to industrial platforms, digital infrastructure, clean energy, or sovereign capacity formation, contact IPC at contact@ipccorp.com ↗.

#CompoundSovereignty | ipccorp.com