



## 1. INTRODUCTION

All members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee, including the European Commission and most EU countries, have committed to help build ‘effective, legitimate, and resilient states’.<sup>1</sup> The formula applied to this agenda tends to be delineated according to ‘core’ functions that the state is expected to fulfil.<sup>2</sup> Approaches are modelled on Western societies and tend to involve ‘off the shelf’ activities such as promoting public administration capacity, representation and accountability through parliament, an autonomous civil service, and an active civil society – all operating according to the law. Democratic and economic reforms, also largely conceived out of Western experience, are expected to confer effectiveness and legitimacy upon the political system. Donors tend to focus on windows of opportunity to support positive change<sup>3</sup>, and a number of them are beginning to offer additional financing to incentivise partner governments to progress in the prioritised areas.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, donors are finding that, in many contexts, progress is particularly problematic and prone to setbacks, if not failure. In many ‘post-conflict’ countries, this is manifested in the high proportion of countries that sees the recurrence of the conflict within five year.<sup>5</sup> A large part of the problem stems from the fact that conflict-affected and other ‘fragile’ settings are very far from sharing a consensus on Western understandings of concepts such as citizenship, ‘citizen’ expectations of the state, and the framing of decisions and processes by formal, enforceable legal rules. In some situations, state institutions may have *lost* their “capacity and/or will to perform a set of functions necessary to the security and wellbeing of their citizens”<sup>6</sup> but in many others they may never, or rarely, have had them.

In such environments, external interventions may inadvertently accentuate the problems. The money provided may itself feed personalised networks, become a contested resource and perhaps something worth fighting for. Thus, instead of applying interventions shaped by Western political history, donors need to act on their commitment to take ‘context’ as their ‘starting point’ (the *first* DAC Principle). They need to focus on the specificities of state-society relations and disaggregated power dynamics in those settings.

At the outset, it must be noted that the concept of power is ‘fundamentally contested’ - people mean a range of very different things when they use the term.<sup>7</sup> Distinctions, for example, need to be drawn between ‘constructive’ (‘power to...’) and ‘controlling’ (‘power over...’) concepts of power. For most developing countries, progress toward democratic governance will require both (a) some reduction in the controlling power of the central state executive and (b) increases in the constructive power of various parts of the state apparatus. The relative weight attached to these concepts by various actors

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example the OECD DAC *Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations*, approved during the High Level Meeting of the OECD Development Assistance Committee in April 2007.

<sup>2</sup> These would include public administration (including financial management), provision of security, establishing the Rule of Law. See, for example, Verena Fritz and Alina Rocha Menocal, *Understanding State-Building from a Political Economy Perspective: An Analytical and Conceptual Paper on Processes, Embedded Tensions and Lessons for International Engagement*, Overseas Development Institute, September 2007.

<sup>3</sup> Rosser, A. (Ed.) (2006). *Achieving turnaround in fragile states*, *IDS Bulletin*, 37.2, 1–78

<sup>4</sup> An incentive tranche of 3 billion has been introduced into the 10th EDF by the EU. Access to these funds will depend on the outcome of a dialogue between the Commission and the partner country on the ambition, pertinence and credibility of its commitments to reform. The basis of this dialogue will be a Governance Profile. See [http://www.europe-cares.org/africa/governance\\_en.html](http://www.europe-cares.org/africa/governance_en.html)

<sup>5</sup> Estimates vary but the figure is most commonly put at about 40%.

<sup>6</sup> Cammack, Diana, *et al.* 2006. “Donors and the ‘Fragile’ States Agenda: A Survey of Current Thinking and Practice”. Report submitted to the Japan International Cooperation Agency. ODI, London, p. ix.

<sup>7</sup> Moore, M. (2005). *Consultant’s report on published studies, principally on Burkina Faso and Ethiopia*, The Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK in ‘Methods of Analysing Power—A Workshop Report’, May 2005, Division for Democratic Governance, Sida

will reflect different ideologies about the organisation of public life and attitudes to authoritative political institutions, especially the state.<sup>8</sup> Yet, notwithstanding debate on the conceptualisation of power and its observability, governance-related processes still need to be thought through on the basis of how different types of power are allocated, competed for, shared, exercised and/or constrained. These have major consequences on the realities and perceptions of state effectiveness, accountability and resilience – i.e. its legitimacy.

## PURPOSE

With a view to improving analyses of power and incentives for change, ‘governance’ assessments are beginning to be improved by more dynamic and nuanced methodologies. These focus on the factors which shape state and society and the inter-relationship between them.<sup>9</sup> Building on these, the State-Society Analytical Framework (SSAF) directs attention towards (i) the Foundational Factors, (ii) the Rules of the Game, and (iii) the ‘Here and Now’ issues which determine the nature of the challenges. This can then be supplemented by subsequent, disaggregated and more detailed analysis in specific sectors.

This IfP ‘democratisation’ cluster is ultimately about participation in political decision-making in conflict-prone and conflict affected contexts. This sits within an over-arching ‘human security’ approach which encompasses the ‘freedom from want’ and the ‘freedom from fear’. In line with that objective and approach, the organisations in the cluster will use the SSAF to help identify the ways and means by which a culture of genuine political participation can be built, and how this endeavour can best be supported by external actors. Particular attention is placed on ways to improve participation of excluded groups, including women and minorities, in peace processes, political decision-making and in holding authorities to account.

The SSAF analysis, conducted initially in four countries (Angola, DRC, Georgia and Pakistan), will shed light not only on complex power dynamics and the nature of state-society relations but also on how externally-financed activities (including by western or non-DAC countries, multinational enterprises and/or multilateral institutions) impact on them. The process of research which will involve consultations in-country as well as co-ordinated discussions in EU/EC headquarters will reflect on the array of internal factors as well as the different types of external interventions. By directing attention at how opportunities could be seized to support more dynamic and institutionalized bargaining between state and society, the SSAF will draw out lessons for more effective international, and particularly EU, engagement.

---

<sup>8</sup> . ‘Liberals’ (according to the classic meaning of the term) define good governance primarily in terms of legal, constitutional and other arrangements that limit institutional/state power. They are worried about the ‘controlling’ use of power, and warm to terms like accountability, democracy and participation. By contrast, ‘collectivists’ see the state (and other authoritative organisations) primarily as a means of aggregating power and resources that may be used for the collective good. They warm to terms like authority, order, and capability. They emphasise the need for arrangements that promote the effectiveness of the state.

<sup>9</sup> They include DFID’s Driver of Change approach, Sida’s Power Analysis and the [Power and Change Analysis][Governance Assessment in Fragile States] being developed by Clingendael for the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## 2. STATE-SOCIETY ANALYSIS

The methodology is organised around three dimensions (Foundational Factors, the Rules of the Game and the Here and Now). Although they should not be used mechanistically (partly because they overlap), these are a guide to structure knowledge and reflection. The questions, some of which are very broad, are suggestions for exploring the issues. They need not be rigidly followed.

### I. FOUNDATIONAL FACTORS (TO BE OUTLINED IN BRIEF)

These are factors which have shaped the history of state (non-)formation and whether the internationally recognised government has historically been able to exercise authority over the whole of its national territory. Such factors tend to change very slowly. They are often of very long term origin, such as the geostrategic position and geographical aspects of the country. There may be very little or nothing that donors can do about them but it is always important to bear them in mind.

#### GEOPOLITICAL POSITION

The proximity of major economic, political and military powers has important effects on state-building/governance. The influence of neighbours can impinge a country's autonomy in shaping and implementing policies and can mean that the country is particularly vulnerable to external dynamics, including interventions and spill-overs of instability.

**Suggested questions:** *Is the country land-locked and so economically dependent on neighbouring countries? Are there cross-border ethnic groups that have historically impacted on stability/legitimacy?<sup>10</sup> Is it constrained by fear of provoking states in the neighbourhood? Does it have strategic resources that are of interest to them?<sup>11</sup> Are there any international unsettled claims by neighbours on the country's territory?*

#### GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE

The natural environment will of course shape development options more broadly, but the interest here is in geographical features that have a continuing, direct impact on governance.

**Suggested Questions:** *Are there geographical features that impede central control over the territory, present physical barriers to communication, or lead to isolation or marginalisation of particular groups or regions?<sup>12</sup> Is competition for scarce resources (water, land), a source of conflict? Does a very small or very large population relative to the size of the country have implications for governance??*

#### POLITICAL HISTORICAL BACKDROP

If current state boundaries and the realities and perceptions of government/public sector employment were forged in the colonial past, this may be sustaining tensions. It may also be the cause of a weak sense of political community and the domination of/competition among political elite to the exclusion of certain groups.

---

<sup>10</sup> Think about the effect of cross-border ethnic issues such as those of the Pashtun in Pakistan and Afghanistan

<sup>11</sup> Think about international interests in natural resources (oil: China, US, Europe).

<sup>12</sup> Think about major features, such as the Congo River in DRC; the Himalaya in Nepal

**Suggested Questions:** *How has the state's history (colonisation/conquest/civil war victory?) shaped whether there is a sense of political community? How has it shaped the realities and perceptions of the access of different groups to political and economic power?*

## SOCIAL SYSTEM AND ITS FOUNDATIONAL IMPACTS ON POLITICS AND THE ECONOMY

Social systems affect the basis for political mobilisation and the ability of different groups (not least all women) to organise together, influence policy and access opportunity. Significant income gaps or other inequalities that exist between different groups can affect state legitimacy and the overall level of social cohesion, particularly where social groups correspond to distinct geographic areas.

**Suggested Questions:** *What is the make-up of the population in terms of religion, caste and/or ethnicity? What is the population density in the county or specific provinces? Are there distinct traditional social strata relating to ethnicity, tribe or religion (e.g. caste), or other social divisions that are politically or economically significant? Are these strata more accentuated in some parts of the country relative to others? Does this have historic impacts on control of political and public administration posts? What is the effect of these historic hierarchies and social traditions on gender relations? To what extent and in what different ways have they affected/do they affect the ability of men and women to participate in governance and economic processes?*

## SOURCES OF REVENUE

The sources of the state's revenue as well as how it is controlled and managed are key determinants of governance. Taxation of citizens and businesses, since it imposes a direct relationship between taxpayer and government is thought to be a mechanism to improve the responsiveness and accountability of government to public needs. By contrast, the availability of ample income from primary commodities and/or aid can lessen the interest of governments in improving public goods and be used to fund elite domination, rebel groups or cartels of actors in the security sector.

**Suggested Questions:** *What is the proportion of primary commodity earnings in the GDP? To what extent in recent decades have state structures been paid for out of natural resource exploitation? Have there long been fundamental disputes about access of different groups to natural resource rents/other revenue? What has traditionally been the geographic reach of the tax collection authorities? What has been the allocation of revenue to central government relative to federal/national provinces?*

## II. RULES OF THE GAME

This section investigates the formal and informal factors that shape state and society and the interaction between them. These factors are relatively fluid in the medium term. In this regard, they differ from Foundational Factors, which tend to change slowly and are harder to be influenced by external actors. However, a historical perspective needs to be retained in the analysis in so far as it continues to influence both the Rules of the Game and the Here and Now.

In all governance systems, the combination of the 'official' framework with 'unofficial' processes determines how power is distributed and exercised as well as the nature of state-society relations. Most countries have formal rules and procedures that are designed to help insulate public institutions from the private sphere of personal relations / private interests.<sup>13</sup> In a 'fragile and conflict-affected' context, however, the weakness, malleability or changeability of those rules and the prominence of informal institutions<sup>14</sup> and relationships may mean that there are major divergences between the

<sup>13</sup> Formal laws and regulations can also sustain and entrench discrimination in these provisions as between men and women, different social groups, registered citizens and non-registered people etc. They can also be used for political ends. The combined result can be to generate and drive tensions and/or violence.

<sup>14</sup> Informal institutions refer to unwritten rules, norms, expectations, and processes. These institutions are understood locally, but they tend to be somewhat difficult for outsiders to apprehend (or work within)

formal system and actual practice – for example in the areas of gender equality and non-discrimination.

Although some are able to access such a system and all are at least familiar with it, poor people (notably women) are collectively disadvantaged as they are less likely to be able to access the vertical hierarchies. Policy and services are not constructed and/or implemented transparently and for the collective public good. Opportunity is limited to those 'inside the tent' or able to pay a 'personalised fee' ("corruption" of small to substantial proportions, depending) in order to access it. Moreover, the lack of transparency and 'legal certainty' in the operating environment has negative consequences on investment, particularly from external actors nervous about reputational risks.

## 1. THE FORMAL FRAMEWORK

Existing analytical tools (such as the EU governance profiles) provide a detailed picture of how far formal provisions cover key governance concerns. Drawing on that material, this section of the SSAF analysis looks at key areas in the formal framework that have actual or potential importance for the nature of political competition and the distribution of power. These must be considered in the light of the informal system which can mean that existing legislative provisions or future changes may not do much by themselves to change actual practice).

### **Suggested Questions:**

**The Constitution:** *What formal rules are embedded in the constitution which separate powers, constrain the political executive, fix presidential/parliamentary terms, and/or protect human rights? How often has the constitution been changed, and under what process? Are religious structures given a particular status under the constitution? What about traditional institutions?*

**Political community:** *What are the legal provisions regarding citizenship and the right to own and trade land? What are the laws on public sector employment and procurement? Are international human rights conventions established in domestic law? Is gender equality safeguarded by law? To which extent have national myths been constructed which influence the (non)emergence of a political community in the country?*

**Institutional political framework:** *What is the formal set-up as regards the institutions and agencies of the executive, parliament and public administration of the national political system? Is there a Presidential or prime ministerial system and how are powers allocated to the posts? What is the formal division of roles between executive and parliament? When is the budget agreed and when/how is it put to parliament? How is the budget for the localities determined? When are the funds transferred? Which ministry leads on the PRSP and who else is involved?*

**State-owned Enterprises:** *What is the formal status of SoEs - especially those with large revenues from control of oil, minerals? What is the relationship with ministries/agencies of the executive?*

**Security sector:** *Are there clear rules defining the responsibilities of each of the official security sector agencies? How does the legal framework (not) provide for civilian oversight of those agencies? Is there a watchdog agency and/or effective 'internal affairs' unit in place e.g. to deal with human rights issues?*

**Judiciary:** *Does the judiciary have constitutional power over / actual power to challenge the executive in the event of [excessive behaviour]? What is the process for appointing judges and magistrates? Do 'customary' mediation/arbitration bodies exercise official powers and perform formal functions?*

**Transitional justice mechanisms:** *What bodies have been formally established to address crimes, grievances and the trauma of conflict? What is the inter-relationship between these bodies and the domestic judicial and political system, as well as international fora? What official powers do the bodies have? How long are they mandated to function? What processes have been established to vet the personnel of state agencies and institutions and prevent the re-emergence of abusive practices?*

**Local governance:** *What is the distribution of roles between the centre and the provinces? Do local bodies have elected officials, independent law-making powers, revenue-raising capacity, revenue sharing rules? Do customary local bodies have official status or formal power?*

**Private sector:** *What is the legal and official situation as regards private sector activity?*

**Media:** *Who owns and controls the influential media? What are the laws governing media freedom?*

**Organised civil society:** *What is the formal legal framework for the operation of civil society, trade unions etc.? Is there a Right to Information Act?*

**Gender:** *Are there formal legal provisions that lay down distinctions between men and women, such as on land, inheritance rights, access to capital etc.? What are the laws and customary rules on marriage and divorce?*

## 2. ASSESSING THE REALITY

Taking into account the formal provisions above *and* reflecting on informal practices and relationships, the next section should assess the *reality* of the situation on the ground. It looks, in particular, at the nature of political competition, the distribution of power and state society relations.

### POLITICAL COMPETITION

How politicians gain and maintain power is central to their own motivation, and influences how political parties and civil society groups organise. Open political competition through democratic elections is likely to be problematic at early stages of state building, especially where there are deep ethnic or religious cleavages and state institutions have limited autonomy and capacity to support the process. Elections can themselves be triggers for violence or populist, divisive campaigning. However, where competition remains based on personal identity or personalised patronage networks, politicians and political parties may continue to have little incentive to focus on the quality of or broader public goods.

#### Suggested Questions:

- i) *To what extent is political competition conducted within the boundaries set by the law? Is there abuse of formal procedure? Does the law itself fall well below international standards? Is there a history of coups or other illicit changes of power? Is there scope for non-state armed actors to transform into political parties to voice their agenda?*
- ii) *Are elites factionalised, mobilising votes based on identity/social groups, or do they have collective and/or national perspectives?*
- iii) *To what extent does continued wealth and power in society depend on direct control of public resources or political position? How does 'indirect' influence manifest itself?*
- iv) *How exclusive is the political elite (in terms of its socio-economic or institutional base, rate of turnover of individual members, accessibility / social mobility, gender inclusivity)?*
- v) *How far are ordinary people able to vote / join political parties, or access other means to exert political influence? Are particular groups excluded (legally, or in practice)? What disparities exist as between men and women?*
- vi) *What do voters expect their elected representatives to deliver: individual patronage benefits, community-specific benefits, or broader public goods? Are tax and public spending key election issues? How far do political parties organise around programmes rather than personalities?*

### DISTRIBUTION AND EXERCISE OF POWER

This section looks at how power is shared and used and aims to draw out any significant shifts in relationships - see section below on identifying key trends. Some governance assessments presuppose that more power sharing will contribute to better governance. However, this will depend on who is sharing power and how. Any strategy for strengthening civil society or public accountability mechanisms needs to take account of how power is shared in a particular context. The political executive may look powerful (the power 'over'...) if it faces few checks and balances, but may be quite weak in terms of capacity to formulate and implement policy and to deliver services (the power 'to'...). Moreover, especially in countries with large natural resources, there may be important factors at play as between state-owned, private and/or multinational companies and the government. These companies may have significant policy influence such as through funding of political parties or the media. They may have also policy influence through their ability to control movements of private capital.

**Suggested Questions:**

**Security Apparatus:** *Is the security sector under the democratic control / oversight of civilian authorities? Does the security apparatus operate as a "state within a state", or is it a professional military established that is answerable to legitimate civilian control?*

**Legislature:** *does it initiate legislation, meet to vote on bills, follow budget processes, and exercise financial control?*

**Judiciary:** *to what extent is it independent and influential enough to challenge the executive, hold judicial reviews, guard against abuses of political power, protect the principle of 'due process'?*

**Other Levels of Government:** *What is the nature of local governance bodies – formal and/or customary? Do they serve as de facto substitutes for central government authorities? Do they have elected officials, independent law-making powers, revenue-raising capacity, revenue-sharing guarantees? How do customary bodies exercise power? Who is appointed to them and how?*

**Public Enterprises** *are these, especially those with large revenues from control of oil, minerals etc. a 'state within a state'? what is the nature of their influence and their relationship with political power dynamics?*

**Private business and the financial sector** *What is the political – economic nexus? What are the relations between the major holders of political and economic power? What individuals or institutions provide the bulk of capital investments and/or financial resources for government? What determines access to financial services for ordinary people? What 'language literacy' is needed to open a bank account, take out a loan, register land title etc?*

**Class, caste and gender groups:**

- *Is there an organised working class, based in industry or agriculture and how influential is it? How large is the middle class and what is its influence? Is there a large landed class with an interest in retaining control of labour, if necessary by repression? Is there a military-related group with a hold on state power? How exclusive is the political elite (in terms of its socio-economic base, rate of turnover of individual members etc.)? Are there informal political understandings, e.g. informal deals that will divide power among patronage networks?*
- *What are the gender-specific disparities as between men and women as regards economic (in)security, access to finance and roles in the social, economic and political life? What are the informal issues that determine, for example, political participation and access to land/financial services/employment for women? (See also 'state-society relations below).*

**Religious Actors:** *How do they interact with secular holders of political power? What is their legal, economic and social influence? Are they integrated into the constitution or in opposition to the state executive? Do they have access to transnational organisations or resources? How much ability do they have to mobilise sections of society?*

**Mass Media:** *who owns and controls it? Which segments of society are the consumers of the mass media? And what outreach do the media have?*

**Civil Society Organisations**<sup>15</sup> *How do they tend to operate? Are there a small number of dominant organisations? How are they linked to politics and political parties? Are there parts of the country where they are stronger than others? Do they tend to represent/be constituted by some social groups more than others?*

**'Uncivil' Society:** *What is the influence of criminals, terrorist groups, armed non-state actors on the governance system? What is their territorial influence and reach? Which groups do they target or affect? How is power wielded and competed for within these groups?*

**External Actors:** *Regional and International actors (governmental, non-governmental and private sector) exert a myriad of pressures and influences on national and local settings. It is important to identify 'who's doing what', the partnerships and interactions involved, and the niches left unaddressed.*<sup>16</sup>

- *What kind of normative and policy pressures are there from external providers of finance and technical assistance (DAC and non-DAC bilaterals, the IFIs, INGOs), especially in highly aid dependent countries? What is the influence of arrangements affecting trade (WTO, EU), investment (IFIs, private financial institutions, multinational enterprises), security (defence co-operation, SSR etc.)? What is the spatial distribution of this influence?*
- *What is the level of aid inflows? What proportion does that aid represent relative to GDP, government revenue, government development budget? What activities are funded and where? What is the volatility of commitments and disbursements? In what ways to beneficiaries participate? [N.B. the activities of the EU and EC are of particular interest.]*
- *Is the country (or groups within it) influenced by diaspora groups? Are these active in media, internet etc. and do they have impacts on public opinion? Do they provide important economic inputs through remittances? How are remittances transferred and used? Is there seasonal migration of labour? How much money is earned and brought back? Do some areas and/or groups receive/rely on remittances more than others? What is the impact of international anti-terrorism laws on these flows of people and money?*
- *Are there destabilising regional cross-border interventions (such as transnational criminal networks)? What assessment can be made of illegal activities in respect of bribery, money laundering, narcotics or other illegal trading? How are criminal networks hampering social, political and economic progress?*

## STATE-SOCIETY RELATIONS

This section draws on all the previous sections of the 'Rules of the Game' to reflect on the nature of state-society interaction. Historically states and public institutions have evolved through processes of political bargaining between rulers and organised groups in society. In many developing countries, there is little effective state-society engagement, and access to state resources may be limited to small, elite groups, who use them often as a way of maintaining/buying social stability in the short term. Poor people can benefit from the patronage of elites, but they sacrifice their 'voice' in the process. Organisation around collective shared interests with a view to demanding better quality services would likely deliver more long term benefits.

### **Suggested Questions:**

<sup>15</sup> These will have a wide variety of interests and capacity to influence public policy and will themselves be shaped by the institutional context. Think about membership organisations (e.g. trade unions, professional associations, groups of service users, grassroots livelihood organisations) as well as elite, urban NGOs.

<sup>16</sup> An overview of current interventions should be prepared by reviewing policy documents. The overview will include activities of other important actors like the UN, World Bank, EU, regional organizations, bilateral donors, and international NGOs. The impacts of particular interventions most likely will cross borders between policy fields. For example: increased security will stimulate economic investments; reduced poverty and unemployment might reduce opportunities for political entrepreneurs to mobilize disenfranchised groups; and an open political climate of dialogue will reduce the appeal of resorting to violent means

- *In what ways do government and the governed interact – in deciding the budget, the PRSP, public works etc.? How far does the state have the financial/human resource capacity to meet the expectations of citizens (e.g. for security, or basic service delivery)? Are tax, public spending and service delivery key election issues?*
- *Are state-society relations highly polarised (e.g. around ethnicity, or ideology)? Do interest groups make demands based on ethnicity or other exclusive criteria, or on the basis of universal rights? Are relationships largely shaped by the operation of personalised networks (and expectations of individual patronage benefits) or more through engagement on 'public goods' issues around which broader groups of citizens organise themselves?*
- *To what extent are ordinary people able to vote / join political parties, or access other means to exert political influence? Are particular groups excluded (legally, or in practice)? How are NGOs and media (including informal/traditional means of communication) contributing to popular knowledge of issues as well as public participation in debate and decision-making?*
- *What are the different experiences and needs of men and women in accessing state services and pushing for government to open up access to economic opportunity and decision-making positions? What are the specific challenges for women in getting their concerns acknowledged and addressed, especially when linked for security-related issues such as sexual and domestic violence?*
- *What transitional justice mechanisms are being sought and by whom? What is the influence of national and international actors who are pressing for action to address impunity? What kind of popular movement seems to be present in order to drive forward a TJ process? Are there disparities in national vision for what that process should look like?*

## IDENTIFYING KEY TRENDS

This section looks at the factors identified above and considers how they change over time. Its purpose is to discern any broad trends, particularly those that have the greatest impact on governance and, in particular, in the way important groups are sharing and exercising power. The interest here is in medium-term dynamics of change that may have an impact on rules of the game; either positively in terms of state-society relations or negatively in terms of instability. For each of the areas below, the interest is in the impact on governance, not in a detailed description. In all cases, it should be considered how the trends are affecting men and women in different ways.

### Suggested Questions:

**Socio-economic:** *Are new technologies (communication, ICT) opening up new levels of awareness and opportunities for disadvantaged groups, both politically and economically (youth, rural population, diaspora)? Is education slowly changing the balance of power in a society? Is bigger (urbanised) middle class emerging which has a greater interest in a more solid formal framework that determines governance? Is increasing competition for (scarcer and/or degraded) natural resources having an effect? What is the impact of global price rises or fall, and any (un)related of economic decline or growth? What is the impact of HIV/AIDS rates and distribution?*

**Government performance:** *Are domestic political trends affecting the rules of the game? Has a succession of relatively fair, peaceful elections helped to embed democratic processes? Are changes in public financial management and/or the quality of public service delivery increasing the legitimacy of the government at the centre and/or of local government organs?*

**Demographic:** *Are there large-scale forced or voluntary population movements within or to/from the country? Have these put a major strain on public finances, service delivery (by government or NGOs) and aid resources and delivery? Have they affected some parts of the country more than others? Is*

*there increasing pressure on urban services? Are demographic pressures or changes affecting the domestic balance of power?*

**Gender:** *How are different non-state actors supporting the gender-sensitive improvement of state-society relations, if at all? To what extent are they winning the backing of power-holders in government and among traditional rules? What changes are emerging?*

**Geo-strategic dynamics and external actors:** *Are changes in the regional security environment affecting the extent to which government shares power with the military? Is the nature of external influence changing? Are new actors gaining influence? Are there some geographically visible shifting trends in terms of the origin of aid and donors? Is the proportion of aid relative to GDP government revenue, government development budget changing? What is the trend as regards the types of activities funded and where they are funded?*

### III. HERE AND NOW

'Here and now' issues are fluid in the short term and have an impact on state-society relations in the same timeframe. They include the capacities and interests of specific individuals and groups/institutions (dominated by key personalities). They also include events and time-specific pressures (e.g. elections, natural disasters, a fiscal crisis that provides incentives for revenue reform; hosting a major international event that puts the spotlight on human rights; etc) to which key actors are, or should be, responding. In the context of the foundational factors and the Rules of the Game, this section should focus on concise analysis of these issues and actors (rather than description). Its purpose is to help identify actual and potential triggers of instability as well as positive change.

**Context:** The interest here is in how current events and circumstances, as well as potential developments in the near future, influence the objectives and behaviour of key actors / stakeholders.

#### **Suggested Questions:**

*What are the immediate dynamics within the government: is it a stable or fragile coalition? What is the effect of a recent or forthcoming election on its stability? Are major security concerns – internal or external – emerging in the short term? Are special events (e.g. hosting the Olympics, a referendum, constitutional changes) influencing its discourse? Is it facing a short term financial crisis due to economic shock or the action of a major trading partner etc.? Has there been a recent man-made or natural disaster (e.g. earthquake) that has strongly debilitated state capacity and legitimacy?*

**Actors and Stakeholders**<sup>17</sup>: This section identifies key individual actors and stakeholders in the here and now, particularly those who command or strongly influence institutions within (or outside) the executive.

**Suggested Questions:** *Taking account of the sections above, especially of the key trends identified in the rules of the game, which individuals and groups have the capacity to act, and the power to make their voice heard? Do these have interests that overlap – actually or potentially – with those of poor or otherwise marginalised people? Which individual actors might be particularly influential, and what are their interests in the immediate term? Is the level of aid flows increasing?*

---

<sup>17</sup> This part could be taken forward using existing tools for stakeholder analysis, mapping interests, capacities, strategies and relationships with other actors, in relation to specific policy areas as required.