WESTERN HEMISPHERE READINESS SERIES

HRS RESILIENCE FOUNDATION

# Western Hemisphere Strategic Infrastructure & Resilience

*Integrated Critical Infrastructure, Strategic Connectivity, and Long-Horizon Resilience*


| PUBLICATION TYPE | PRIMARY ENVIRONMENT | EDITION |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Independent sector readiness assessment | Western Hemisphere | September 2026 |
| **SERIES POSITION** | **AUTHOR** | **INSTITUTION** |
| Sector Readiness Assessment 10 | André Vieira | HRS Resilience Foundation |

# CONTENTS


— Executive Summary 3

01 Infrastructure as a System 4

02 From Sector Readiness to System Readiness 5

03 The HRS System Resilience Architecture 6

04 Critical Dependencies Across the Nine Sectors 7

05 Strategic Nodes, Corridors and Chokepoints 8

06 Energy–Digital–Industrial Nexus 9

07 Materials–Manufacturing–Logistics Nexus 10

08 Food–Medical–Infrastructure Nexus 11

09 Cascading Failure and Compound Disruption 12

10 Foreign Strategic Participation and Infrastructure Dependency 13

11 Infrastructure Optionality and Effective Redundancy 14

12 The HRS System Readiness Test 15

13 Western Hemisphere Strategic Infrastructure Landscape 16

14 Implications for the United States 17

15 50–100 Year Infrastructure Horizon 18

16 HRS Research Priorities and Decision Framework 19

17 Conclusion 20

— Methodology, Research Integrity and Limitations 21

— Selected Bibliography and Sources 22


*About this series. The Western Hemisphere Readiness Series is an independent program of HRS Resilience Foundation research. Each assessment applies the HRS analytical constructs to a critical sector. SRA 10 extends the series to the system level by examining the dependencies and alternative pathways connecting SRA 01–09.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# The Case for System-Level Resilience

The first nine HRS Sector Readiness Assessments examine critical systems that support modern economic, public-service and security functions: telecommunications and digital infrastructure; data centers, cloud and artificial intelligence; critical minerals; rare earths; energy and power infrastructure; ports and logistics; food and agricultural systems; pharmaceutical and medical supply chains; and advanced manufacturing.

SRA 10 addresses the next analytical question: what happens when these systems are treated as one interconnected infrastructure architecture? A power interruption can degrade communications, data centers, water systems, manufacturing and logistics. A port disruption can constrain minerals, energy equipment, food, medicines and industrial inputs. A material shortage can become a manufacturing problem; a manufacturing problem can become an infrastructure-repair problem; and a digital disruption can reduce the ability of institutions to detect, coordinate and recover.

The HRS approach therefore shifts from sector readiness to system readiness. The relevant unit of analysis is the critical function and the set of pathways required to keep that function operating. The question is not whether every asset can be protected from every disruption. It is whether essential functions have sufficient alternatives, recovery capacity and institutional authority to remain viable when one or more dependencies fail.

The 2026 U.S. policy environment makes this system-level question particularly relevant. The National Resilience Strategy places resilience across national security, economic, public health and infrastructure reliability domains and emphasizes risk prioritization, modernization, distributed responsibility and affordability. The 2026 National Defense Strategy emphasizes the defense industrial base. Federal energy actions identify grid infrastructure, supply chains and large-scale energy infrastructure as matters relevant to national defense.[1–5]

HRS treats these policies descriptively. The assessment does not depend on any single administration, slogan or political program. Its long-horizon architecture is built around durable institutional interests: national security, reliable infrastructure, economic strength, industrial capacity, freedom of action, secure supply chains, and the ability of sovereign states to maintain essential functions.

Across the Western Hemisphere, the objective is resilient optionality: multiple credible pathways for energy, information, materials, production, transport, food, medical supplies and emergency response. This does not require uniform policies, common ownership, or identical development models. Sovereign governments retain full authority over their resources, infrastructure, regulation, procurement and international relationships.

> *HRS System-Level Finding — A resilient infrastructure architecture is one in which disruption at a critical node does not automatically become disruption of the essential function that node supports.*

SECTION 01

# Infrastructure as a System

Infrastructure is often organized administratively by sector, but essential functions do not operate that way. Electricity, telecommunications, transportation, water, industrial production, food distribution, medical supply and public safety are operationally coupled. A system can therefore appear healthy when measured asset-by-asset while remaining fragile at the points where sectors intersect.

SRA 01 established the cross-sector character of communications infrastructure: communications support energy, transportation, water, emergency services, information technology and financial services, while communications themselves depend on energy, information technology and transportation.[6] SRA 05 similarly identifies electricity as a strategic operating layer for industry, telecommunications, data centers, transportation, health, water, agriculture and defense-supporting activity.[7]

| SYSTEM LAYER | EXAMPLES | SYSTEM-LEVEL QUESTION |
|---|---|---|
| **Physical** | Power plants, grids, ports, roads, rail, pipelines, facilities | Can the physical pathway continue or be restored? |
| **Digital** | Telecom, cloud, control systems, data, software | Can information and operational control continue? |
| **Industrial** | Factories, machine tools, components, repair capacity | Can critical goods be produced, repaired or replaced? |
| **Logistics** | Ports, corridors, warehouses, customs, inland transport | Can critical flows be rerouted? |
| **Resource** | Energy, minerals, water, agricultural inputs | Are critical inputs available and substitutable? |
| **Institutional** | Authorities, contracts, regulation, emergency procedures | Can decisions be made and implemented quickly? |

HRS does not assume that integration is always beneficial. Tighter coupling can improve efficiency while increasing the speed with which failures propagate. The objective is therefore not maximum interconnection; it is controlled interconnection with sufficient alternatives.

SECTION 02

# From Sector Readiness to System Readiness

The nine preceding assessments form an evidence base rather than nine isolated publications. Each contributes a specific capability to the system-level picture.

| SRA | PRIMARY CONTRIBUTION | SYSTEM RELEVANCE |
|---|---|---|
| **01** | Connectivity, digital dependency, cyber/operational continuity | Information and coordination layer |
| **02** | Compute, cloud, power, cooling, hardware and workload continuity | Digital processing layer |
| **03** | Resources, processing, refining, reserves and substitutability | Material input layer |
| **04** | Mine-to-magnet chain and processing concentration | Specialized industrial input layer |
| **05** | Generation, transmission, storage, fuel and restoration | Core operating-energy layer |
| **06** | Gateways, corridors, chokepoints, operational technology and recovery | Physical flow layer |
| **07** | Inputs, production, processing, storage and distribution | Essential-goods layer |
| **08** | Active ingredients, manufacturing, cold chain, equipment and reserves | Health-security layer |
| **09** | Production depth, tooling, workforce and transferability | Production and repair layer |
| **10** | Interdependency, cascading failure and alternative pathways | System-readiness layer |

SRA 09 explicitly connects materials, energy, logistics, technology and workforce to industrial capacity and recommends considering the assessments together when evaluating hemispheric resilience.[8] SRA 08 similarly links medical continuity to energy, ports, logistics and food systems

SRA 10 does not replace the earlier assessments. It provides the analytical layer in which their findings can be tested against common scenarios, shared dependencies and competing recovery requirements.

SECTION 03

# The HRS System Resilience Architecture

HRS defines the Western Hemisphere Resilience Architecture as an analytical model, not a political organization, treaty, common authority or ownership structure. It describes the functional relationships among critical systems and the conditions under which sovereign states and institutions can preserve essential operations.

| HRS FUNCTION | DEFINITION AT SYSTEM LEVEL |
|---|---|
| **Baseline** | Map assets, services, dependencies, ownership, corridors and institutional responsibilities. |
| **Exposure** | Identify physical, digital, financial, geographic, technological and external-source exposure. |
| **Dependency** | Determine which inputs, suppliers, routes, technologies or decisions are non-substitutable. |
| **Continuity** | Test whether essential functions can continue under degraded conditions. |
| **Recovery** | Measure the time, resources and authorities required to restore lost capability. |
| **Adaptation** | Determine whether the system can change before accumulated dependencies become systemic constraints. |

SRA 01–09 provide the sector evidence base; SRA 10 evaluates the connections among the nine sectors — digital infrastructure, data and artificial intelligence, materials, rare earths, energy, maritime and logistics, food, medical supply, and manufacturing.

At system level, every stage must consider cross-sector consequences. A decision that improves readiness in one sector while creating a new single point of failure in another is not automatically a resilience improvement.

SECTION 04

# Critical Dependencies Across the Nine Sectors

A critical dependency exists when loss of an input, service, route, technology, supplier or institutional function can materially impair an essential capability and replacement is not available within an acceptable period.

| DEPENDENCY | PRIMARY SECTORS AFFECTED | TYPICAL PROPAGATION PATH |
|---|---|---|
| **Electricity** | 01, 02, 06, 07, 08, 09 | Power loss → communications/compute/production/logistics disruption |
| **Telecommunications / data** | 01, 02, 06, 09 | Connectivity loss → control/data/coordination degradation |
| **Critical materials** | 03, 04, 09, 05 | Material shortage → equipment/manufacturing/energy constraints |
| **Ports & corridors** | 03, 04, 05, 07, 08, 09 | Gateway disruption → delayed inputs and finished goods |
| **Industrial equipment** | 05, 06, 08, 09 | Equipment shortage → slower repair/expansion/recovery |
| **Water** | 05, 07, 08, 09 | Water interruption → generation, agriculture, processing, manufacturing impacts |
| **Workforce** | 01, 02, 05, 06, 08, 09 | Skill shortage → maintenance, repair and recovery delays |
| **Finance / contracts** | 03, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09 | Capital/contract disruption → delayed procurement and project execution |

> *The HRS Strategic Dependency Test asks: What fails? What depends on it? How quickly does the effect propagate? Is there an independent substitute? Can the substitute operate at required scale? Who has authority to activate it? How long can the essential function remain degraded?*

Multiple assets do not constitute meaningful redundancy if they share the same upstream dependency, technology platform, energy source, corridor or maintenance ecosystem. SRA 06 formalizes this through route, facility, equipment, supplier and decision-authority levels.[10]

SECTION 05

# Strategic Nodes, Corridors and Chokepoints

System resilience is shaped disproportionately by nodes that connect multiple sectors or geographic regions. A strategic node may be a port, power substation, transmission corridor, data center, cable landing station, industrial cluster, refinery, mine-to-processing link, railway junction, water system, warehouse network or specialized repair facility.

| NODE TYPE | CONNECTED FUNCTIONS | PRIORITY READINESS TEST |
|---|---|---|
| **Maritime gateway** | Minerals, food, energy equipment, medical goods, manufacturing | Alternative port + inland route + equipment + information pathway |
| **Energy node** | Generation, transmission, fuel, industrial load | Alternative generation + transmission + restoration capacity |
| **Digital node** | Telecom, cloud, data, government, finance | Independent connectivity + power + compute + recovery |
| **Industrial cluster** | Manufacturing, workforce, suppliers, energy, logistics | Production transfer + tooling + workforce + upstream alternatives |
| **Resource corridor** | Mine, rail/road, port, processing facility | Processing alternative + transport alternative + stockpile |
| **Medical node** | Active ingredients, manufacturing, packaging, cold chain, distribution | Qualified alternate production + reserves + logistics |

HRS defines a strategic chokepoint as a location or system component where loss of capacity produces consequences materially larger than the physical size of the asset itself. The objective is not to eliminate all chokepoints. It is to understand their system consequences and ensure that essential functions retain alternatives.

A mineral chain may have multiple mines but one processing pathway. A manufacturing network may have multiple factories but one machine-tool supplier. A digital system may have multiple data centers but depend on the same regional grid or carrier. These are examples of nominal rather than effective redundancy.

SECTION 06

# Energy–Digital–Industrial Nexus

Energy is a foundational operating layer because digital infrastructure and industrial production increasingly require continuous, high-quality electricity. The 2026 Department of Energy Office of Electricity strategic plan identifies scaling for new load, reliability, security, resilience and supply-chain security as core grid challenges. The Department of Energy has also highlighted constraints involving transformers, circuit breakers, substations and power electronics.[11–12]

Reliability work by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation shows that rapidly increasing demand, including demand associated with data centers and the digital economy, is becoming a material reliability-planning issue for the North American bulk power system.[13]

| DEPENDENCY | FAILURE CONSEQUENCE | RESILIENCE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| **Generation adequacy** | Load shedding / curtailed industrial operations | Diverse dependable capacity and demand management |
| **Transmission capacity** | Generation unavailable to constrained load | Transmission alternatives and restoration capability |
| **Transformers / grid equipment** | Extended repair or expansion delays | Supplier depth, standardization, refurbishment and domestic capacity |
| **Control systems** | Operational degradation | Segmentation, secure alternatives, manual procedures |
| **Data centers** | Loss of compute and digital services | Geographic diversity, workload portability, power diversity |
| **Industrial workforce** | Longer repair / expansion cycles | Training pipelines, cross-skilling and knowledge retention |

HRS does not prescribe a universal energy mix. The system-readiness question is whether the chosen architecture can meet essential demand, recover from credible disruption and preserve the ability to adapt as technology and demand change.

SECTION 07

# Materials–Manufacturing–Logistics Nexus

SRA 03 and SRA 04 establish that possession of minerals is not equivalent to strategic readiness. Processing, refining, transport, manufacturing, recycling and qualified industrial demand determine whether a resource can become usable capability. SRA 09 extends the chain into production depth, tooling, workforce, equipment and transferability.[14–15]

This creates a circular dependency. Manufacturing requires materials and logistics; logistics requires energy and equipment; energy infrastructure requires materials and manufacturing; and the industrial base requires logistics to deliver both inputs and finished equipment.

| CHAIN | PRIMARY DEPENDENCY | SYSTEM-LEVEL VULNERABILITY |
|---|---|---|
| **Resource → processing** | Power, water, technology, equipment | Extraction without transformation capacity |
| **Processing → manufacturing** | Qualified materials, transport, contracts | Single processing pathway |
| **Manufacturing → deployment** | Ports, rail, roads, warehousing | Production without delivery capacity |
| **Repair → restoration** | Spare parts, machine tools, workforce | Long recovery due to specialized equipment |
| **Recycling → secondary supply** | Collection, processing, technology | Loss of potential substitute material |

The system-level priority is production optionality. A resilient architecture preserves more than one credible pathway from strategic input to usable capability. Where full duplication is inefficient, inventories, repair capacity, modular design, qualified substitutes and preplanned transfer arrangements can create additional options.

SECTION 08

# Food–Medical–Infrastructure Nexus

Food and medical systems are often evaluated as end-use sectors, but both depend on the same underlying infrastructure. Food production and distribution require energy, water, fertilizer, machinery, storage, transportation and digital systems. Pharmaceutical and medical supply chains require energy, water, specialized equipment, packaging, logistics, cold chain, data and skilled labor.[16–17]

This creates common-mode risks. A major power failure, port closure, fuel shortage, cyber incident or transportation disruption can affect food and medical continuity simultaneously. The system-level response should therefore avoid designing each sector's emergency architecture independently when the sectors share underlying dependencies.

| SHARED LAYER | FOOD EXPOSURE | MEDICAL EXPOSURE |
|---|---|---|
| **Energy** | Irrigation, processing, refrigeration, transport | Manufacturing, sterilization, cold chain, facilities |
| **Water** | Production, processing | Manufacturing, cleaning, quality systems |
| **Logistics** | Inputs, storage, export/import flows | Active ingredients, equipment, finished medicines |
| **Digital** | Market coordination, farm operations, logistics | Quality, inventory, traceability, distribution |
| **Manufacturing** | Machinery, fertilizer, processing equipment | Active ingredients, devices, packaging, diagnostics |
| **Workforce** | Agriculture, logistics, processing | Manufacturing, laboratory, technical services |

HRS uses the concept of critical-function continuity: when a shared dependency fails, priority should be given to maintaining essential functions whose interruption creates the greatest secondary consequences. This requires pre-identified alternatives, reserves and decision authority.

SECTION 09

# Cascading Failure and Compound Disruption

A cascading failure occurs when disruption in one system activates dependencies in other systems, increasing the scale or duration of the original event. Compound disruption occurs when two or more stresses interact so that recovery is materially harder than under either stress alone.

The HRS system-level framework distinguishes physical propagation (failure of a route or facility), functional propagation (loss of a service required by another system), and decision propagation (institutional overload, conflicting priorities or unclear authority).

| SCENARIO | PRIMARY SHOCK | POTENTIAL CASCADE |
|---|---|---|
| **Grid equipment shortage** | Transformer failure / long replacement time | Power restoration delay → telecom, water, industry, health |
| **Port closure + fuel constraint** | Gateway unavailable while fuel supply tightens | Rerouting congestion → agriculture, medical, manufacturing |
| **Cyber incident + workforce shortage** | Operational technology degraded | Slower diagnosis/recovery → prolonged physical disruption |
| **Mineral processing interruption** | Refining unavailable | Manufacturing shortage → equipment repair/energy expansion delays |
| **Major data-center outage** | Compute unavailable | Government, finance, logistics and industrial coordination degraded |
| **Logistics disruption + medical shortage** | Transport constrained while supply is low | Hospital inventory depletion → emergency procurement pressure |

These are stress tests, not predictions. The appropriate output is a readiness finding: which dependency would become decisive, how long the function could operate, and what alternative could be activated?

SECTION 10

# Foreign Strategic Participation and Infrastructure Dependency

Foreign investment, ownership, construction, technology or operation is not treated by HRS as inherently harmful. The analytical question is whether a particular form of participation creates a dependency that materially constrains security, continuity, data access, maintenance, substitution or sovereign decision-making.

The 2026 U.S. policy environment has placed greater attention on strategic infrastructure and foreign-source dependencies. A White House action on the bulk-power system in August 2026 directs attention to foreign-produced equipment, associated software and lifecycle mechanisms where risks could affect critical infrastructure.[4]

The U.S. Southern Command's 2026 posture statement to Congress places Western Hemisphere security, strategic access and infrastructure within a broader defense context.[18] Independent research from U.S. policy institutions also examines foreign infrastructure participation and U.S. investment across energy, digital infrastructure, manufacturing and services.[19–20]

| VARIABLE | LOWER EXPOSURE | HIGHER EXPOSURE |
|---|---|---|
| **Control** | Multiple independent operators / clear authority | Single operator with strategic control |
| **Technology** | Interoperable / replaceable | Proprietary / difficult to replace |
| **Maintenance** | Multiple qualified providers | Single external maintenance ecosystem |
| **Data** | Transparent access and governance | Opaque or externally controlled critical data |
| **Supply** | Multiple independent sources | Common upstream source |
| **Recovery** | Domestic/regional repair capability | External repair dependency |
| **Sovereign authority** | Clear practical ability to direct/substitute | Limited practical alternatives |

HRS does not recommend categorical exclusion of any foreign partner, technology or supplier. It recommends project-by-project strategic dependency analysis with explicit continuity, security, lifecycle and substitution requirements — a determination that remains the exclusive prerogative of the sovereign government concerned.

SECTION 11

# Infrastructure Optionality and Effective Redundancy

Infrastructure optionality is the capacity to maintain an essential function through more than one credible pathway. It is distinct from simple duplication. Two facilities can share the same power corridor, network provider, software platform, equipment supplier, port, water source or workforce pool and therefore fail together.

| LEVEL | QUESTION | EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE REDUNDANCY |
|---|---|---|
| **Route** | Can flows move another way? | Validated alternate corridor with adequate capacity |
| **Facility** | Can another site perform the function? | Qualified facility with required inputs and approvals |
| **Equipment** | Can the failed component be replaced? | Compatible spare / alternate equipment / repair capability |
| **Supplier** | Can another supplier deliver? | Independent qualified supplier with real capacity |
| **Decision authority** | Can the alternative be activated? | Predefined authority, contract, procedure and resources |

The strongest form of optionality is not necessarily the most expensive. Standardization, spare parts, modularity, interoperability, geographic diversity, emergency contracts or small strategic inventories can create more resilience than full asset duplication.

HRS ECONOMIC QUESTION

*What is the least-cost intervention that creates a materially independent alternative to a critical dependency?*

SECTION 12

# The HRS System Readiness Test

SRA 10 consolidates the sector methodologies into a system-level test. It is a decision framework rather than a numerical score.

| STAGE | SYSTEM QUESTION | ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Dependency** | What must remain available? | Critical inputs, services, routes, technologies |
| **2. Exposure** | Where can it fail? | Geography, concentration, cyber, physical, external-source |
| **3. Interconnection** | What else depends on it? | Cross-sector dependency map, cascade pathways |
| **4. Substitutability** | What can replace it? | Qualified alternatives, transferability, interoperability |
| **5. Continuity** | How long can essential functions operate? | Reserves, degraded operations, alternate capacity |
| **6. Recovery** | How quickly can capability return? | Repair time, procurement lead time, workforce, authority |
| **7. Adaptation** | Can the system change before vulnerability accumulates? | Technology refresh, infrastructure lifecycle, institutional learning |

A system is structurally stronger when critical dependencies are visible, alternative pathways are credible, activation authority is clear, recovery capacity is measurable, and lessons from disruption change future design.

A system is structurally exposed when a critical function depends on concentrated inputs, shared upstream dependencies, long replacement cycles, opaque technology, limited repair capability or unclear decision authority.

The framework is deliberately technology-neutral and administration-neutral. It can be applied in 2030, 2050 or 2126 without assuming which technology, supplier, political administration or energy configuration will dominate.

SECTION 13

# Western Hemisphere Strategic Infrastructure Landscape

The Western Hemisphere contains complementary infrastructure and industrial capabilities distributed across different sovereign jurisdictions. HRS does not rank countries. The following roles are analytical descriptions of capabilities relevant to system-level resilience and are not policy assignments.

| JURISDICTION / REGION | ANALYTICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ROLE |
|---|---|
| **United States** | Advanced industrial, energy, digital, defense, financial and technology depth; principal source of capital, equipment, research and demand. |
| **Canada** | Energy, minerals, advanced manufacturing, aerospace, transport, research and Arctic/Atlantic/Pacific connectivity depth. |
| **Mexico** | Manufacturing, energy, logistics, automotive/electronics and North American production integration. |
| **Brazil** | Large diversified industrial, agricultural, energy, mineral, logistics and digital platform; major Atlantic geography. |
| **Argentina** | Agricultural, food-processing, energy, chemicals, automotive, industrial and resource capabilities; South Atlantic position. |
| **Guyana** | Rapidly developing energy, transport, agricultural and infrastructure base with growing northern South American Atlantic relevance. |
| **Chile** | Mining, energy, Pacific logistics, advanced materials and industrial services; Pacific-facing position. |
| **Peru** | Mining, food, industrial services and Pacific logistics; resource-to-port corridors. |
| **Colombia** | Energy, food, manufacturing, logistics and Caribbean/Pacific access; geographic connectivity. |
| **Bolivia** | Critical mineral and energy-resource potential, especially lithium; inland logistics and processing capacity are key variables. |
| **Paraguay** | Agriculture, river logistics, energy and export-oriented industrial activity linked to regional corridors. |
| **Uruguay** | Atlantic logistics, ports, food/agricultural systems, energy and services; regional gateway potential. |
| **Central America** | Interoceanic logistics, ports, energy, manufacturing/assembly, agriculture and proximity to North American markets. |
| **Caribbean** | Maritime gateways, energy terminals, air-sea logistics, food and medical supply nodes, undersea connectivity and strategic geography. |

Recent national planning demonstrates that infrastructure priorities are independently developed by sovereign governments. Mexico's 2026–2030 plan covers energy, rail, roads, ports, health, water and airports; Brazil's 2026 national logistics plan establishes a long-range transport reference; Peru's 2026–2031 plan prioritizes high-impact infrastructure; Guyana's 2026 budget places major resources in roads, energy and transport; and Uruguay continues national investment in transport and logistics.[21–25]

SECTION 14

# Implications for the United States

The system-level relevance to the United States is direct. A more resilient Western Hemisphere can increase the number of available pathways for U.S. supply chains, industrial inputs, energy, logistics, emergency response and strategic access. It can also reduce the probability that a disruption at one regional node becomes a broader U.S. economic or security problem.

The 2026 National Defense Strategy identifies the U.S. defense industrial base as foundational to developing, producing, sustaining and transporting military capability. The National Resilience Strategy frames infrastructure reliability, economic resilience, national security and public safety as interconnected resilience domains.[1,5]

| DEPARTMENT / AGENCY | POTENTIAL RELEVANCE |
|---|---|
| **Department of State** | Western Hemisphere engagement; sovereign-government coordination; diplomatic and economic tools; strategic access. |
| **Department of Defense / SOUTHCOM** | Defense mobility, logistics, force-supporting infrastructure, contingency access and regional security. |
| **Department of Energy** | Grid reliability, energy infrastructure, critical materials, energy technology and supply-chain security. |
| **Department of Commerce / NIST** | Industrial capacity, manufacturing, standards, technology and supply-chain depth. |
| **U.S. Trade Representative** | Trade relationships, market access and supply-chain diversification. |
| **Department of Transportation / MARAD** | Ports, maritime infrastructure, logistics corridors and transportation continuity. |
| **Department of Homeland Security / CISA** | Critical infrastructure protection, cyber resilience and operational continuity. |
| **Department of Agriculture** | Food production, agricultural inputs, logistics and food-system continuity. |
| **HHS / ASPR / FDA / CDC** | Medical supply chains, preparedness, manufacturing and continuity of critical health functions. |
| **DFC / EXIM / SBA** | Investment, export finance, project preparation and private-sector capacity where authorized. |

The HRS proposition is not that U.S. agencies should manage foreign infrastructure. It is that U.S. decision-makers benefit from understanding the infrastructure dependencies that connect U.S. interests to sovereign systems across the hemisphere.

SECTION 15

# 50–100 Year Infrastructure Horizon

Infrastructure has a time horizon that exceeds electoral cycles, administrations and technology generations. A transmission corridor, port, industrial cluster, fiber route, water system, refinery, mine, railway or data-center campus can shape economic and strategic options for decades.

| REFERENCE | STRATEGIC QUESTION | HRS PRIORITY |
|---|---|---|
| **2030** | Can immediate bottlenecks and single points of failure be reduced? | Dependency maps, reserves, repair capacity, alternative routes, project preparation. |
| **2050** | Has durable infrastructure depth been built? | Distributed capacity, equipment ecosystems, workforce, diversified corridors. |
| **2075** | Can the architecture adapt as technologies and trade patterns change? | Interoperability, technology refresh, flexible facilities, substitute pathways. |
| **2126** | Can future institutions preserve strategic choice under unknown conditions? | Adaptable architecture, learning systems, replacement pathways and sovereign decision authority. |

THE HRS 100-YEAR PROPOSITION

*Not a prediction about 2126. It is a design principle: build systems that can change faster than vulnerabilities accumulate.*

Lifecycle thinking is essential. Procurement decisions should consider replacement time, maintenance ecosystems, software and firmware dependencies, workforce availability, standardization, interoperability and exit options. Infrastructure should not be designed around an irreversible dependency when a practical alternative can be preserved.

The appropriate long-horizon question is not "what technology will dominate?" It is "will future decision-makers retain credible choices when today's infrastructure reaches the end of its useful life?" HRS designs its analytical frameworks for a multi-decade institutional application horizon, so that today's assessment remains a usable reference as conditions change.

SECTION 16

# HRS Research Priorities and Decision Framework

SRA 10 identifies research priorities that can convert system-level analysis into future country, corridor and project assessments without turning the public research series into a procurement program.

| PRIORITY | RESEARCH QUESTION | POSSIBLE HRS OUTPUT |
|---|---|---|
| **System dependency mapping** | Which dependencies connect multiple critical sectors? | System Dependency Register |
| **Strategic node analysis** | Which nodes have disproportionate system consequences? | Strategic Node Profiles |
| **Corridor resilience** | Which alternative routes are operationally credible? | Corridor Readiness Assessments |
| **Compound stress testing** | Which combinations produce unacceptable cascades? | Scenario Stress Tests |
| **Production optionality** | Where can critical production be transferred or expanded? | Industrial Optionality Maps |
| **Infrastructure lifecycle** | Which long-lived assets create future lock-in? | Lifecycle Dependency Reviews |
| **Foreign participation** | Where does participation create material dependency? | Project-Level Dependency Reviews |
| **Investment feasibility** | Which interventions create durable capability? | Readiness-to-Investment Assessments |
| **Institutional readiness** | Can authorities activate alternatives quickly? | Decision & Activation Reviews |

These outputs are intentionally modular. They can support public research, government technical discussions, private-sector feasibility work or country-specific assessments while preserving a clear separation between HRS Foundation research and any future commercial implementation activity by HRS Hemispheric Resilience System, Inc.

SECTION 17

# Conclusion

The Western Hemisphere's strategic infrastructure should not be understood as a collection of independent sectors. Electricity, digital connectivity, data infrastructure, materials, manufacturing, ports, logistics, food and medical systems form a network of dependencies. The reliability of one system can determine the availability of another.

The first nine HRS Sector Readiness Assessments establish the sector evidence base. SRA 10 adds the system layer: it asks where dependencies converge, where failures can cascade, where redundancy is only nominal, and where alternative pathways can preserve essential functions.

The 2026 U.S. policy environment reinforces the relevance of this approach. The National Resilience Strategy emphasizes risk-informed resilience; the National Defense Strategy emphasizes industrial capacity; the Department of Energy and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation identify energy-system reliability and supply-chain constraints as strategic issues; and the Southern Command's posture to Congress places renewed attention on Western Hemisphere security and strategic access.[1,5,11,13,18]

At the same time, the architecture must remain durable beyond any particular administration. HRS therefore anchors its analysis in enduring institutional interests: reliable infrastructure, national security, economic continuity, industrial depth, secure supply chains, freedom of action, recoverability and sovereign choice.

The Western Hemisphere does not require every country to possess every capability. It requires sufficient depth and optionality that a failure in one jurisdiction, corridor, technology or supplier does not automatically become a failure of the essential function. For the United States, this means a hemisphere in which critical economic and security pathways have greater depth, more credible alternatives and stronger recovery capacity. For sovereign governments across the hemisphere, it means greater visibility into their own dependencies and more options when conditions change.

FINAL HRS PROPOSITION

*Resilience is not the strength of individual infrastructure sectors. It is the availability of alternative pathways across interconnected critical systems.*

That proposition is the bridge between the HRS public research program and the next generation of country, corridor and implementation assessments.

METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND LIMITATIONS

# HRS System Readiness Methodology

SRA 10 applies the HRS Readiness Cycle and the HRS Strategic Dependency Test at a system level. The methodology is an original HRS analytical construct developed by synthesizing recurring readiness variables established across SRA 01–09.

**Evidence discipline.** Documented facts are distinguished from HRS analytical judgments. Public-source evidence is used to establish conditions, policies, infrastructure characteristics and documented dependencies. Where evidence is incomplete, uncertainty is not converted into a categorical finding.

**Sovereignty.** Sovereignty is a foundational boundary condition. HRS does not score the legitimacy of a government's choices, recommend ownership transfers, or prescribe which foreign partner, technology or supplier a sovereign state should select.

**Foreign participation.** Nationality alone is not a risk variable. HRS evaluates control, concentration, access, data, technology lifecycle, maintenance, substitutability and recovery implications on a project-by-project basis.

**Time horizon.** The 50–100 year horizon is a resilience design horizon, not a forecast. Infrastructure and institutional arrangements are evaluated for adaptability across multiple technology and policy cycles.

**Limitations.** This public assessment is not a classified intelligence estimate, engineering audit, cybersecurity certification, investment recommendation or country-level readiness score. Country roles are analytical descriptions and do not represent commitments by any government.

**Originality.** The document presents original HRS synthesis and terminology. Source materials are identified by institution and title; no source is reproduced beyond short descriptive references. The analytical architecture, system-readiness test and propositions are HRS constructs.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Dependency before exposure** | Identify what the function requires before judging disruption magnitude. |
| **Effective redundancy over nominal redundancy** | Test whether alternatives can operate independently. |
| **Critical function over asset count** | Measure ability to preserve essential services, not simply facility count. |
| **Recovery as a design variable** | Include repair time, workforce, procurement and authority. |
| **Adaptation over permanence** | Preserve ability to replace, reroute, redesign and learn. |
| **Sovereign choice as a boundary** | Expand options without prescribing sovereign policy. |

Terminology note: certain 2026 public commentary uses informal shorthand for aspects of the current U.S. Western Hemisphere posture. HRS does not treat such expressions as formal doctrine or a permanent policy category. This assessment instead relies on durable, documented institutional priorities and policy instruments: national resilience, national security, infrastructure reliability, industrial capacity, strategic access and sovereign choice.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

# Sources

The bibliography prioritizes official U.S. government sources, supplemented by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, selected policy-research institutions and official national-government sources used to describe regional infrastructure conditions. Accessed for this edition in 2026.


[1] White House. National Resilience Strategy. June 2026.

[2] White House. White House Unveils President Trump·s America First Resilience Strategy. June 23, 2026.

[3] White House. Presidential Determination Pursuant to Section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as Amended, on Development, Manufacturing, and Deployment of Large-Scale Energy and Energy-Related Infrastructure. April 20, 2026.

[4] White House. Executive Order 14421 · Declaring a National Emergency to Secure the United States Bulk-Power System. August 26, 2026.

[5] U.S. Department of Defense. 2026 National Defense Strategy. January 2026.

[6] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 01 · Telecommunications & Digital Infrastructure. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[7] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 05 · Energy Security & Strategic Power Infrastructure. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[8] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 09 · Advanced Manufacturing & Industrial Capacity. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[9] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 02 · Data Centers, Cloud & AI Infrastructure. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[10] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 06 · Ports, Logistics & Maritime Infrastructure. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[11] U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Electricity. Office of Electricity Strategic Plan. March 2026.

[12] U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Electricity. Strengthening America·s Grid Supply Chain. August 10, 2026.

[13] North American Electric Reliability Corporation. 2025 Long-Term Reliability Assessment. 2026.

[14] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 03 · Critical Minerals & Strategic Materials. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[15] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 04 · Rare Earths & Western Hemisphere Mineral Security. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[16] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 07 · Food Security & Strategic Agricultural Resilience. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[17] HRS Resilience Foundation. Sector Readiness Assessment 08 · Pharmaceutical & Medical Supply Chains. 2026. HRS Research Series.

[18] U.S. Southern Command. 2026 Posture Statement to Congress. March 16, 2026.

[19] Center for Strategic and International Studies. China·s Expanding Interests in Latin America: Development, Leverage, Coercion, and Crime. March 19, 2026.

[20] Atlantic Council. Mapping U.S. Investment in Latin America and the Caribbean. July 22, 2026.

[21] Government of Mexico. Infrastructure Investment Plan for Development with Wellbeing 2026·2030. February 3, 2026.

[22] Government of Brazil, Ministry of Transport. National Logistics Plan 2050. August 2026.

[23] Government of Peru, Ministry of Economy and Finance. National Infrastructure Plan 2026·2031. 2026.

[24] Government of Guyana, Ministry of Finance. Budget 2026 · At a Glance. January 2026.

[25] Government of Uruguay, Ministry of Transport and Public Works. El MTOP presentó ante el Parlamento el balance de gestión 2025 y los principales proyectos de infraestructura. August 6, 2026.

[26] Inter-American Development Bank. Eppur si Muove: The Evolution of Infrastructure Gaps in LAC 2021·2026. August 2026.

[27] U.S. Department of Transportation / Maritime Administration. Trump·s Transportation Secretary Sean P. Duffy Invests Nearly $800 Million into American Ports to Strengthen Supply Chains. April 28, 2026.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE READINESS SERIES

# HRS Resilience Foundation

Independent public research on hemispheric critical-infrastructure resilience, published as part of the Western Hemisphere Readiness Series. HRS analysis is designed to remain a durable reference across administrations, technology cycles and market conditions.

## SERIES TO DATE

SRA 01 — Telecommunications & Digital Infrastructure
SRA 02 — Data Centers, Cloud & AI Infrastructure
SRA 03 — Critical Minerals & Strategic Materials
SRA 04 — Rare Earths & Western Hemisphere Mineral Security
SRA 05 — Energy Security & Strategic Power Infrastructure
SRA 06 — Ports, Logistics & Maritime Infrastructure
SRA 07 — Food Security & Strategic Agricultural Resilience
SRA 08 — Pharmaceutical & Medical Supply Chains
SRA 09 — Advanced Manufacturing & Industrial Capacity
SRA 10 — Western Hemisphere Strategic Infrastructure & Resilience

**André Vieira, MD**

FOUNDER & CHAIRMAN, HRS RESILIENCE FOUNDATION