



From Normative Vision to Governed Measurement: UCTA Model II's 560-Indicator Architecture for Islamic Civilizational Renewal

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian*,

1. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), s14110213@gmail.com

Abstract

Islamic civilizational-renewal scholarship offers normatively rich accounts of worldview, justice, maqāsid, and institutional reform, but provides limited guidance for translating these commitments into auditable measurement and revisable public decisions. This study asks how Islamic civilizational renewal can be operationalized as a scripturally grounded, non-reductive, and governable indicator architecture. Using conceptual design science, it develops and structurally evaluates UCTA Model II; the unit of analysis is the indicator architecture rather than a country, institution, population, or sacred text. The design corpus comprises the registered UCTA lineage, a controlled indicator catalogue, a scriptural–axiological grounding protocol, civilizational design notes, and methodological controls from performance measurement, composite-indicator construction, early warning, validation, and measurement ethics. The resulting artifact specifies five meta-pillars, fourteen strategic dimensions, 280 operational key performance indicators, 140 strategic progress indicators, and 140 crisis warning indicators. The 560-item candidate library separates present performance, sustained strategic trajectory, and emerging fragility; distinguishes 518 non-composite measures from 42 derived composites; and establishes controlled coding, source-to-construct traceability, no-double-counting rules, and non-compensatory red lines for severe failures in dignity, justice, trust, peace, theological integrity, evidence integrity, and data governance. Theoretically, the study reframes civilizational measurement as a governed translation problem linking normative grounding, construct specification, institutional capability, observation, and corrective action. Practically, it provides a role-based architecture for bounded pilots connecting indicators to owners, data lineage, review cadence, and response rules. UCTA Model II remains structurally specified but empirically unvalidated; expert review, feasibility testing, institutional pilots, contextual calibration, sensitivity analysis, invariance assessment, and longitudinal validation remain necessary.

Keywords: Islamic civilizational renewal; design science research; performance measurement; strategic progress indicators; crisis warning indicators; maqasid al-shariah; measurement governance



1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Islamic civilizational renewal concerns more than cultural remembrance, political aspiration, or institutional expansion. It concerns the translation of a normative worldview into knowledge systems, law, public ethics, organizations, economic arrangements, technologies, and durable patterns of collective action. Ibn Khaldun's account of *'umrān* placed social organization, authority, solidarity, economy, and historical transformation at the centre of civilizational analysis [1]. Al-Attas interpreted the modern Muslim predicament partly as a disordering of knowledge and *adab*, while al-Faruqi and AbuSulayman framed renewal as a disciplined reconstruction of knowledge rather than the superficial attachment of religious terminology to inherited disciplines [2,3]. These perspectives imply that civilizational renewal requires an architecture linking worldview, knowledge, institutions, action, and learning.

Maqāsid-oriented scholarship strengthens this translational requirement by directing legal and policy reasoning toward purpose, welfare, justice, human development, and systemic interdependence. Auda's systems approach emphasizes multidimensionality, openness, hierarchy, interrelation, and purposefulness [4]. Chapra connects development to moral agency, institutional reform, distributive justice, and human well-being rather than material expansion alone [5]. Kamali similarly treats maqāsid and *ijtihād* as methodological resources for civilizational renewal [6]. In this article, Islamic civilizational renewal denotes the long-horizon transformation of epistemic, theological, cultural, institutional, economic, environmental, and technological capacities in accordance with explicitly stated normative and ethical boundaries.

The Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture (UCTA) was initially formulated as a goal architecture specifying five meta-pillars and fourteen strategic domains [7]. Subsequent work distinguished a performance architecture for measurable rapprochement and civilizational renewal and developed related models for theological convergence, intra-Islamic dialogue, and multidimensional *Taqrīb* governance [8-11]. This research lineage clarified important domains and processes, but it did not yet provide a fully separated architecture for present operational performance, cumulative strategic progress, and emerging crisis exposure.

The primary theoretical lens of the study is Design Science Research, which treats UCTA Model II as a purposeful artifact constructed to address a defined governance problem [12-15]. Systems thinking provides a supporting account of interdependence, feedback, delay, resilience, and unintended consequences [16]. The critical rival lens is the sociology and governance of quantification, which questions the assumption that indicators merely represent reality rather than actively shaping categories, incentives, visibility, and authority. Performance-management and composite-indicator scholarship demonstrates the strategic value of disciplined measurement while warning that measures require theoretical justification, ownership, data controls, robustness testing, and adaptation [17-19]. Critical



indicator scholarship further shows that quantification can restructure social relations, establish contested forms of comparability, and simplify complex moral realities [20-22].

Institutional decision environments are becoming increasingly data-intensive, AI-mediated, and dependent on composite assessments and early-warning systems; this simultaneously increases demand for auditable measurement and the risk that poorly governed metrics distort institutional priorities, conceal uncertainty, or normalize harmful forms of comparison [18-24].

1.2 Statement of Problem

The central research problem is the absence of an integrated and non-reductive decision architecture capable of translating Islamic civilizational aims into measurable institutional manifestations without converting revelation, metaphysical truth, faith, sanctity, or human worth into numerical variables. Normative concepts such as justice, dignity, trust, stewardship, responsible freedom, wisdom, solidarity, and moral courage are consequential for governance, but they cannot be operationalized responsibly through undefined scores or undifferentiated indicator lists.

The opposite problem is equally significant. When civilizational discourse remains exclusively aspirational, institutions lack explicit constructs, operational boundaries, data responsibilities, review cycles, warning thresholds, and corrective-action mechanisms. Universities, religious institutions, civil-society organizations, waqf bodies, public agencies, and transnational organizations may consequently undertake activities without knowing whether current performance is adequate, strategic transformation is occurring, or systemic fragility is increasing.

UCTA Model II addresses this problem by distinguishing three decision functions. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) assess current operational performance, capability, process quality, outputs, and immediate outcomes. Strategic Progress Indicators (SPIs) assess sustained, multi-period advancement toward civilizational objectives. Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs) identify deterioration, risk acceleration, systemic fragility, or threshold breach before crisis manifestation. The proposed design contains 280 KPIs, 140 SPIs, and 140 CWIs across fourteen strategic dimensions. It also distinguishes 518 non-composite candidates from 42 derived composites and prohibits derived indices from being reintroduced into their own input structures.

The conceptual proposition is: normative source grounding → construct specification → institutional capability → operational performance, strategic trajectory, and crisis exposure → governed response and learning.

This relationship is conditioned by data quality, contextual comparability, source traceability, ownership, interpretive plurality, and non-compensatory ethical safeguards. It is presented as a design proposition rather than a statistically established causal model.



1.3 Research Gap

The relevant literatures resolve separate components of this problem but do not fully integrate them. Islamic civilizational and maqāṣid scholarship provides normative direction and accounts of knowledge, justice, welfare, and renewal [1-6]. Design-science scholarship explains how purposeful artifacts can be constructed, evaluated, and positioned as knowledge contributions [12-15]. Systems and performance-measurement research addresses feedback, strategic alignment, ownership, aggregation, and adaptation [16-19]. Critical quantification scholarship exposes the constitutive and political effects of indicators [20-22], while early-warning and AI-governance frameworks distinguish monitoring from preparedness, response, and risk control [23,24].

The decisive gap is therefore not simply that “few studies” have measured Islamic civilization. The deeper tension is that normatively rich civilizational models often remain operationally indeterminate, whereas technically precise measurement systems may remain normatively thin, compensatory, and reductionist. No component literature by itself specifies how theological and axiological orientation can be connected to a version-controlled, three-layer indicator system with differentiated decision uses, source-to-construct traceability, no-double-counting rules, red-line safeguards, contextual comparability controls, and an explicit validation pathway.

A second gap concerns measurement-category error. Operational performance, long-term transformation, and crisis exposure are frequently represented through the same scorecard logic. This obscures whether an institution is performing routine activities, achieving sustained structural progress, or approaching a critical failure. UCTA Model II addresses this gap by treating KPI, SPI, and CWI as related but analytically distinct libraries rather than interchangeable labels.

1.4 Research Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of the study is to develop and delimit UCTA Model II as a scripturally grounded, non-reductive, and governable design-science architecture for Islamic civilizational renewal. The study specifies the artifact’s construct hierarchy, indicator layers, coding logic, aggregation safeguards, claim boundaries, and validation requirements.

PRQ. How can Islamic civilizational renewal be operationalized as a scripturally grounded, non-reductive, and governable three-layer indicator architecture integrating operational performance, strategic progress, and crisis warning across theological, cultural, governance, economic, environmental, and technological domains?

SRQ1. What scriptural–axiological foundations, meta-pillars, and strategic dimensions are required to define a coherent and governable target state?

SRQ2. How should KPIs, SPIs, and CWIs be differentiated, coded, linked, and governed to prevent duplication, category error, and false claims of measurement independence?



SRQ3. What aggregation rules can distinguish non-composite indicators from derived composites and prevent critical red-line failures from being concealed?

SRQ4. How can definitions, units of analysis, ownership, cadence, data lineage, targets, and thresholds be standardized without imposing false universal comparability?

SRQ5. What validation sequence is required before UCTA Model II can support institutional decision-making, policy evaluation, or cross-context benchmarking?

1.5 Significance and Contributions

The theoretical significance of the study lies in repositioning civilizational measurement as a governed translation problem rather than a purely technical exercise. Normative sources do not directly produce indicators; they inform construct boundaries, ethical constraints, institutional purposes, and prohibited interpretations. Measurement then addresses observable capacities, practices, processes, outcomes, trajectories, and risks.

Methodologically, the study advances a three-layer architecture that separates current performance from strategic transformation and crisis exposure. This distinction is testable through subsequent expert review, data-feasibility assessment, pilot implementation, and analysis of whether the three layers generate non-redundant decision information.

For governance practice, the architecture links each measurement function to a different type of action: KPIs to operational correction, SPIs to strategic milestones and resource decisions, and CWIs to escalation and crisis-response playbooks. The theory–practice bridge therefore lies in enabling decision-makers to determine not only whether an institution is performing, but also whether it is advancing toward a civilizational objective and whether emerging conditions threaten that trajectory.

1.6 Scope and Boundary Conditions

The study is conceptual and design-science oriented. Its unit of analysis is the architecture through which institutions, programmes, communities, jurisdictions, and transnational systems may organize civilizational objectives and measurement responsibilities. It is not restricted to a single country or institutional sector, but its applicability across Muslim contexts remains an empirical question. The study does not estimate effects, establish causal relationships, validate universal thresholds, rank countries or religious communities, or claim institutional endorsement.

The technological scope includes AI governance, data quality, privacy, cybersecurity, public communication, and digital institutional capability where these are already represented in the UCTA architecture. The study does not claim that scriptural sources directly describe contemporary technologies; rather, source-grounded principles delimit such constructs as verification, justice, accountability, privacy, non-harm, and stewardship.

This paper contributes by (1) specifying a checkable five-meta-pillar and fourteen-dimension construct architecture; (2) separating 280 operational KPIs, 140 SPIs, and 140 CWIs into



distinct decision functions; (3) establishing auditable no-double-counting, red-line, source-traceability, and non-reduction rules; and (4) defining the empirical conditions that must be satisfied before the artifact can support comparative evaluation, institutional deployment, or claims of broader validity.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Search and Selection Logic

This study uses an integrative, theory-building review rather than a systematic or meta-analytic review. Its purpose is to connect bodies of scholarship that address different components of the same design problem: Islamic civilizational renewal, maqāṣid-based governance, artifact development, systems interdependence, performance measurement, composite-index construction, critical quantification, early-warning governance, AI risk management, and measurement validation. The evidence base was limited to English-language books, peer-reviewed articles, established methodological works, authoritative technical guidance, and the registered UCTA research lineage contained in the study corpus.

Sources were included when they contributed directly to at least one of five functions: defining civilizational renewal; explaining the translation of normative purposes into institutions; specifying principles of artifact design; identifying measurement and aggregation controls; or defining validation, warning, and ethical-governance requirements. Sources concerned only with isolated sectoral metrics, unsupported civilizational rankings, or empirical claims not relevant to the architecture were excluded. Non-peer-reviewed institutional reports were retained only where they provide recognized methodological or governance standards, particularly for composite indicators, early-warning systems, and artificial-intelligence risk management [19,23,24]. The registered UCTA works [7-11] are used to establish model genealogy rather than as independent evidence of empirical validity.

2.2 Theoretical Background: Foundation and Rival Lenses

Design Science Research (DSR) is the primary theoretical and methodological lens because UCTA Model II is intended as a purposeful artifact rather than a descriptive theory of existing institutions. DSR defines research relevance through a consequential problem, design through a viable artifact, rigor through justified knowledge inputs, and contribution through demonstration and evaluation [12-15]. For this study, the principal DSR prediction is that an operationally indeterminate normative vision can be made more governable through an explicitly bounded architecture of constructs, indicators, decision rules, and validation requirements. DSR does not, however, permit artifact construction to be treated as evidence of effectiveness; empirical legitimacy depends on subsequent demonstration, evaluation, and revision.

Systems thinking complements DSR by treating civilizational capacity as an interdependent configuration rather than a collection of independent domains. Feedback, delay, cross-domain effects, path dependence, and unintended consequences imply that improving one subsystem may destabilize another [16]. This lens supports the separation of operational performance,



strategic trajectory, and crisis exposure, while cautioning against linear causal claims and domain-by-domain optimization.

The principal rival lens is the sociology of quantification. This perspective argues that indicators do not merely describe social reality; they create categories, commensurability, visibility, authority, and incentives [20-22]. It explains why measurement may simplify plural theological meanings, privilege easily counted outputs, and transform provisional proxies into institutional truths. Its explanatory advantage lies in diagnosing power, classification, and reduction. Its limitation is that critique alone does not provide a constructive architecture for accountable institutional learning. Conversely, DSR explains how an artifact can be built but may understate the political and moral effects of measurement. UCTA therefore combines constructive design with critical quantification: indicators are treated as revisable governance instruments, not neutral representations.

2.3 Conceptual Domain Map

Islamic civilizational renewal has been variously framed as social organization and historical transformation, restoration of an integrated worldview and *adab*, reconstruction of knowledge, and realization of maqāṣid through justice, welfare, and human development [1-6]. The present study defines it theoretically as long-horizon transformation guided by an Islamic normative horizon and operationally as observable changes in institutional capability, policy, knowledge, social relations, economic stewardship, environmental responsibility, and technological governance. Its level of analysis ranges from programmes and institutions to jurisdictions and transnational systems. It does not denote the numerical measurement of faith or civilizational superiority.

Scriptural–axiological grounding denotes the disciplined translation of normative sources into construct boundaries, ethical purposes, and prohibited interpretations. Empirically, it requires source-to-construct traceability rather than treating scriptural passages as direct formulas. Its boundary condition is non-reduction: revelation, sanctity, metaphysical truth, spiritual merit, and intrinsic human worth remain outside scoring.

Institutional capability refers to the organized ability to convert objectives into sustained practice through people, rules, knowledge, resources, technologies, and accountability. Operationally, it is manifested in capacities such as qualified personnel, functioning governance processes, data stewardship, programme continuity, and corrective-action authority. Capability is an enabling condition, not equivalent to final impact.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) represent present operational performance, process quality, capability, outputs, or immediate outcomes. Their unit of analysis may be a programme, institution, event, community, or jurisdiction. KPIs are bounded by controllability and decision relevance; they should not be interpreted automatically as evidence of strategic transformation.



Strategic Progress Indicators (SPIs) represent sustained movement toward a defined target state across multiple periods. Their operational meaning lies in trajectory, institutionalization, milestone attainment, or capability consolidation. A positive activity count is not an SPI unless it demonstrates durable advancement.

Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs) represent emerging deterioration, fragility, risk acceleration, or threshold breach. Their purpose is anticipatory governance rather than retrospective performance assessment. Their validity depends on warning lead time, corroborating evidence, false-positive control, and an associated response rule.

Derived composites combine multiple non-composite indicators into a dimension-level summary. They are reporting outputs rather than independent observations. Their boundary conditions include theoretical justification, explicit normalization and weighting, no double counting, sensitivity analysis, and non-compensatory red-line constraints [19].

Measurement governance comprises the definitions, ownership, data lineage, access controls, cadence, thresholds, contestability, aggregation rules, and revision procedures that make indicators decision-worthy. It operates across all levels of analysis and is required because a technically correct measure can still be ethically inappropriate or institutionally harmful.

2.4 Critical Synthesis by Themes and Mechanisms

Normative purpose and institutional translation

Islamic civilizational scholarship strongly supports the proposition that renewal cannot be reduced to material development. *‘Umrān*, integrated knowledge, *adab*, maqāsid, justice, moral agency, welfare, and institutional reform all connect ethical purpose to social organization [1-6]. The consensus is strongest at the level of normative orientation. Evidence is weaker concerning the exact mechanisms by which these concepts become measurable governance constructs, because most of this literature is philosophical, juridical, historical, or programmatic rather than measurement-oriented.

The contested issue is whether operationalization enables accountability or distorts the very values it seeks to serve. The conflict arises because abstract concepts possess multiple meanings, operate at different levels, and may not correspond to reflective psychometric constructs. The present model resolves this tension by measuring institutional manifestations and conditions rather than theological truth or inward virtue. The evidence is conceptually coherent but remains empirically limited because the proposed translation mechanisms have not yet been tested in institutional settings. This debate informs SRQ1 by establishing the need for source-to-construct traceability, explicit construct boundaries, and non-reduction safeguards.

Artifact design, system interdependence, and institutional learning

DSR establishes that purposeful artifacts should be problem-relevant, theoretically grounded, transparent, and evaluated [12-15]. Systems thinking adds that the value of an indicator



architecture depends on relationships among components, feedback, delay, and whole-system consequences [16]. Together, these literatures support an architecture rather than an unstructured list.

The principal disagreement concerns what counts as evaluation. Internal consistency, expert approval, technical usability, and observed institutional effects represent different levels of evidence. A structurally coherent catalogue may be suitable for expert review but cannot support claims of predictive accuracy or societal impact. This distinction is sometimes blurred when proposed frameworks report “findings” before demonstration or field evaluation. Evidence for the general principles of artifact development is well established, whereas evidence for UCTA-specific effectiveness remains absent because no field evaluation has been conducted. This distinction informs the PRQ and SRQ5 by separating architectural completion from empirical validation and demonstrated institutional effectiveness.

Performance measurement versus the politics of quantification

Performance-management scholarship shows how strategy can be connected to objectives, measures, targets, initiatives, and organizational learning [17,18]. Composite-indicator methodology further specifies theoretical frameworks, data selection, imputation, normalization, weighting, aggregation, robustness analysis, and transparent presentation [19]. This literature offers mature technical controls for indicator architecture.

Critical quantification scholarship contests the assumption that these controls make measurement neutral. Indicators influence behaviour, establish comparability, redistribute attention, and may convert contested classifications into authoritative facts [20-22]. The tension exists because performance research commonly evaluates managerial utility, whereas critical scholarship examines social consequences, classification power, and loss of meaning.

UCTA treats this tension as a governance requirement. Measurement is legitimate only where constructs are bounded, proxy limitations are disclosed, evidence is contestable, and severe failures in dignity, justice, trust, peace, or theological integrity cannot be hidden by high aggregate scores. The literature provides strong support for both the technical utility of indicators and their constitutive social and institutional risks. This debate informs SRQ3 and SRQ4 by justifying no-double-counting rules, red-line vetoes, contextual calibration, and restrictions on comparative ranking.

Time horizon, strategic progress, and early warning

Conventional performance architectures often place outputs, outcomes, risks, and transformation milestones within the same scorecard. This creates category error: a programme may deliver activities while failing to alter long-term capacity, or it may meet operational targets while systemic risk is accelerating. Early-warning guidance emphasizes that detection must be linked to risk knowledge, monitoring, communication, preparedness, and response [23]. AI-risk governance similarly links governance, contextual mapping, measurement, management, documentation, and human oversight [24].



The unresolved issue is the degree of independence among KPI, SPI, and CWI streams. An SPI or CWI may use data originating in operational systems, but shared data do not imply identical constructs or decision functions. False independence arises when derivatives of the same observation are counted as separate evidence; false equivalence arises when operational underperformance and crisis exposure use identical thresholds. The literature strongly supports linking warning signals to response mechanisms, but support for the precise KPI–SPI–CWI taxonomy remains provisional because the taxonomy has not yet been empirically tested. This debate informs SRQ2 by requiring explicit data dependencies, distinct temporal logic, corroboration rules, and layer-specific decision rights.

Validity, comparability, and weighting

Content validation is necessary when a large candidate library is generated, but expert consensus is not equivalent to construct or predictive validity. CREDES improves transparency in Delphi design [25]; Lawshe formalizes judgments of item necessity [26]; and COSMIN emphasizes relevance, comprehensiveness, and comprehensibility [27,28]. AHP can support contextual prioritization, but its outputs depend on expert composition, consistency, and sensitivity [29]. Mathematical models require disclosure of assumptions, uncertainty, limitations, and potential consequences [30].

The central conflict concerns standardization. Common definitions enable comparison, but uniform targets may be invalid across different legal systems, institutional capacities, languages, data environments, and religious contexts. Measurement invariance cannot be assumed from translation or expert agreement alone. Content-validity procedures and methodological transparency are well established, whereas cross-context portability remains uncertain until piloting and measurement-invariance testing are completed. This debate informs SRQ4 and SRQ5 by requiring standardized indicator charters alongside context-calibrated baselines, thresholds, weights, and validation claims.

2.5 Measurement and Operationalization Review

The central measurement problem is not selecting one universal instrument, but matching measure type to decision function. KPIs are commonly operationalized through rates, counts, coverage measures, processing times, maturity scores, and outcome indices. Their strengths are interpretability and managerial relevance; their principal validity threats are proxy substitution, gaming, denominator instability, and conflation of outputs with outcomes. UCTA mitigates these risks through explicit numerator–denominator definitions, polarity, unit of analysis, ownership, and evidence lineage.

SPIs require baseline-to-target trajectories, milestone attainment, institutionalization measures, or sustained multi-period change. A single-period improvement is insufficient. Threats include regression to the mean, selective baselines, attribution error, and inconsistent target horizons. Mitigation requires frozen baselines, predefined time windows, trend analysis, and dependency mapping to relevant KPIs.



CWIs require event, trend, anomaly, exposure, or threshold logic. Their key threats are false positives, false negatives, delayed reporting, biased monitoring systems, and surveillance harms. Valid operationalization therefore requires corroborating signals, risk ownership, escalation criteria, response playbooks, de-escalation rules, and privacy controls [23,24].

Derived composites support communication and strategic overview but risk double counting, compensatory masking, sensitivity to normalization, and unstable weights. UCTA therefore treats composites as outputs, excludes them from their own input sets, and requires red-line vetoes for severe ethical or governance failures [19,29,30].

Source-grounded constructs present an additional validity threat: interpretive selection may give apparent religious authority to a contemporary measure. Mitigation requires an auditable distinction among source text, interpretation, construct, indicator, and empirical observation. Measurement does not validate the theological interpretation, and theological grounding does not validate the measure.

2.6 Research Gaps and RQ Bridge

The literature reveals four connected gaps. First, normative civilizational frameworks do not provide a sufficiently explicit translation mechanism from sources to governable constructs. Second, performance architectures insufficiently distinguish current operations, strategic trajectory, and emerging fragility. Third, composite measurement may permit high scores in one domain to conceal red-line failures elsewhere. Fourth, standardization is often pursued without adequate attention to contextual comparability and staged validation.

UCTA Model II responds by specifying a source-grounded construct architecture, differentiating KPI, SPI, and CWI decision functions, separating non-composite and derived measures, and defining a validation pathway. Accordingly, the PRQ addresses the overall translation problem; SRQ1 addresses normative and dimensional foundations; SRQ2 addresses categorical differentiation; SRQ3 addresses aggregation and red-line governance; SRQ4 addresses operational standardization and contextual comparability; and SRQ5 addresses empirical legitimacy.

The conceptual model proposes that normative grounding shapes construct specification; construct specification directs institutional capabilities and measurement choices; institutional capability enables observable operational performance; repeated and corroborated evidence informs strategic trajectories and crisis exposure; and measurement governance moderates whether evidence produces learning, protection, escalation, or distortion. Data quality, source traceability, institutional ownership, contextual comparability, and ethical safeguards act as boundary conditions. These relationships are design propositions, not estimated causal effects.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Rationale



This study employed conceptual Design Science Research to construct and assess the internal coherence of UCTA Model II as a governed measurement artifact [12-15]. The research claim is limited to artifact specification, construct organization, and structural design evaluation. No causal, predictive, psychometric, adoption, or societal-effect claims are made.

3.2 Context, Unit of Analysis, and Evidence Base

The unit of analysis was the indicator architecture rather than a person, country, institution, population, or sacred text. The design corpus comprised the registered UCTA research lineage, the controlled 560-indicator catalogue, the legacy-to-Model-II crosswalk, scriptural–axiological grounding materials, civilizational design notes, and methodological literature on performance measurement, aggregation, validation, early warning, and measurement ethics. Documentary materials were included when they informed construct boundaries, indicator classification, governance controls, or validation requirements; unsupported empirical claims and context-specific metrics without architectural relevance were excluded.

3.3 Artifact-Construction Procedure

Artifact development followed nine auditable stages: problem definition; stabilization of five meta-pillars and fourteen dimensions; source-to-construct mapping; generation and consolidation of candidate measures; classification into KPI, SPI, and CWI layers; separation of non-composite and derived measures; controlled coding, naming, polarity, and redundancy review; specification of no-double-counting, red-line, data-governance, and non-reduction rules; and preparation of the validation pathway. The resulting architecture contains 280 KPIs, 140 SPIs, and 140 CWIs, including 518 non-composite measures and 42 derived composites.

3.4 Analysis, Traceability, and Quality Controls

Analysis consisted of conceptual mapping, crosswalk comparison, layer classification, duplicate and redundancy screening, and rule-based structural auditing. SRQ1 was addressed through source and construct mapping; SRQ2 through KPI–SPI–CWI classification; SRQ3 through base/composite and aggregation controls; SRQ4 through specification of mandatory indicator-charter fields; and SRQ5 through a staged Delphi, CVR/CVI, feasibility, pilot, sensitivity, invariance, and external-validation protocol [19,25-30]. An audit trail preserved the source hierarchy, construct decisions, indicator codes, naming changes, classification logic, and validation status.

3.5 Validity, Ethics, and Replication

Structural credibility was supported through explicit definitions, stable coding, unique names and abbreviations, traceable revisions, and separation of completed architecture controls from pending empirical validation. Because the study used documentary materials and involved neither human participants nor personal data, informed consent and institutional ethics approval were not applicable to the present study. Subsequent expert-panel and institutional-pilot studies are subject to context-specific ethics review, privacy protection, conflict-of-interest disclosure, and data-governance requirements. The reproducibility materials comprise the controlled catalogue, codebook, crosswalk, change log, grounding protocol, and validation



instruments. No empirical dataset or statistical analysis code was generated in the present study.

4. Design Results: The UCTA Model II Artifact

4.1 Data Overview and Evidence Base

The results consist of design outputs generated from the documentary corpus described in the Methodology. The unit of analysis was the UCTA Model II architecture rather than an individual, institution, country, or religious community. The analyzed materials comprised the registered UCTA lineage, the legacy-to-Model-II crosswalk, the controlled indicator catalogue, scriptural–axiological grounding records, naming and coding controls, and governance and validation specifications. The study did not involve participant- or institution-level observations; consequently, statistical missing-data procedures were not applicable. Indicator formulae, empirical baselines, calibrated thresholds, and validated weights that had not been established were explicitly classified as pending operational specifications and were not replaced with assumed values. The reported results were limited to pre-specified structural outputs of the nine-stage artifact-construction procedure; no exploratory empirical analyses were undertaken.

4.2 Measurement Checks and Structural Diagnostics

Conventional reliability, factor-validity, multicollinearity, common-method-bias, model-fit, and statistical-significance tests were not applicable because no survey, observational sample, or estimated measurement model was used. Quality assessment instead addressed structural coherence and auditability.

The structural audit confirmed five meta-pillars, fourteen strategic dimensions, and forty candidate indicators per dimension. The complete catalogue contains 560 unique indicator codes, names, and abbreviations. Layer-prefix checks confirmed that operational, strategic-progress, and crisis-warning measures were separately coded. The crosswalk preserved the relationship between the original UCTA goal architecture and Model II, while the controlled naming register recorded renamed, redistributed, merged, or conceptually refined constructs. These checks establish catalogue integrity at the architecture level; they do not establish construct validity, predictive accuracy, or cross-context equivalence.

4.3 Main Findings

4.3.1 A multidimensional civilizational target architecture

In response to SRQ1, the first design result is a five-meta-pillar and fourteen-dimension construct architecture. The dimensions comprise: theological coherence and doctrinal literacy; epistemic integration and methodological renewal; comparative jurisprudence and legal harmonization; maqāṣid-based law and public policy; Ummah identity and social cohesion; ethics of difference, dignity, and trust; culture, language, heritage, and civilizational aesthetics; transnational institutions and governance coordination; rule of law, justice, mediation, and accountability; civic participation, inclusion, and community capacity;



education, research, innovation, and human capital; Islamic economic cooperation, waqf, and shared prosperity; environmental stewardship, resource security, and climate resilience; and digital transformation, artificial intelligence, data governance, and public communication.

The result specifies civilizational renewal as an interdependent construct system rather than a list of isolated policy sectors. A cross-cutting Scriptural–Axiological Grounding Layer was added without creating a fifteenth dimension or increasing the active catalogue. This layer organizes twelve value clusters covering purpose and responsibility; reason and wisdom; dignity, responsible freedom, and authenticity; justice and rights; truthfulness, evidence integrity, and *amānah*; mercy and forgiveness; moral courage; consultation and accountability; unity with legitimate diversity; distributive justice; stewardship and sustainability; and self-restraint, patience, hope, and moral formation. These clusters constrain construct interpretation and institutional practice; they are not instruments for scoring private faith or spiritual merit.

4.3.2 Separation of operational performance, strategic progress, and crisis warning

In response to SRQ2, the second result is the formal separation of three indicator libraries:

280 KPIs + 140 SPIs + 140 CWIs = 560 candidate indicators.

Each dimension contains twenty operational Key Performance Indicators, ten Strategic Progress Indicators, and ten Crisis Warning Indicators. KPIs represent current processes, capacities, integrity controls, outputs, and immediate outcomes. SPIs represent sustained advancement, institutionalization, coverage expansion, gap reduction, or movement toward a defined strategic state. CWIs represent deterioration, harmful incidence, system vulnerability, rights breach, discourse escalation, or declining resilience.

The coding architecture uses UCTA-Dxx-KPI-01–20, UCTA-Dxx-SPI-01–10, and UCTA-Dxx-CWI-01–10. Separate coding and naming prevent the three functions from being treated as interchangeable. Shared source data are permissible, but any dependency between a KPI and a derived SPI or CWI must be disclosed; common data origin does not establish measurement independence. The material design contribution is categorical rather than statistical: the artifact distinguishes what is happening now, whether durable progress is occurring, and whether a harmful trajectory is emerging.

4.3.3 Non-composite measures, derived composites, and non-compensation

In response to SRQ3, the third result is a controlled base–composite architecture. Each dimension contains nineteen non-composite KPIs and one derived KPI composite, nine non-composite SPIs and one derived SPI composite, and nine non-composite CWIs and one derived CWI composite. Across the full catalogue, this produces 518 non-composite candidate measures and 42 derived dimension-level composites.

A derived composite is defined as a reporting output rather than an additional independent observation. It cannot re-enter its own component set or a parent calculation containing the same evidence. Its components, normalization, weights, missing-data treatment, and



uncertainty must remain inspectable. This no-double-counting rule prevents circular scoring and artificial inflation of evidence.

The fourth design result is a non-compensatory red-line logic. Weighted averages cannot override severe failures involving injustice, dehumanization, violence, systematic denial of rights, theological falsification, evidence corruption, serious data abuse, or collapse of social trust. Weight caps, minimum-evidence requirements, disaggregation, sensitivity analysis, uncertainty disclosure, and veto rules limit the authority of composite scores. These controls make aggregation conditional rather than automatically compensatory.

4.3.4 Measurement-governance and execution architecture

In response to SRQ4, the fifth result is a standardized governance specification for converting indicator titles into operational instruments. The mandatory charter fields include construct definition, inclusion and exclusion boundaries, unit of analysis, formula, numerator and denominator where applicable, measurement unit, polarity, data source and lineage, accountable owner, data steward, cadence, baseline, target or warning threshold, disaggregation, missing-data treatment, confidence grade, and validation status.

Standardization applies to definitions and governance procedures, not to universal numerical targets. Baselines, targets, weights, and warning thresholds require contextual calibration according to institutional capacity, legal environment, language, data availability, and risk exposure. The artifact therefore supports common architecture while explicitly withholding claims of automatic comparability across institutions or countries.

The resulting execution chain is: source-grounded construct definition → institutional capability → operational observation → KPI assessment → sustained SPI trajectory or corroborated CWI exposure → governed response and learning.

An operational observation becomes evidence of strategic progress only when change is sustained, corroborated, and connected to institutional development. An adverse observation becomes a CWI only when risk logic, threshold conditions, ownership, corroboration, escalation, response, and de-escalation rules are specified.

4.3.5 Validation Requirements and Claim Boundaries

In response to SRQ5, the sixth result is a staged validation pathway separating structural completion from empirical legitimacy. Architecture, counts, coding, naming, layer separation, crosswalk, and base-composite classification are complete at the proposed-design level. Indicator-level operational specification and empirical validation remain incomplete.

The defined validation sequence comprises construct stabilization; multidisciplinary Delphi review; Content Validity Ratio and Content Validity Index assessment; redundancy and data-feasibility screening; heterogeneous institutional pilots; specification of formative, reflective, or emergent measurement models; contextual weighting; sensitivity and uncertainty analysis; measurement-invariance assessment; and longitudinal external validation [25-30].



Consequently, Model II is reported as a structurally specified candidate architecture, not as a validated universal measurement system.

4.4 Additional Analyses

The study conducted structural crosswalk and consistency analyses rather than statistical robustness tests. Crosswalk analysis showed that the earlier UCTA architecture was not discarded but retained, expanded, redistributed, or elevated into the new dimensional and cross-cutting structure. Naming review corrected ambiguous, exclusionary, or category-inconsistent terms while preserving a traceable record of all substantive changes. Redundancy screening distinguished potential semantic overlap from legitimate data dependencies.

4.5 Results-to-Objectives Traceability

Collectively, the construct map addresses SRQ1; the differentiated KPI–SPI–CWI architecture addresses SRQ2; the base–composite and red-line rules address SRQ3; the indicator–charter and contextual–calibration requirements address SRQ4; and the staged validation pathway addresses SRQ5. Questions concerning effectiveness, predictive validity, institutional usability, and cross-context comparability remain unanswered because they require expert and pilot evidence beyond the present design.

4.6 Transparency, Ethics, and Data Availability

The study analyzed documentary and architectural materials and did not process participant-level or personal data; anonymization was therefore not required. The controlled catalogue, codebook, crosswalk, naming-change register, grounding protocol, and validation templates constitute the reproducible artifact package. No empirical dataset or statistical analysis code exists at this stage. Future institutional pilots may require restricted access, de-identification, privacy controls, ethics review, and protection against surveillance, discriminatory classification, and inappropriate religious ranking.

5. Discussion

5.1 Summary of Principal Findings

UCTA Model II addresses the research problem by recasting Islamic civilizational measurement as a governed translation architecture rather than a catalogue of undifferentiated indicators. Six principal findings emerge. First, Islamic civilizational renewal can be represented as an interdependent five-meta-pillar and fourteen-dimension construct system without treating civilization as a single scalar outcome. Second, operational performance, strategic progress, and crisis exposure require analytically distinct KPI, SPI, and CWI functions. Third, the distinction between 518 non-composite measures and 42 derived composites prevents dimension-level summaries from being misrepresented as additional independent evidence. Fourth, no-double-counting and red-line rules constrain compensatory aggregation. Fifth, scriptural–axiological grounding can delimit construct meaning and ethical use while leaving revelation, sanctity, faith, spiritual merit, and intrinsic human worth outside



scoring. Sixth, the architecture is structurally specified but remains operationally and empirically conditional.

Inferential null results were not applicable because the study did not estimate statistical models. A central architectural finding is that a completed catalogue is not equivalent to a validated measurement system. Institution-specific definitions, data contracts, owners, baselines, targets, warning thresholds, weighting structures, and external validation remain unresolved. This distinction strengthens rather than weakens the credibility of the artifact because it prevents design completion from being presented as evidence of institutional effectiveness.

5.2 Interpretation and Mechanisms

The structural findings indicate that the measurement problem cannot be addressed by increasing the number of indicators alone; each measure must instead be linked to a bounded construct, decision function, time horizon, data lineage, accountable owner, and response rule. The KPI–SPI–CWI distinction therefore represents a governance mechanism. KPIs support operational correction, SPIs support interpretation of sustained movement, and CWIs support escalation when deterioration or fragility exceeds an accepted boundary.

The source-to-construct architecture also clarifies how normative reasoning can inform institutional measurement without becoming a numerical theology. Normative sources identify purposes, constraints, and prohibited interpretations; institutional analysis identifies observable manifestations; measurement governance specifies how evidence may be collected, interpreted, and challenged. This mechanism addresses the central tension between accountability and reductionism.

The separation of the three layers may improve institutional learning by discouraging the interpretation of activity counts as structural transformation and crisis signals as routine underperformance; this proposition requires institutional testing. Whether it actually improves decisions, trust, resilience, or justice cannot be inferred from the present design and must be evaluated through institutional pilots.

A second plausible mechanism is non-compensatory protection. Red-line rules may prevent strong economic, technological, or administrative scores from concealing severe failures in dignity, justice, peace, evidence integrity, or rights. This mechanism is theoretically coherent but remains untested against alternative aggregation procedures.

5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature

The artifact extends Islamic civilizational and maqāṣid scholarship by supplying an explicit institutional translation layer. Earlier scholarship establishes that civilizational renewal concerns knowledge, *adab*, justice, moral agency, human development, and purposive social organization [1-6]. UCTA Model II agrees with this multidimensional conception but differs by specifying how normative purposes may be connected to candidate constructs, institutional capabilities, operational observations, strategic trajectories, and warning signals.



The findings also align with Design Science Research, which treats an artifact as a purposeful response to a defined problem and distinguishes construction from demonstration and evaluation [12-15]. The present study advances this literature by applying artifact logic to a normatively sensitive civilizational domain. It simultaneously qualifies a purely constructive DSR position: technical coherence is insufficient where indicators reshape visibility, incentives, classification, and authority.

This qualification is consistent with critical quantification scholarship, which shows that indicators create comparability and institutional power rather than merely recording reality [20-22]. UCTA responds by incorporating contestability, source traceability, claim boundaries, non-reduction, and red-line safeguards into the artifact itself. It therefore treats critical scrutiny not as an external objection to measurement but as a design requirement.

The KPI–SPI–CWI distinction further extends performance-measurement and early-warning literature. Conventional scorecards translate strategy into objectives, targets, and initiatives [17,18], while composite-indicator methodology provides controls for normalization, weighting, aggregation, and robustness [19]. Early-warning and AI-risk frameworks add monitoring, preparedness, response, human oversight, and documented accountability [23,24]. UCTA integrates these streams but distinguishes three temporal and decision functions that conventional scorecards may combine.

5.4 Alternative Explanations and Rival Mechanisms

One alternative explanation is that the apparent contribution arises mainly from relabelling existing output, outcome, risk, and strategic indicators. This explanation is partly plausible because KPI, progress, and warning concepts are not individually new. The contribution instead lies in their governed integration within a source-bounded civilizational architecture, the explicit treatment of measurement dependence, and the coupling of aggregation with ethical veto rules.

A second rival explanation is that the 560-item structure reflects numerical symmetry rather than theoretical necessity. The present design does not resolve this criticism. The 20/10/10 allocation is a provisional design choice that requires evaluation through Delphi review, content-validity assessment, redundancy analysis, and data-feasibility screening. Some dimensions may ultimately require fewer or differently distributed measures.

A third explanation is that governance safeguards may remain ceremonial if institutions lack independent assurance, data quality, resources, or authority to act. This risk is substantial. The architecture can specify decision rights and escalation logic, but it cannot ensure compliance or prevent strategic manipulation without field-level governance and accountability.

5.5 Theoretical Implications

First, the study extends DSR by showing that artifact evaluation in normatively contested domains must include claim legitimacy, not only utility, usability, and technical consistency. This contribution follows from the source-grounding and non-reduction findings and



addresses the literature gap concerning the translation of normative purposes into governable constructs.

Second, the model integrates systems thinking and performance measurement through a temporal decision architecture. KPI, SPI, and CWI are not simply indicator labels; they represent current-state, trajectory, and fragility logics. This contribution follows from the three-layer finding and addresses measurement-category error.

Third, the study introduces non-compensation as a substantive boundary condition for civilizational measurement. Composite performance is conditionally valid only where severe ethical or governance failures cannot be averaged away. This contribution follows from the red-line and base-composite findings and addresses the masking problem identified in the literature.

Fourth, the model qualifies universalist approaches to indicator standardization. Definitions and governance protocols may be standardized, whereas thresholds, weights, baselines, and interpretations require contextual calibration. This contribution follows from the indicator-chapter result and addresses the tension between comparability and validity.

5.6 Practical and Policy Implications

Governing councils and policy authorities should first select a bounded subset of indicators rather than deploy the entire library. The required action is to assign decision owners, data stewards, evidence sources, review cadence, and escalation authority. Enabling systems include controlled indicator registries, data-lineage records, evidence repositories, and role-based dashboards. Progress should be tracked through charter completion, data availability, ownership coverage, and unresolved red-line risks. This is a short-term architecture and readiness task; its primary failure mode is administrative adoption without valid data or authority to act.

Institutions conducting pilots should separate operational monitoring from strategic and crisis reviews. Operational teams should manage KPIs, strategic forums should review SPI trajectories, and risk or ethics bodies should govern CWIs and response playbooks. The relevant measures are data completeness, trajectory stability, warning lead time, corroboration rate, false-positive incidence, and corrective-action closure. This is a medium-term pilot objective. Risks include excessive reporting burden, delayed data, duplicated signals, and the use of CWI monitoring as surveillance.

Transnational bodies, universities, waqf institutions, civil-society organizations, and public agencies should not use the architecture for ranking before measurement invariance and contextual comparability are established. Initial use should focus on internal diagnosis, institutional learning, and controlled comparison of trends within comparable settings. The principal measures are definition equivalence, data-quality confidence, cross-language consistency, and sensitivity to alternative weights. The central risks are false comparability, political misuse, and theological delegitimation.



5.7 Boundary Conditions, Limitations, and Threats to Validity

The findings are limited to structural and conceptual coherence. They do not demonstrate that the architecture improves policy, predicts crisis, produces civilizational renewal, or is accepted by institutions. Generalizability is constrained because no country, organization, language group, or legal system has been studied. The equal allocation of indicators may overrepresent some dimensions and underrepresent others.

Content-selection bias may persist because the architecture was developed from a controlled documentary corpus rather than an independently sampled international expert process. Interpretive bias may affect source-to-construct mapping, while data and weighting choices may later introduce institutional and political bias. Some dimensions are likely formative, others reflective, and others emergent; applying one validation model across all dimensions would create construct error.

The model's size also creates implementation risk. A 560-item candidate library may be useful as a repository but unmanageable as a single dashboard. Role-based selection and phased deployment are therefore necessary. These limitations may reduce usability and comparability but do not negate the architectural finding that differentiated measurement and governance controls are required.

5.8 Future Research Agenda

Future research should: conduct multidisciplinary Delphi and CVR/CVI validation; assess indicator redundancy and necessity; complete data-feasibility audits; compare formative, reflective, and emergent measurement models; pilot the architecture in heterogeneous institutions; test whether KPIs, SPIs, and CWIs provide incremental decision information; estimate CWI warning lead time and error rates; evaluate alternative normalization, weighting, and red-line rules; test cross-language and cross-context measurement invariance; study gaming, surveillance, and target displacement; and use longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs to examine whether implementation is associated with improved institutional learning, trust, justice, or resilience.

5.9 Ethics, Governance, and Responsible Use

Responsible deployment requires purpose limitation, data minimization, controlled access, traceable definitions, independent review, human oversight, and procedures for contesting classifications. AI-assisted collection or analysis must preserve documentation, bias testing, privacy, explainability, and accountable human decision rights [24]. UCTA must not be used to score personal faith, rank religious communities, infer spiritual worth, or legitimize coercive surveillance. The author declares no conflict of interest. Subsequent expert and institutional studies should disclose panel affiliations, funding sources, and decision authority.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Key Findings



This study examined how Islamic civilizational renewal can be operationalized as a scripturally grounded, non-reductive, and governable indicator architecture. In response to the PRQ, UCTA Model II specifies five meta-pillars, fourteen strategic dimensions, and three differentiated measurement layers comprising 280 Key Performance Indicators, 140 Strategic Progress Indicators, and 140 Crisis Warning Indicators. SRQ1 is addressed through the multidimensional construct architecture and the cross-cutting scriptural–axiological grounding layer. SRQ2 is addressed by separating present operational performance, sustained strategic progress, and emerging crisis exposure into distinct decision functions. SRQ3 is addressed through the distinction between 518 non-composite measures and 42 derived composites, together with no-double-counting and non-compensatory red-line rules. SRQ4 is addressed through standardized indicator-chapter requirements while retaining contextual calibration of baselines, thresholds, and weights. SRQ5 is addressed through a staged validation pathway. No statistical null findings were produced because the study did not estimate an empirical model; the principal contrary finding is that structural completeness does not constitute empirical validity.

6.2 Scholarly Contributions

The study changes the literature in four respects. First, it reframes civilizational measurement as a governed translation problem connecting normative grounding, construct definition, institutional capability, observation, and corrective decision. Second, it introduces a three-layer temporal and decision architecture that distinguishes operational performance from strategic trajectory and crisis exposure. Third, it establishes non-compensation and source-to-construct traceability as boundary conditions for legitimate civilizational measurement. Fourth, it extends design-science logic by making claim legitimacy, non-reduction, and ethical contestability explicit components of artifact quality.

6.3 Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

Governing councils, universities, religious institutions, civil-society organizations, waqf bodies, and public agencies should begin with bounded pilots rather than activating the full catalogue. In the short term, each pilot should assign owners, data stewards, evidence sources, review cadence, and response authority to a limited set of operational KPIs, associated SPI trajectories, and corresponding CWI triggers; the main risk is administrative adoption without reliable data. In the medium term, strategic forums should monitor milestone attainment through SPIs, while risk and ethics bodies should review corroborated CWIs, escalation decisions, and corrective-action closure; the main constraints are reporting burden, false alerts, and surveillance risk. In the long term, comparative use should occur only after construct equivalence, measurement invariance, contextual calibration, and sensitivity testing have been demonstrated; premature ranking would create false comparability and political or theological misuse.

6.4 Limitations

The study is limited to conceptual and structural design. It does not establish causal effects, predictive accuracy, institutional usability, crisis-detection performance, or cross-context



generalizability. The equal 20/10/10 allocation per dimension is a controlled architectural decision rather than an empirically established optimum. The source corpus may also contain selection and interpretive bias, while indicator definitions, data contracts, baselines, weights, and thresholds remain incomplete at the operational level. These limitations restrict claims to artifact specification and structural coherence.

6.5 Directions for Future Research

Future studies should use multidisciplinary Delphi panels and CVR/CVI data across diverse Islamic scholarly and professional contexts to test content validity; institutional pilot data to assess feasibility, data burden, and decision usefulness; longitudinal datasets to test whether KPIs, SPIs, and CWIs provide non-redundant information over time; comparative multilingual samples to evaluate measurement invariance; simulation and sensitivity analysis to compare weighting, aggregation, and red-line rules; field studies to estimate CWI warning lead time and error rates; and qualitative case studies to examine gaming, surveillance, resistance, and unintended institutional effects. Each design should specify context, data source, validation criterion, and expected contribution before broader deployment.

6.6 Closing Synthesis

Islamic civilizational renewal requires both normative depth and institutional accountability. UCTA Model II offers a controlled architecture for connecting these demands while preserving clear limits on what may legitimately be quantified. Its scientific value now depends on disciplined expert validation, contextual piloting, and longitudinal evaluation. This paper changes civilizational-measurement literature by introducing a non-reductive three-layer governance architecture and enables institutions and policymakers to pilot accountable, context-sensitive systems for monitoring performance, strategic progress, and emerging crisis.

References

- [1] Ibn Khaldun. The Muqaddimah: an introduction to history. Rosenthal F, translator; Dawood NJ, editor. Abridged ed. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 1967.
- [2] Al-Attas SMN. Prolegomena to the metaphysics of Islam: an exposition of the fundamental elements of the worldview of Islam. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization; 1995.
- [3] Al-Faruqi IR, AbuSulayman AH. Islamization of knowledge: general principles and work plan. 2nd ed. Herndon (VA): International Institute of Islamic Thought; 1989.
- [4] Auda J. Maqasid al-Shariah as philosophy of Islamic law: a systems approach. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought; 2008. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvkc67tg>
- [5] Chapra MU. The Islamic vision of development in the light of Maqasid al-Shariah. Jeddah: Islamic Research and Training Institute, Islamic Development Bank; 2008.



- [6] Kamali MH. Maqasid al-Shariah and ijihad as instruments of civilisational renewal: a methodological perspective. *Islam and Civilisational Renewal*. 2011;2(2):245-271. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.52282/ICR.V2I2.647>
- [7] MoghadasNian SAH. Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture (UCTA): a KPI-governed goal architecture for Islamic civilizational renewal . University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35438.27202>
- [8] MoghadasNian SAH. UCTA-PA: Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture: a performance architecture for measurable rapprochement and civilizational renewal . University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16602.40647>
- [9] MoghadasNian SAH. Global Kalam Strategic Framework (GKSF): a fourteen-pillar KPI-based comparative model for Islamic unity and theological convergence . University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16774.28489/1>
- [10] MoghadasNian SAH. Islamic Hiwar Framework (IHF): a KPI-based architecture for intra-faith dialogue and civilizational unity . University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34234.30403>
- [11] MoghadasNian SAH. Taqrib Quadripartite Architecture (TQA-4): a KPI-governed super-framework for engineering Islamic unity . University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10560.80646>
- [12] Hevner AR, March ST, Park J, Ram S. Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*. 2004;28(1):75-105. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148625>
- [13] Peffers K, Tuunanen T, Rothenberger MA, Chatterjee S. A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*. 2007;24(3):45-77. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240302>
- [14] Gregor S, Hevner AR. Positioning and presenting design science research for maximum impact. *MIS Quarterly*. 2013;37(2):337-355. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.01>
- [15] Simon HA. *The sciences of the artificial*. 3rd ed. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 1996.
- [16] Meadows DH. *Thinking in systems: a primer*. White River Junction (VT): Chelsea Green Publishing; 2008.
- [17] Kaplan RS, Norton DP. *The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action*. Boston (MA): Harvard Business School Press; 1996.
- [18] Melnyk SA, Bititci U, Platts K, Tobias J, Andersen B. Is performance measurement and management fit for the future? *Management Accounting Research*. 2014;25(2):173-186. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2013.07.007>
- [19] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; European Commission, Joint Research Centre. *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: methodology and user guide*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2008. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264043466-en>
- [20] Espeland WN, Stevens ML. A sociology of quantification. *European Journal of Sociology*. 2008;49(3):401-436. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975609000150>
- [21] Davis KE, Kingsbury B, Merry SE. Indicators as a technology of global governance. *Law & Society Review*. 2012;46(1):71-104. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2012.00473.x>
- [22] Merry SE. Measuring the world: indicators, human rights, and global governance. *Current Anthropology*. 2011;52(S3):S83-S95. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1086/657241>
- [23] United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction; World Meteorological Organization. *Global status of multi-hazard early warning systems 2023*. Geneva: UNDRR and WMO; 2023.



- [24] National Institute of Standards and Technology. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). Gaithersburg (MD): National Institute of Standards and Technology; 2023. NIST AI 100-1. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>
- [25] Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, Radbruch L, Brearley SG. Guidance on conducting and reporting Delphi studies (CREDES) in palliative care: recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliative Medicine*. 2017;31(8):684-706. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216317690685>
- [26] Lawshe CH. A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*. 1975;28(4):563-575. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x>
- [27] Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, Alonso J, Patrick DL, de Vet HCW, et al. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Quality of Life Research*. 2018;27(5):1147-1157. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-018-1798-3>
- [28] Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, Westerman MJ, Patrick DL, Alonso J, et al. COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Quality of Life Research*. 2018;27(5):1159-1170. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0>
- [29] Saaty TL. Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Services Sciences*. 2008;1(1):83-98. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSCI.2008.017590>
- [30] Saltelli A, Bammer G, Bruno I, Charters E, Di Fiore M, Didier E, et al. Five ways to ensure that models serve society: a manifesto. *Nature*. 2020;582(7813):482-484. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01812-9>



Appendix

Appendix A. UCTA Model II: Final Controlled KPI, SPI and CWI Lists

This appendix presents the final controlled naming and abbreviation edition of the Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture (UCTA) Model II indicator catalogue. The architecture comprises 280 Operational Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), 140 Strategic Progress Indicators (SPIs), and 140 Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs), producing a total of 560 candidate indicators across five meta-pillars and fourteen strategic dimensions.

Each dimension contains twenty KPIs, ten SPIs, and ten CWIs. KPIs assess current institutional performance, capability, process quality, implementation, outputs, and immediate outcomes. SPIs assess sustained advancement towards long-term civilizational objectives, institutionalisation, and strategic trajectory. CWIs identify emerging deterioration, systemic fragility, accelerating risk, or threshold breach requiring review, escalation, or corrective action.

The catalogue uses three controlled coding structures:

- UCTA-Dxx-KPI-01–20
- UCTA-Dxx-SPI-01–10
- UCTA-Dxx-CWI-01–10

All indicator codes, names, and abbreviations have been checked for uniqueness and consistent placement. The architecture includes non-composite indicators and derived dimension-level composites; derived indicators are reporting outputs and must not be reintroduced as inputs into their own calculations or parent scores.

The indicators are restricted to observable and governable constructs, including institutional capability, evidence integrity, process quality, inclusion, implementation, strategic progress, risk exposure, data governance, and safeguard compliance. They do not quantify revelation, doctrinal truth, sanctity, piety, sincerity, spiritual worth, salvation, or divine acceptance, and they must not be used to rank Islamic traditions or represent legitimate theological and jurisprudential plurality as a performance deficit.

The catalogue constitutes a final proposed design artefact, not an empirically validated scale. Operational definitions, formulas, data sources, ownership, baselines, targets, thresholds, weighting, and cross-context comparability require subsequent Delphi review, content-validity assessment, data-feasibility analysis, piloting, reliability and validity testing, and external validation.

PART I — OPERATIONAL KPIs (280)

1. Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy

(Strategic Dimension: Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Foundational Doctrine Literacy Rate (FDLR)
- Core Creed Curriculum Coverage Rate (CCCCR)
- Shared Principle Recognition Index (SPRI)
- Doctrinal Source Competency Rate (DSCR)
- Intra-Islamic Theology Research Output (IITRO)
- Cross-School Doctrine Mapping Coverage (CSDMC)
- Doctrinal Misrepresentation Rate (DMRR)
- Sectarian Stereotype Reduction Rate (SSRR)
- Qualified Kalam Scholar Density (QKSD)
- Joint Theological Forum Participation Rate (JTFPR)
- Theology Curriculum Peer-Review Coverage (TCPRC)



- Doctrinal Dialogue Resolution Rate (DDRR)
- Foundational Belief Terminology Alignment Score (FBTAS)
- Theological Evidence Traceability Score (TETS)
- Creedal Disagreement Documentation Quality (CDDQ)
- Sacred-Text Interpretation Transparency Score (STITS)
- Doctrinal Boundary Clarity Index (DBCI)
- Theological Pluralism Governance Maturity (TPGM)
- Takfir-Related Incident Rate (TRIR)
- Theological Coherence Governance Score (TCGS)

2. Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal

(Strategic Dimension: Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Revelation-Reason Integration Score (RRIS)
- Epistemic Method Literacy Rate (EMLR)
- Usul al-Din Methodology Coverage Rate (UDMCR)
- Classical-Contemporary Knowledge Integration Index (CCKII)
- Interdisciplinary Ijtihad Project Rate (IIPR)
- Evidence Hierarchy Clarity Score (EHCS)
- Interpretive Method Transparency Score (IMTS)
- Epistemic Diversity Inclusion Rate (EDIR)
- Methodological Bias Detection Rate (MBDR)
- Scholarly Source Verification Rate (SSVR)
- Knowledge Claim Traceability Index (KCTI)
- Epistemic Conflict Resolution Rate (ECRR)
- Rational Theology Innovation Output (RTIO)
- Contemporary Issue Response Timeliness (CIRT)
- Comparative Epistemology Research Intensity (CERI)
- Hermeneutic Competency Certification Rate (HCCR)
- Knowledge Integration Network Density (KIND)
- Epistemic Quality Assurance Maturity (EQAM)
- Unverified Religious Claim Rate (URCR)
- Civilizational Knowledge Renewal Index (CKRI)

3. Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization

(Strategic Dimension: Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Comparative Fiqh Coverage Rate (CFCR)
- Cross-Madhab Ruling Mapping Completion Rate (CMRMCR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Common-Ruling Identification Rate (CRIR)
- Jurisprudential Divergence Documentation Quality Score (JDDQS)
- Joint Ijtihad Initiative Count (JIIC)
- Emerging-Issue Joint Fatwa Rate (EJFR)
- Fatwa Evidence Traceability Score (FETS)
- Legal School Representation Balance (LSRB)
- Harmonizable Ruling Adoption Rate (HRAR)
- Mutual Recognition of Jurisprudential Reasoning Rate (MRJRR)
- Comparative Fiqh Curriculum Penetration Rate (CFCPR)
- Scholar Exchange Participation Rate (SEPR)
- Cross-School Legal Research Output (CSLRO)
- Jurisprudential Conflict Mediation Rate (JCMR)
- Sectarian Legal Discrimination Incidence (SLDI)
- Fiqh Data Standardization Rate (FDSR)
- Fatwa Database Interoperability Score (FDIS)
- Legal Adaptability to Novel Issues Score (LANIS)
- Comparative Jurisprudence Institutional Capacity Score (CJICS)
- Fiqh Convergence Progress Index (FCPI)

4. Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy

(Strategic Dimension: Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Maqasid Alignment Rate of Policies (MARP)
- Public Interest Assessment Coverage Rate (PIACR)
- Dignity Impact Assessment Rate (DIAR)
- Justice Impact Assessment Quality Score (JIAQS)
- Necessities Protection Coverage Rate (NPCR)
- Harm Prevention Effectiveness Rate (HPER)
- Policy Shari'ah Evidence Traceability Score (PSETS)
- Cross-School Policy Consultation Rate (CSPCR)
- Rights Compatibility Review Coverage Rate (RCRCR)
- Vulnerable Group Safeguard Score (VGSS)
- Legal Reform Implementation Rate (LRIR)
- Policy Coherence across Jurisdictions Score (PCAJS)
- Ethical Regulation Compliance Rate (ERCR)
- Maqasid Policy Innovation Count (MPIC)
- Regulatory Response Timeliness (RRT)
- Unintended Harm Incidence Rate (UHIR)



- Public Policy Legitimacy Index (PPLI)
- Legal Accessibility and Clarity Score (LACS)
- Evidence-Based Fatwa-to-Policy Conversion Rate (EFPC)
- Maqasid Governance Maturity Index (MGMI)

5. Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion

(Strategic Dimension: Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Shared Ummah Identity Index (SUII)
- Cross-Community Trust Rate (CCTR)
- Social Cohesion Score (SCS)
- Intra-Muslim Acceptance Rate (IMAR)
- Sectarian Social Distance Index (SSDI)
- Common Citizenship Commitment Rate (CCCR)
- Shared Heritage Awareness Rate (SHAR)
- Intercommunity Friendship Density (IFD)
- Cross-Sect Community Project Rate (CSCPR)
- Social Polarization Reduction Rate (SPRR)
- Inclusive National Identity Balance (INIB)
- Ummah Solidarity Mobilization Rate (USMR)
- Youth Unity Engagement Rate (YUER)
- Women's Participation Rate in Cohesion Programs (WPRCP)
- Minority Muslim Inclusion Score (MMIS)
- Diaspora Connectivity Index (DCI)
- Shared Ritual Respect Rate (SRRR)
- Discrimination Complaint Resolution Rate (DCRR)
- Identity-Based Violence Incidence (IBVI)
- Civilizational Belonging Index (CBI)

6. Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust

(Strategic Dimension: Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Adab al-Ikhtilaf Compliance Rate (AICR)
- Dignified Dialogue Score (DDS)
- Respectful Language Usage Rate (RLUR)
- Dehumanizing Speech Incidence (DHSI)
- Hate Speech Reduction Rate (HSRR)
- Ethical Mediation Success Rate (EMSR)
- Trust Restoration Rate (TRR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Mutual Empathy Index (MEI)
- Religious Leader Ethical Conduct Score (RLEC)
- Dialogue Code Adoption Rate (DCAR)
- Grievance Acknowledgment Rate (GAR)
- Apology and Reconciliation Completion Rate (ARCR)
- Ethical Facilitator Certification Rate (EFCR)
- Conflict-Sensitive Communication Coverage (CSCC)
- Rumor Correction Response Time (RCRT)
- Retaliatory Rhetoric Incidence (RRI)
- Safeguarding Compliance Rate (SCR)
- Intergroup Fairness Perception Index (IFPI)
- Ethical Breach Closure Rate (EBCR)
- Social Trust Resilience Index (STRI)

7. Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics

(Strategic Dimension: Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Islamic Heritage Preservation Rate (IHPR)
- Endangered Languages of Muslim Communities Support Rate (ELMCSR)
- Manuscript Digitization Coverage Rate (MDCR)
- Shared Cultural Production Rate (SCPR)
- Cross-Regional Cultural Exchange Rate (CRCER)
- Civilizational Arts Participation Rate (CAPR)
- Heritage Site Conservation Compliance Rate (HSCCR)
- Museum and Archive Accessibility Rate (MAAR)
- Youth Heritage Literacy Rate (YHLR)
- Cultural Narrative Diversity Index (CNDI)
- Shared Symbol Recognition Score (SSRS)
- Arabic and Islamic Language Proficiency Rate (AILPR)
- Cultural Stereotype Reduction Index (CSRI)
- Ethical Creative Industry Output (ECIO)
- Traditional Craft Sustainability Rate (TCSR)
- Civilizational Design Innovation Count (CDIC)
- Religiously and Culturally Inclusive Public Space Quality Score (RCIPSQS)
- Cultural Diplomacy Engagement Rate (CDER)
- Heritage Knowledge Transmission Rate (HKTR)
- Cultural Vitality and Aesthetic Renewal Index (CVARI)

8. Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination



5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities, Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

(Strategic Dimension: Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Transnational Institutional Coordination Score (TICS)
- Joint Policy Initiative Rate (JPIR)
- OIC Decision Implementation Rate (ODIR)
- Cross-Border Governance Agreement Rate (CBGAR)
- Institutional Mandate Clarity Score (IMCS)
- Governance Role Duplication Rate (GRDR)
- Strategic Plan Alignment Rate (SPAR)
- Shared Program Delivery Rate (SPDR)
- Interinstitutional Data-Sharing Rate (IDSR)
- Joint Budget Execution Rate (JBER)
- Governance Meeting Decision Closure Rate (GMDCR)
- Cross-Country Policy Harmonization Score (CCPHS)
- Institutional Accountability Compliance Rate (IACR)
- Civilizational Strategy Office Coverage (CSOC)
- Leadership Continuity Readiness Score (LCRS)
- Succession Plan Coverage Rate (SPCR)
- Governance Capability Maturity Score (GCMS)
- Stakeholder Representation Balance Score (SRBS)
- Institutional Trust Index (ITI)
- Transnational Governance Effectiveness Index (TGEI)

9. Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability

(Strategic Dimension: Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Rule of Law Confidence Index (RLCI)
- Justice Access Rate (JAR)
- Case Resolution Timeliness (CRT)
- Mediation Settlement Rate (MSR)
- Arbitration Enforcement Rate (AER)
- Judicial Independence Perception Index (JIPI)
- Anti-Corruption Control Score (ACCS)
- Public Sector Integrity Rate (PSIR)
- Legal Aid Coverage Rate (LACR)
- Rights Violation Redress Rate (RVRR)
- Due Process Compliance Rate (DPCR)
- Cross-Jurisdiction Dispute Resolution Rate (CJDRR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Accountability Report Publication Rate (ARPR)
- Audit Finding Closure Rate (AFCR)
- Whistleblower Protection Coverage Rate (WPCR)
- Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Rate (CIDR)
- Judicial Data Transparency Score (JDTS)
- Restorative Justice Program Success Rate (RJPSR)
- Impunity Incidence Rate (IIR)
- Civilizational Justice Governance Index (CJGI)

10. Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity

(Strategic Dimension: Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Civic Participation Rate (CPR)
- Community Consultation Coverage (CCC)
- Civil Society Organization Density (CSOD)
- Youth Civic Leadership Rate (YCLR)
- Women's Decision Participation Rate (WDPR)
- Marginalized Group Representation Rate (MGRR)
- Volunteer Mobilization Rate (VMR)
- Community-Led Initiative Completion Rate (CLICR)
- Local Dialogue Forum Coverage (LDFC)
- Participatory Budgeting Adoption Rate (PBAR)
- Community Grievance Resolution Rate (CGRR)
- Social Innovation Project Rate (SIPR)
- Local Institution Capacity Score (LICS)
- Grassroots Funding Sustainability Rate (GFSR)
- Civic Education Completion Rate (CECR)
- Public Consultation Response Rate (PCRR)
- Community Resilience Network Density (CRND)
- Local Partnership Effectiveness Index (LPEI)
- Participation Equity Gap (PEG)
- Community Empowerment Maturity Index (CEMI)

11. Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital

(Strategic Dimension: Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Civilizational Studies Curriculum Coverage (CSCVR)
- Islamic Research Quality Index (IRQI)
- Cross-University Collaboration Rate (CUCR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Joint Degree Program Count (JDPC)
- Scholar Mobility Rate (SMR)
- Student Exchange Participation Rate (SXPR)
- Research Citation Impact (RCI)
- Open Knowledge Access Rate (OKAR)
- Advanced Theology Graduate Rate (ATGR)
- Comparative Studies Faculty Density (CSFD)
- Critical Thinking Competency Score (CTCS)
- Digital Scholarship Adoption Rate (DSAR)
- Research Integrity Compliance Rate (RICR)
- Curriculum Future-Readiness Index (CFRI)
- Graduate Employability Rate in Renewal Sectors (GER-RS)
- Women's Advanced Scholarship Participation Rate (WASPR)
- Youth Innovation Fellowship Completion Rate (YIFCR)
- Academic-Policy Translation Rate (APTR)
- Brain Drain Reduction Rate (BDRR)
- Civilizational Human Capital Index (CHCI)

12. Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity

(Strategic Dimension: Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Intra-OIC Trade Share (IOTS)
- Cross-Border Investment Growth Rate (CBIGR)
- Halal Market Integration Index (HMII)
- Islamic Finance Inclusion Rate (IFIR)
- Waqf Asset Productivity Rate (WAPR)
- Waqf Social Impact Yield (WSIY)
- Zakat Delivery Effectiveness Rate (ZDER)
- Poverty Reduction Contribution Rate (PRCR)
- Youth Employment Growth Rate (YEGR)
- Women's Economic Participation Rate (WEPR)
- SME Cross-Border Market Access Rate (SCBMAR)
- Shared Infrastructure Investment Rate (SIIR)
- Economic Dependency Reduction Index (EDRI)
- Supply Chain Resilience Score (SCRS)
- Ethical Investment Compliance Rate (EICR)
- Income Inequality Reduction Rate (IIRR)
- Innovation Finance Deployment Rate (IFDR)



- Endowment Digitalization Rate (EDR)
- Social Enterprise Survival Rate (SESR)
- Shared Prosperity and Economic Resilience Index (SPERI)

13. Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience

(Strategic Dimension: Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Environmental Stewardship Compliance Rate (ESCR)
- Renewable Energy Share (RES)
- Carbon Intensity Reduction Rate (CIRR)
- Water Security Index (WSI)
- Sustainable Agriculture Adoption Rate (SAAR)
- Biodiversity Protection Coverage Rate (BPCR)
- Climate Adaptation Plan Coverage Rate (CAPCR)
- Disaster Preparedness Readiness Score (DPRS)
- Climate Risk Disclosure Rate (CRDR)
- Green Waqf Investment Rate (GWIR)
- Circular Economy Adoption Rate (CEAR)
- Waste Recovery Rate (WRR)
- Air Quality Improvement Rate (AQIR)
- Ecosystem Restoration Completion Rate (ERestCR)
- Food Security Resilience Index (FSRI)
- Cross-Border Environmental Cooperation Rate (CBECR)
- Sustainable City Readiness Index (SCRI)
- Environmental Justice Complaint Resolution Rate (EJCRR)
- Disaster Recovery Time (DRT)
- Islamic Ecological Civilization Index (IECI)

14. Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication

(Strategic Dimension: Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication; Meta-Pillar: Technological and Digital Capability)

- Digital Public Service Adoption Rate (DPSAR)
- Data Governance Maturity Score (DGMS)
- Master Data Quality Rate (MDQR)
- Data Lineage Coverage Rate (DLCR)
- AI Governance Compliance Rate (AIGCR)
- Algorithmic Impact Assessment Coverage Rate (AIACR)
- Responsible AI Review Rate (RAIR)
- Cyber Resilience Index (CRI)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Critical Infrastructure Security Coverage Rate (CISCR)
- Digital Inclusion Rate (DIR)
- Digital Literacy Rate (DLR)
- Islamic Knowledge Platform Usage Rate (IKPUR)
- Media Information Integrity Score (MIIS)
- Misinformation Correction Rate (MCR)
- Evidence-Based Civilizational Narrative Reach and Credibility Score (ECNRCS)
- Cross-Border Digital Interoperability Score (CBDIS)
- Open Data Publication Rate (ODPR)
- Privacy Compliance Rate (PCR)
- Digital Innovation Commercialization Rate (DICR)
- AI-Enabled Civilizational Governance Index (AECGI)



PART II — STRATEGIC PROGRESS INDICATORS (140)

1. Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy

(Strategic Dimension: Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Foundational Doctrine Literacy Strategic Progress Rate (FDLR-SPI)
- Core Creed Curriculum Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (CCCCR-SPI)
- Shared Foundational Principle Recognition Strategic Progress Rate (SFPRR-SPI)
- Doctrinal Source Competency Strategic Progress Rate (DSCR-SPI)
- Cross-School Doctrine Mapping Strategic Progress Completion Rate (CSDMCR-SPI)
- Joint Theological Forum Strategic Progress Participation Rate (JTFFPR-SPI)
- Theology Curriculum Peer-Review Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (TCPRCR-SPI)
- Doctrinal Dialogue Strategic Progress Resolution Rate (DDRR-SPI)
- Theological Evidence Traceability Strategic Progress Score (TETS-SPI)
- Theological Coherence Strategic Progress Index (TCPI-SPI)

2. Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal

(Strategic Dimension: Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Revelation-Reason Integration Strategic Progress Score (RRIS-SPI)
- Epistemic Method Literacy Strategic Progress Rate (EMLR-SPI)
- Usul al-Din Methodology Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (UDMCR-SPI)
- Classical-Contemporary Knowledge Integration Strategic Progress Index (CCKII-SPI)
- Interdisciplinary Ijtihad Project Strategic Progress Rate (IIPR-SPI)
- Evidence Hierarchy Clarity Strategic Progress Score (EHCS-SPI)
- Interpretive Method Transparency Strategic Progress Score (IMTS-SPI)
- Scholarly Source Verification Strategic Progress Rate (SSVR-SPI)
- Knowledge Claim Traceability Strategic Progress Rate (KCTR-SPI)
- Civilizational Knowledge Renewal Strategic Progress Index (CKRPI-SPI)

3. Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization

(Strategic Dimension: Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Comparative Fiqh Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (CFCR-SPI)
- Cross-Madhab Ruling Mapping Strategic Progress Completion Rate (CMRMCR-SPI)
- Common Ruling Identification Strategic Progress Rate (CRIR-SPI)
- Joint Ijtihad Initiative Strategic Progress Rate (JIIR-SPI)
- Emerging-Issue Joint Deliberation Strategic Progress Rate (EIJDR-SPI)
- Fatwa Evidence Traceability Strategic Progress Score (FETS-SPI)
- Legal School Representation Balance Strategic Progress Score (LSRBS-SPI)
- Harmonizable Ruling Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (HRAR-SPI)



5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities, Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Comparative Fiqh Curriculum Penetration Strategic Progress Rate (CFCPR-SPI)
- Fiqh Convergence Strategic Progress Index (FCPI-SPI)

4. Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy

(Strategic Dimension: Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Maqasid Alignment Rate of Policies Strategic Progress Measure (MARP-SPI)
- Public Interest Assessment Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (PIACR-SPI)
- Dignity Impact Assessment Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (DIACR-SPI)
- Justice Impact Assessment Quality Strategic Progress Score (JIAQS-SPI)
- Necessities Protection Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (NPCR-SPI)
- Harm Prevention Strategic Progress Effectiveness Rate (HPER-SPI)
- Policy Shariah Evidence Traceability Strategic Progress Score (PSETS-SPI)
- Cross-School Policy Consultation Strategic Progress Rate (CSPCR-SPI)
- Rights Compatibility Review Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (RCRCR-SPI)
- Maqasid Governance Strategic Progress Index (MGPI-SPI)

5. Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion

(Strategic Dimension: Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Shared Ummah Identity Strategic Progress Index (SUII-SPI)
- Cross-Community Trust Strategic Progress Rate (CCTR-SPI)
- Intra-Muslim Acceptance Strategic Progress Rate (IMAR-SPI)
- Common Citizenship Commitment Strategic Progress Rate (CCCR-SPI)
- Shared Heritage Awareness Strategic Progress Rate (SHAR-SPI)
- Intercommunity Friendship Strategic Progress Density (IFD-SPI)
- Cross-Sect Community Project Strategic Progress Rate (CSCPR-SPI)
- Youth Unity Engagement Strategic Progress Rate (YUER-SPI)
- Diaspora Connectivity Strategic Progress Index (DCI-SPI)
- Social Cohesion Strategic Progress Index (SCPI-SPI)

6. Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust

(Strategic Dimension: Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Adab al-Ikhtilaf Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (AICR-SPI)
- Dignified Dialogue Strategic Progress Score (DDS-SPI)
- Respectful Language Usage Strategic Progress Rate (RLUR-SPI)
- Ethical Mediation Success Strategic Progress Rate (EMSR-SPI)
- Trust Restoration Strategic Progress Rate (TRR-SPI)
- Mutual Empathy Strategic Progress Index (MEI-SPI)
- Dialogue Code Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (DCAR-SPI)



- Apology and Reconciliation Strategic Progress Completion Rate (ARCR-SPI)
- Ethical Facilitator Certification Strategic Progress Rate (EFCR-SPI)
- Ethical Dialogue Strategic Progress Index (EDPI-SPI)

7. Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics

(Strategic Dimension: Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Islamic Heritage Preservation Strategic Progress Rate (IHPR-SPI)
- Endangered Languages of Muslim Communities Support Strategic Progress Rate (ELMCSR-SPI)
- Manuscript Digitization Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (MDCR-SPI)
- Shared Cultural Production Strategic Progress Rate (SCPR-SPI)
- Cross-Regional Cultural Exchange Strategic Progress Rate (CRCER-SPI)
- Youth Heritage Literacy Strategic Progress Rate (YHLR-SPI)
- Heritage Site Conservation Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (HSCCR-SPI)
- Religiously and Culturally Inclusive Public Space Quality Strategic Progress Score (RCIPSQS-SPI)
- Heritage Knowledge Transmission Strategic Progress Rate (HKTR-SPI)
- Cultural Vitality Strategic Progress Index (CVPI-SPI)

8. Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination

(Strategic Dimension: Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Transnational Institutional Coordination Strategic Progress Score (TICS-SPI)
- Joint Policy Initiative Strategic Progress Rate (JPIR-SPI)
- OIC Decision Implementation Strategic Progress Rate (ODIR-SPI)
- Cross-Border Governance Agreement Implementation Strategic Progress Rate (CBGAIR-SPI)
- Institutional Mandate Clarity Strategic Progress Score (IMCS-SPI)
- Strategic Plan Alignment Strategic Progress Rate (SPAR-SPI)
- Shared Program Delivery Strategic Progress Rate (SPDR-SPI)
- Interinstitutional Data-Sharing Strategic Progress Rate (IDSR-SPI)
- Governance Decision Closure Strategic Progress Rate (GDCR-SPI)
- Transnational Governance Strategic Progress Index (TGPI-SPI)

9. Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability

(Strategic Dimension: Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Rule of Law Confidence Strategic Progress Index (RLCI-SPI)
- Justice Access Strategic Progress Rate (JAR-SPI)
- Case Resolution Timeliness Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (CRTCR-SPI)
- Mediation Settlement Strategic Progress Rate (MSR-SPI)
- Arbitration Enforcement Strategic Progress Rate (AER-SPI)
- Judicial Independence Perception Strategic Progress Index (JIPI-SPI)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Public Sector Integrity Strategic Progress Rate (PSIR-SPI)
- Legal Aid Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (LACR-SPI)
- Rights Violation Redress Strategic Progress Rate (RVRR-SPI)
- Civilizational Justice Strategic Progress Index (CJPI-SPI)

10. Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity

(Strategic Dimension: Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Civic Participation Strategic Progress Rate (CPR-SPI)
- Community Consultation Reach Strategic Progress Rate (CCRR-SPI)
- Civil Society Organization Strategic Progress Density (CSOD-SPI)
- Youth Civic Leadership Strategic Progress Rate (YCLR-SPI)
- Women's Decision Participation Strategic Progress Rate (WDPR-SPI)
- Marginalized Group Representation Strategic Progress Rate (MGRR-SPI)
- Volunteer Mobilization Strategic Progress Rate (VMR-SPI)
- Community-Led Initiative Strategic Progress Completion Rate (CLICR-SPI)
- Participatory Budgeting Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (PBAR-SPI)
- Community Empowerment Strategic Progress Index (CEPI-SPI)

11. Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital

(Strategic Dimension: Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Civilizational Studies Curriculum Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (CSCCR-SPI)
- Islamic Research Quality Strategic Progress Index (IRQI-SPI)
- Cross-University Collaboration Strategic Progress Rate (CUCR-SPI)
- Joint Degree Program Strategic Progress Count (JDPC-SPI)
- Scholar Mobility Strategic Progress Rate (SMR-SPI)
- Student Exchange Strategic Progress Participation Rate (SXPR-SPI)
- Open Knowledge Access Strategic Progress Rate (OKAR-SPI)
- Research Integrity Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (RICR-SPI)
- Academic-Policy Translation Strategic Progress Rate (APTR-SPI)
- Civilizational Human Capital Strategic Progress Index (CHCPI-SPI)

12. Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity

(Strategic Dimension: Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Intra-OIC Trade Strategic Progress Share (IOTS-SPI)
- Cross-Border Investment Strategic Progress Growth Rate (CBIGR-SPI)
- Halal Market Integration Strategic Progress Index (HMII-SPI)
- Islamic Finance Inclusion Strategic Progress Rate (IFIR-SPI)
- Waqf Asset Productivity Strategic Progress Rate (WAPR-SPI)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Waqf Social Impact Yield Strategic Progress Measure (WSIY-SPI)
- Zakat Delivery Strategic Progress Effectiveness Rate (ZDER-SPI)
- SME Cross-Border Market Access Strategic Progress Rate (SCBMAR-SPI)
- Ethical Investment Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (EICR-SPI)
- Shared Prosperity Strategic Progress Index (SPPI-SPI)

13. Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience

(Strategic Dimension: Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Environmental Stewardship Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (ESCR-SPI)
- Renewable Energy Strategic Progress Share (RES-SPI)
- Carbon Intensity Strategic Progress Reduction Rate (CIRR-SPI)
- Water Security Strategic Progress Index (WSI-SPI)
- Sustainable Agriculture Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (SAAR-SPI)
- Biodiversity Protection Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (BPCR-SPI)
- Climate Adaptation Plan Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (CAPCR-SPI)
- Disaster Preparedness Readiness Strategic Progress Score (DPRS-SPI)
- Circular Economy Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (CEAR-SPI)
- Ecological Resilience Strategic Progress Index (ERPI-SPI)

14. Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication

(Strategic Dimension: Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication; Meta-Pillar: Technological and Digital Capability)

- Digital Public Service Strategic Progress Adoption Rate (DPSAR-SPI)
- Data Governance Strategic Progress Maturity Score (DGMS-SPI)
- Master Data Quality Strategic Progress Rate (MDQR-SPI)
- Data Lineage Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (DLCR-SPI)
- AI Governance Strategic Progress Compliance Rate (AIGCR-SPI)
- Algorithmic Impact Assessment Strategic Progress Coverage Rate (AIACR-SPI)
- Responsible AI Review Strategic Progress Rate (RAIR-SPI)
- Cyber Resilience Strategic Progress Index (CRI-SPI)
- Digital Inclusion Strategic Progress Rate (DIR-SPI)
- Digital Civilization Strategic Progress Index (DCPI-SPI)



PART III — CRISIS WARNING INDICATORS (140)

1. Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy

(Strategic Dimension: Theological Coherence and Doctrinal Literacy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Doctrinal Misrepresentation Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (DMIR-CWI)
- Sectarian Stereotype Crisis Warning Prevalence Rate (SSPR-CWI)
- Unverified Doctrinal Claim Crisis Warning Rate (UDCR-CWI)
- Takfir-Related Incident Crisis Warning Rate (TRIR-CWI)
- Doctrinal Boundary Ambiguity Crisis Warning Score (DBAS-CWI)
- Theological Exclusion Complaint Crisis Warning Rate (TECR-CWI)
- Cross-School Representation Imbalance Crisis Warning Index (CSRII-CWI)
- Polemical Escalation Crisis Warning Rate (PER-CWI)
- Doctrinal Dialogue Breakdown Crisis Warning Rate (DDBR-CWI)
- Theological Fragmentation Crisis Warning Index (TFRI-CWI)

2. Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal

(Strategic Dimension: Epistemic Integration, Revelation-Reason and Methodological Renewal; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Methodological Bias Detection Crisis Warning Failure Rate (MBDFR-CWI)
- Unverified Religious Claim Crisis Warning Rate (URCR-CWI)
- Interpretive Method Opaqueness Crisis Warning Score (IMOS-CWI)
- Epistemic Conflict Escalation Crisis Warning Rate (ECER-CWI)
- Source Attribution Crisis Warning Error Rate (SAER-CWI)
- Contemporary Issue Response Crisis Warning Delay (CIRD-CWI)
- Epistemic Silo Crisis Warning Index (ESI-CWI)
- Hermeneutic Competency Gap Crisis Warning Rate (HCGR-CWI)
- Knowledge Reproducibility Crisis Warning Failure Rate (KRFR-CWI)
- Epistemic Integrity Crisis Warning Index (EIRI-CWI)

3. Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization

(Strategic Dimension: Comparative Jurisprudence and Legal Harmonization; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Divergence Documentation Defect Crisis Warning Rate (DDDR-CWI)
- Sectarian Legal Discrimination Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (SLDIR-CWI)
- Fatwa Source Verification Crisis Warning Failure Rate (FSVFR-CWI)
- Cross-School Legal Exclusion Crisis Warning Rate (CSLER-CWI)
- Jurisprudential Conflict Escalation Crisis Warning Rate (JCER-CWI)
- Novel-Issue Legal Response Crisis Warning Delay (NILRD-CWI)
- Fatwa Database Interoperability Gap Crisis Warning Score (FDIGS-CWI)
- Conflicting Fatwa Proliferation Crisis Warning Rate (CFPR-CWI)



5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities, Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Jurisprudential Mediation Crisis Warning Failure Rate (JMFR-CWI)
- Jurisprudential Fragmentation Crisis Warning Index (JFRI-CWI)

4. Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy

(Strategic Dimension: Maqasid-Based Law and Public Policy; Meta-Pillar: Epistemic, Theological and Jurisprudential Foundations)

- Unintended Harm Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (UHIR-CWI)
- Vulnerable Group Safeguard Crisis Warning Failure Rate (VGSFR-CWI)
- Policy Legitimacy Deficit Crisis Warning Score (PLDS-CWI)
- Rights Incompatibility Finding Crisis Warning Rate (RIFR-CWI)
- Regulatory Response Crisis Warning Delay (RRD-CWI)
- Maqasid Misalignment Crisis Warning Rate (MMR-CWI)
- Policy Coherence Gap Crisis Warning Index (PCGI-CWI)
- Ethical Regulation Noncompliance Crisis Warning Rate (ERNR-CWI)
- Fatwa-to-Policy Distortion Crisis Warning Rate (FPDR-CWI)
- Maqasid Governance Crisis Warning Index (MGRI-CWI)

5. Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion

(Strategic Dimension: Ummah Identity and Social Cohesion; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Sectarian Social Distance Crisis Warning Index (SSDI-CWI)
- Social Polarization Crisis Warning Rate (SPR-CWI)
- Identity-Based Discrimination Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (IBDIR-CWI)
- Identity-Based Violence Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (IBVIR-CWI)
- Minority Muslim Exclusion Crisis Warning Rate (MMER-CWI)
- Shared Ritual Disrespect Incident Crisis Warning Rate (SRDIR-CWI)
- Intercommunity Trust Erosion Crisis Warning Rate (ICTER-CWI)
- Identity Misinformation Exposure Crisis Warning Rate (IMER-CWI)
- Community Segregation Crisis Warning Index (CSI-CWI)
- Ummah Fragmentation Crisis Warning Index (UFRI-CWI)

6. Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust

(Strategic Dimension: Ethics of Difference, Dignity and Trust; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Dehumanizing Speech Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (DHSIR-CWI)
- Hate Speech Crisis Warning Prevalence Rate (HSPR-CWI)
- Retaliatory Rhetoric Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (RRIR-CWI)
- Grievance Acknowledgment Crisis Warning Failure Rate (GAFR-CWI)
- Rumor Correction Crisis Warning Delay (RCD-CWI)
- Safeguarding Breach Crisis Warning Rate (SBR-CWI)
- Ethical Breach Recurrence Crisis Warning Rate (EBRR-CWI)



- Dialogue Participant Withdrawal Crisis Warning Rate (DPWR-CWI)
- Intergroup Fairness Deficit Crisis Warning Score (IFDS-CWI)
- Dignity and Trust Crisis Warning Index (DTRI-CWI)

7. Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics

(Strategic Dimension: Culture, Language, Heritage and Civilizational Aesthetics; Meta-Pillar: Identity, Culture, Ethics and Aesthetics)

- Heritage Loss Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (HLIR-CWI)
- Cultural Stereotype Crisis Warning Prevalence Rate (CSPR-CWI)
- Language Endangerment Acceleration Crisis Warning Rate (LEAR-CWI)
- Manuscript Deterioration Crisis Warning Rate (MDRR-CWI)
- Cultural Narrative Exclusion Crisis Warning Index (CNEI-CWI)
- Traditional Craft Attrition Crisis Warning Rate (TCAR-CWI)
- Heritage Site Noncompliance Crisis Warning Rate (HSNCR-CWI)
- Cultural Appropriation Dispute Crisis Warning Rate (CADR-CWI)
- Civilizational Memory Discontinuity Crisis Warning Score (CMDS-CWI)
- Cultural Erosion Crisis Warning Index (CERI-CWI)

8. Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination

(Strategic Dimension: Transnational Institutions and Governance Coordination; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Governance Role Duplication Crisis Warning Rate (GRDR-CWI)
- Joint Budget Execution Variance Crisis Warning Rate (JBEVR-CWI)
- Leadership Continuity Gap Crisis Warning Score (LCGS-CWI)
- Succession Plan Coverage Gap Crisis Warning Rate (SPCGR-CWI)
- Stakeholder Representation Imbalance Crisis Warning Index (SRII-CWI)
- Institutional Accountability Breach Crisis Warning Rate (IABR-CWI)
- Cross-Country Policy Conflict Crisis Warning Rate (CCPCR-CWI)
- Interinstitutional Data-Sharing Crisis Warning Failure Rate (IDSFR-CWI)
- Transnational Institutional Trust Decline Crisis Warning Rate (TITDR-CWI)
- Transnational Governance Failure Crisis Warning Index (TGFRI-CWI)

9. Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability

(Strategic Dimension: Rule of Law, Justice, Mediation and Accountability; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Anti-Corruption Control Crisis Warning Failure Rate (ACCFR-CWI)
- Due Process Violation Crisis Warning Rate (DPVR-CWI)
- Impunity Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (IIR-CWI)
- Audit Finding Recurrence Crisis Warning Rate (AFRR-CWI)
- Conflict-of-Interest Nondisclosure Crisis Warning Rate (CINR-CWI)
- Whistleblower Retaliation Crisis Warning Rate (WBRR-CWI)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Judicial Data Opacity Crisis Warning Score (JDOS-CWI)
- Cross-Jurisdiction Dispute Backlog Crisis Warning Rate (CJDBR-CWI)
- Restorative Justice Crisis Warning Failure Rate (RJFR-CWI)
- Justice and Accountability Crisis Warning Index (JARI-CWI)

10. Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity

(Strategic Dimension: Civic Participation, Inclusion and Community Capacity; Meta-Pillar: Socio-Political and Governance Capacity)

- Participation Equity Crisis Warning Gap (PEG-CWI)
- Community Grievance Resolution Crisis Warning Failure Rate (CGRFR-CWI)
- Civic Space Restriction Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (CSRIR-CWI)
- Grassroots Funding Concentration Risk Crisis Warning Measure (GFCR-CWI)
- Local Institution Capacity Deficit Crisis Warning Score (LICDS-CWI)
- Public Consultation Nonresponse Crisis Warning Rate (PCNRR-CWI)
- Volunteer Attrition Crisis Warning Rate (VAR-CWI)
- Community Resilience Network Fragmentation Crisis Warning Score (CRNFS-CWI)
- Elite Capture Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (ECIR-CWI)
- Civic Exclusion and Capacity Crisis Warning Index (CECRI-CWI)

11. Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital

(Strategic Dimension: Education, Research, Innovation and Human Capital; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Research Misconduct Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (RMIR-CWI)
- Curriculum Obsolescence Crisis Warning Rate (COR-CWI)
- Brain Drain Crisis Warning Rate (BDR-CWI)
- Comparative Studies Faculty Capacity Crisis Warning Gap (CSFCG-CWI)
- Critical Thinking Competency Deficit Crisis Warning Rate (CTCDR-CWI)
- Digital Scholarship Exclusion Crisis Warning Rate (DSER-CWI)
- Graduate Employability Gap Crisis Warning Rate (GEGR-CWI)
- Women's Advanced Scholarship Participation Crisis Warning Gap (WASPG-CWI)
- Research Funding Concentration Risk Crisis Warning Measure (RFCR-CWI)
- Knowledge and Human Capital Crisis Warning Index (KHCRI-CWI)

12. Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity

(Strategic Dimension: Islamic Economic Cooperation, Waqf and Shared Prosperity; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Economic Dependency Crisis Warning Index (EDI-CWI)
- Income Inequality Gap Crisis Warning Index (IIGI-CWI)
- Youth Unemployment Crisis Warning Rate (YUR-CWI)
- Women's Economic Exclusion Crisis Warning Rate (WEER-CWI)
- Supply Chain Disruption Crisis Warning Rate (SCDR-CWI)



- Waqf Asset Underutilization Crisis Warning Rate (WAUR-CWI)
- Zakat Leakage and Exclusion Crisis Warning Rate (ZLER-CWI)
- Social Enterprise Crisis Warning Failure Rate (SEFR-CWI)
- Illicit Finance Exposure Crisis Warning Rate (IFER-CWI)
- Economic Vulnerability Crisis Warning Index (EVRI-CWI)

13. Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience

(Strategic Dimension: Environmental Stewardship, Resource Security and Climate Resilience; Meta-Pillar: Human Capital, Economic and Environmental Stewardship)

- Climate Risk Exposure Crisis Warning Index (CREI-CWI)
- Water Stress Crisis Warning Rate (WSR-CWI)
- Food Insecurity Crisis Warning Rate (FIR-CWI)
- Air Quality Noncompliance Crisis Warning Rate (AQNCR-CWI)
- Ecosystem Degradation Crisis Warning Rate (EDR-CWI)
- Waste Leakage Crisis Warning Rate (WLR-CWI)
- Environmental Justice Complaint Backlog Crisis Warning Rate (EJCBR-CWI)
- Disaster Recovery Crisis Warning Delay (DRD-CWI)
- Greenwashing Crisis Warning Incidence Rate (GIR-CWI)
- Ecological Crisis Warning Index (ECRI-CWI)

14. Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication

(Strategic Dimension: Digital Transformation, AI, Data Governance and Public Communication; Meta-Pillar: Technological and Digital Capability)

- Critical Infrastructure Cyber Incident Crisis Warning Rate (CICIR-CWI)
- Data Privacy Breach Crisis Warning Rate (DPBR-CWI)
- Algorithmic Bias Incident Crisis Warning Rate (ABIR-CWI)
- AI Model Validation Crisis Warning Failure Rate (AIMVFR-CWI)
- Misinformation Exposure Crisis Warning Rate (MER-CWI)
- Media Information Integrity Deficit Crisis Warning Score (MIIDS-CWI)
- Digital Exclusion Crisis Warning Gap (DEG-CWI)
- Cross-Border Interoperability Crisis Warning Failure Rate (CBIFR-CWI)
- Open Data Misuse Incident Crisis Warning Rate (ODMIR-CWI)
- Digital and AI Governance Crisis Warning Index (DAGRI-CWI)