
MEASURING PROGRESS IN CONFLICT
ENVIRONMENTS (MPICE)
A Metrics Framework

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 2010		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2010 to 00-00-2010	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE). A Metrics Framework				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) United States Institute of Peace, 1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC, 20036-3011				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 98	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

MEASURING PROGRESS IN CONFLICT ENVIRONMENTS (MPICE) *A Metrics Framework*

EDITED BY:

JOHN AGOGLIA, U.S. ARMY PEACEKEEPING AND STABILITY OPERATIONS INSTITUTE

MICHAEL DZIEDZIC, UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

BARBARA SOTIRIN, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE PRESS
Washington, D.C.

The views expressed in this book are those of the authors alone. They do not necessarily reflect views of the United States Institute of Peace.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE
1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036-3011
www.usip.org

© 2010 by the Endowment of the United States Institute of Peace. All rights reserved.

First published 2010

To request permission to photocopy or reprint materials for course use, contact the Copyright Clearance Center at www.copyright.com. For print, electronic media, and all other subsidiary rights, e-mail permissions@usip.org.

Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standards for Information Science—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

CONTENTS

Purpose.	x
Acknowledgments	xi
Introduction	xii
Development of MPICE	xii
The MPICE System.	xiii
Structure of the MPICE Metrics Framework	xiv
The MPICE Sectors.	xv
Explanation of Data Collection and Trend Codes	xvi
Brief Introduction to the Tailoring Process	xviii
SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT	1
Drivers of Conflict	
Political Violence	2
Threat from Ex-combatants	3
Popular Support for Violent Factions.	5
Use of Security Forces for Political Repression.	6

Criminalization of Security Forces	7
External Destabilization	7
Institutional Performance	
Compliance with Security Agreements	10
Performance of Security Forces	10
Subordination and Accountability to Legitimate Government Authority	12
Public Confidence in Security Forces	15
Consent for Role of International Security Forces	15
POLITICAL MODERATION AND STABLE DEMOCRACY	17
Drivers of Conflict	
Competition for Absolute Power	18
Political Grievances	19
External Destabilization	20
Institutional Performance	
Peace Settlement	22
Delivery of Essential Government Services	24

Governmental Legitimacy, Responsiveness, and Accountability	24
Political Parties and Electoral Process	26
Respect for Minority Rights.	27
Citizen Participation and Civil Society	28
Free and Responsible Media.	29
RULE OF LAW	33
Drivers of Conflict	
Injustice	35
Impunity.	36
Criminalization of State Institutions	37
Institutional Performance	
Public Order and Safety	39
Administration of Justice	40
Judicial Independence and Government Accountability	44
Respect for Human Rights.	45
Equality Before the Law.	46
Societal Support for Rule of Law.	47

SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY	51
Drivers of Conflict	
Political Impact of Illicit Wealth	53
Economic Incentives for Conflict	55
Economic Inequality between Groups in Conflict	55
Effects of Economic Decline	56
External Drivers of Conflict	56
Institutional Performance	
Infrastructure	58
Fiscal Integrity	59
Regulatory and Corporate Governance Framework	59
Financial Institutions	61
Employment	61
Private Sector	62
Management of Natural Resources	63
Economic Performance and Self Reliance	63

SOCIAL WELL-BEING	67
Drivers of Conflict	
Societal Cleavages.	69
Social Disintegration	70
Population Displacement	70
Demographic Pressures	71
External Destabilization	72
Institutional Performance	
Access to Basic Needs.	73
Provision of Basic Social Services	73
Peace Process	75
Reconciliation Processes	75
National Identity and Social Capital	76

PURPOSE

This document constitutes the Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE) Metrics Framework. The Framework is a hierarchical metrics system of *outcome-based* goals, indicators, and measures. Once collected, the measures can be aggregated to provide indications of trends toward the achievement of stabilization goals over time.

MPICE provides a system of metrics that can assist in formulating policy and implementing strategic and operational plans to transform conflict and bring stability to war-torn societies. These metrics provide the content for baseline operational-

and strategic-level assessments allowing policymakers to diagnose potential obstacles to stabilization prior to an intervention. The principal purpose is to enable practitioners to track progress from the point of intervention through stabilization and, ultimately, to a self-sustaining peace. This metrics system is designed to identify potential sources of continuing violent conflict and instability and to gauge the capacity of indigenous institutions to overcome them. The intention is to assist policymakers in establishing realistic goals, bringing adequate resources and authorities to bear, focusing their efforts strategically, and enhancing prospects for attaining an enduring peace.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people contributed to the development of the Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE) Metrics Framework, including those who attended the scores of workshops conducted to create and refine the contents. While we would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank each and every one, they are too numerous to list in full. Their role in developing the MPICE Metrics Framework, however, cannot be overstated.

We would specifically like to recognize the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Rapid Response Technology Office for providing the majority of the funding for the effort, and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) for funding to augment the project. We thank the senior-level steering committee for providing oversight and guidance. This committee was composed of representatives from OSD, the Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), the Department of State, USAID, USACE, the United States Institute of Peace, the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Army G3, and the U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute. Hundreds of academics, government officials, military personnel, nongovernmental organization representatives, and other experts and practitioners gathered for working group sessions to develop the Framework during 2006 and 2007. We would like to extend our appreciation to them for their acumen, expertise, and perseverance. We express our gratitude for JFCOM's 2007 Multinational Experiment 5 (MNE5) organiza-

tional team and to the participants for their assistance in refining the product and identifying suggestions to make application of MPICE more relevant to the user community. We acknowledge the valuable comments, suggestions, and insights offered by attendees at several peer review workshops held at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, the Carr Center at Harvard University, the Center for Law and Military Operations, and the Naval Postgraduate School.*

We particularly want to highlight the numerous contributions, diligence, professionalism, and overall support to the MPICE effort by our contractors: Elon Weinstein of International Sustainable Systems; Rob Grossman, Dennis Skocz; and Scott Tousley of Logos Technologies, Inc.; Dave Redding of MPRI, Inc. and Charlotte Anderholt, our research assistant from Georgetown University.

*The MPICE project is indebted to Alan Kuperman and James Lindsay at the LBJ School, Sarah Sewell and Tyler Moselle at the Carr Center, Katherine Gorove at the Center for Law and Military Operations, and Karen Guttieri at the Naval Postgraduate School for their assistance in organizing these peer review sessions. While they were invaluable in identifying improvements, any remaining defects are the exclusive responsibility of the MPICE developers.

INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of the Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE, pronounced M-Peace) project is to provide a comprehensive capability for measuring progress during stabilization and reconstruction operations for subsequent integrated interagency and intergovernmental use. MPICE enables policymakers to establish a baseline before intervention and track progress toward stability and, ultimately, self-sustaining peace. The intention is to contribute to establishing realistic goals, focusing government efforts strategically, integrating interagency activities, and enhancing the prospects for attaining an enduring peace. This metrics framework supports strategic and operational planning cycles.

Designed for policymakers, analysts, planners, and program and project implementers in conflict areas around the world, MPICE was developed through a collaborative effort led by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), the U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), The Fund for Peace (FFP), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Department of State (DOS) with funding support from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), USACE, and USAID. The MPICE system was tested through “case study” application in Afghanistan and Sudan. Refinement will continue as it is applied in current and future crises.

Development of MPICE

There has been a long-standing need for “measures of effectiveness” focused on diplomatic, military, and development efforts in places prone to or emerging from conflict. Traditionally, U.S. government (USG) agencies have tended to measure outputs, such as the number of schools built, miles of roads paved, or numbers of police trained. Outputs, however, measure what we do but not what we achieve. Outcomes (also referred to as impacts or effects within USG organizations) indicate the success or failure of programs and strategies since they seek to measure the attainment of goals that reinforce stability and self-sustaining peace.

Recognizing the need for an interagency capability to measure outcomes, in late 2004 USIP established a Working Group on Measuring Progress with the Center for Strategic and International Studies as part of the Institute’s Filling the Gaps project. The working group met through the spring of 2005, producing a Special Report that recommended a framework to “measure progress toward reducing the means and motivations for violent conflict and building local capacity to resolve conflict peacefully.”¹

-
1. Craig Cohen, “Measuring Progress in Stabilization and Reconstruction,” USIP Special Report, 2005.

In December 2005, the State Department's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) published the *U.S. Government Draft Planning Framework for Reconstruction, Stabilization, and Conflict Transformation*.² Conflict transformation entails diminishing the dynamics that provoke violent conflict and enhancing the capacity of indigenous institutions to resolve internal disputes peacefully.³ To complement its other planning tools, S/CRS sought assistance in developing a metrics system to gauge progress toward conflict transformation and stabilization.⁴

As part of the U.S. Army Concept, Plans, and Doctrine Branch's (G3) Dwight D. Eisenhower National Security Conference Series, the PKSOI asked the research and development directorate of the USACE and the Science and Technology Office at the DOS to convene a conference on metrics for stability operations based on their work with the National Science and Technology Council's Regional Stability Interagency Working Group (April 2004–December 2006), which identified the understanding and measuring of the effects of stability operations as a national research and development priority. Capitalizing on USIP's work, a

collaborative effort ensued that recognized and began to address gaps in interagency capability to measure outcomes and effects. At the end of 2005, USACE and USAID funded initial feasibility pilots aimed at exploring what it would take to build a metrics system. USACE proposed an applied research and development effort in late 2006 that was funded by OSD's Rapid Response Technology Office. To provide oversight and guidance for the effort, a steering committee was formed with senior-level representatives from OSD, the U.S. Joint Forces Command, USAID, DOS, USACE, USIP, the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army G3, and PKSOI. Throughout 2006 and 2007, hundreds of academics, government officials, military personnel, nongovernmental organization representatives, and other experts and practitioners gathered for working sessions and evaluations of the emerging Framework.

The MPICE System

The MPICE System is composed of three primary components: the MPICE Metrics Framework, the MPICE Handbook, and the MPICE Tools. This document presents the MPICE Metrics Framework. The MPICE Handbook is the users guide for the MPICE System and documents the procedures for collecting and analyzing the data and processes for tailoring the indicators and measures to the context involved. The MPICE Tools are software modules to automate the MPICE tailoring process, data collection, analysis, and training. This suite of software tools enables a range of users to implement the MPICE process and aggregate and visualize complex qualitative and quantitative data.

2. *U.S. Government Draft Planning Framework for Reconstruction, Stabilization, and Conflict Transformation*, United States Joint Forces Command J7 Pamphlet, Version 1.0, 2005.
3. This concept is articulated in Jock Covey, Michael J. Dziedzic, and Leonard R. Hawley, eds. *The Quest for Viable Peace: International Intervention and Strategies for Conflict Transformation* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press and the Association of the United States Army, 2005).
4. See *U.S. Government Draft Planning Framework for Reconstruction, Stabilization and Conflict Transformation*, p. 4.

The MPICE Handbook and Tool components are still under development and will be released with the MPICE Metrics Framework Version 2.0.

STRUCTURE OF THE MPICE METRICS FRAMEWORK

MPICE identifies the conflict environment as falling into one of three Objective States on the trajectory toward sustainable peace:

STATE 0 – IMPOSED STABILITY: Drivers of violent conflict persist, requiring the active and robust presence of external military forces, in partnership with a sizable international civilian presence, to perform vital functions such as imposing order, reducing violence, delivering essential services, moderating political conflict, and instituting an acceptable political framework pursuant to a peace accord.

STATE I – ASSISTED STABILITY: Drivers of violent conflict have been reduced to the extent that they can be largely managed by local actors and indigenous institutions (formal and informal). This permits the reduction of outside military intervention and civilian assistance to minimal levels that can be sustained by the intervening parties over the long term. (Note: Elsewhere this stage has been called viable peace or sustainable peace.)⁵

5. See Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, eds. *The Quest for Viable Peace*.

STATE II – SELF-SUSTAINING PEACE: Local institutions are able to cope effectively with residual drivers of violent conflict and resolve internal disputes peacefully without the need for an international military or civilian administrative presence. (Note: FfP defines this condition as sustainable security.)⁶

MPICE is intended for use predominately during States 0 (Imposed Stability) and I (Assisted Stability), during an intervention in conflict-ravaged areas. The focus is not on environments in which conflict management and stabilization are no longer driving forces affecting institutional development priorities.

MPICE is structured to measure the drivers of violent conflict against the ability of indigenous institutions to resolve the conflict peacefully. Institutional performance includes the formal institutions of government and informal societal practices. This relationship is assessed in five sectors or end states essential to the resolution of conflict: Safe and Secure Environment, Political Moderation and Stable Governance, Rule of Law, Sustainable Economy, and Social Well-Being.⁷ This categorization scheme is derived from USIP's "Framework for Societies Emerging from Conflict."

6. "Conflict Resolution: A Methodology for Assessing Internal Collapse and Recovery," by Pauline H. Baker, in *Armed Conflict in Africa*, Carolyn Pumphrey and Rye Schwartz-Barcott, eds. (Lanham, MD: Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003).

7. Available at <http://www.usip.org/resources/framework-success-fragile-states-and-societies-emerging-conflict>.

THE MPIC SECTORS

Each of these sectors or end states is divided into two subsectors, Conflict Drivers and Institutional Performance, which are then each further subdivided hierarchically as follows:



This example from the MPICE Framework is illustrative:

Sector:	Political Moderation and Stable Governance
Subsector:	Diminish the Drivers of Conflict
Goal:	Political Grievances Diminished
Indicator:	Are atrocities committed against opposition identity groups on a systematic basis?
Measures:	Number of incidents of political violence, to include extra-judicial killings, disappearances, massacres, vandalism, “ethnic cleansing.” (By identity group) (QD) (CA) Prosecution rates for these crimes (By identity group). (QD)

The indicator states the concept that is to be evaluated, while the measures describe the empirical data to be collected. If more than one measure is used per indicator, they are aggregated to produce an indicator score. The indicators inform users about whether or not the goal is being realized over time.

Data collection methodologies are recommended for each measure (in this example, “QD” indicates quantitative data and “CA” stands for content analysis).

Explanation of Data Collection and Trend Codes

Measures in the MPICE Metrics Framework are followed by a series of codes indicating suggested data collection methodologies and the trend desired in data collected over time if the goals are being met. These codes are explained below.

MPICE data collection methodologies include content analysis, expert knowledge, quantitative data, and survey/polling data. These four methodologies were tagged as recommended ways to gather the desired data by subject matter experts assembled during MPICE development workshops. These methods should be considered suggestive and not exclusive.

Content Analysis (CA): Involves surveying media publications using key Boolean phrases that represent the indicators in order to track the salience of issues, monitor events, identify perceptions, and determine trends.

Expert Knowledge (EK): Entails creating a panel of independent, knowledgeable, and experienced experts to assess an issue of interest (e.g., the capacity of law enforcement agencies to perform essential administrative and bureaucratic functions). The reliability and repeatability of the findings depend on specifying the evaluation criteria and data-gathering methodology in advance and following them consistently in the field.

Quantitative Data (QD): Utilizes statistics relating to security, standard of living, and economic development, for example, to assess the situation in a country. We provide references to existing sources of quantitative data related to MPICE measures.

Survey/Polling Data (S/PD): Involves conducting public opinion surveys in order to assess how the public views a variety of issues.

Once collected, the data can be aggregated and analyzed to establish trends over time.

Each measure within this Framework also has a tag identifying the preferred trend direction:

“+” indicates the preferred trend is increasing or positive;

“–” indicates the preferred trend is decreasing or negative;

“d” indicates that the preferred trend depends on other conditions. These conditions will be fully specified in Version 2.0 of the Framework.

The measures are structured in such a way that the majority of drivers should decrease over time and the performance of institutions should increase over time. For example, the Drivers of Conflict goal External Destabilization Diminished, with the indicator *Do perpetrators of political violence find sanctuary and support in neighboring states?*, has three measures:

- Presence of perpetrators of political violence from the conflict-affected state/region in neighboring countries. (EK) –
- Refusal by neighboring states to extradite indicted members of armed factions. (EK) –

- Refusal of neighboring states to take measures to control the common or shared border. (EK) –

Trends for these measures should decline over time in order for stabilization to progress, thus the minus sign.

Similarly, the institutional goal Delivery of Essential Government Services Strengthened, with the indicator *Are public expectations for provision of essential public services and utilities being met?*, has two measures:

- Perception of the quality of life following international intervention (by identity group). (S/PD) +
- Level of public satisfaction with accessibility of essential government services and utilities. (By identity group) (S/PD) +

Trends for these measures should increase over time in order for stabilization to progress, thus the plus sign.

However, some measures may not be uniformly indicative of progress or deterioration. These measures may be influenced by an intervening variable such as the stage of the conflict, or by influences peculiar to a location (e.g., local, regional, or national level). Thus these measures, while generally valuable, require an additional degree of interpretation.

For example, the Delivery of Essential Government Services Strengthened goal, with the indicator *Are the various levels of*

government capable of providing essential services, utilities and functions?, has a measure:

- Number of essential government functions that are being performed by international actors. (QD) d

This measure has been tagged as dependant (or “d”) because it is not a measure of Institutional Performance that is necessarily always desired to trend to the positive or negative. The number of essential government functions performed by international actors is likely to rise during the first months after an intervention. This should not be considered a negative indicator at that stage. Indeed, the sooner international assistance providers can provide a peace dividend, the better. The subsequent replacement of international service providers by indigenous authorities is unambiguously a positive trend.

The Delivery of Essential Government Services Strengthened goal, with the indicator *Does a professional civil service exist?*, has the measure:

- Perception of the degree of corruption in the civil service. (by identity group) d

This measure has been tagged as dependant (or “d”) because it is a measure of institutional performance that may be influenced by other factors. Normally a reduction in the perception of the degree of corruption is desirable. However, there could be an increase that is purely a function of other positive developments. For example, an increase in media attention may be the cause,

which itself may indicate actual corruption, perceived corruption, or an increased freedom of the press to report on corruption. Another factor might be the growing awareness by the public of the government’s responsibilities. Dependent measures tagged with a “d” should be thoroughly assessed to determine which direction indicates progress and under what conditions.

Brief Introduction to the Tailoring Process

Policymakers will establish the national goals or international mandates to be achieved. Since the goals, indicators, and measures contained in the MPICE Metrics Framework are generic in nature, they must be adapted to the specific policy goals, conflict dynamics, and cultural peculiarities relevant to each conflict setting. This process will be described in detail in the MPICE Handbook. Two salient methodological issues are noted here.

The first issue is the selection of appropriate measures to collect. There is a requirement to identify which of the measures catalogued in MPICE are relevant to the particular policy goals and entrenched sources of conflict in each case. This down-selection process entails identifying a manageable number of measures that are of the greatest relevance to the conflict environment.

The second issue is the adaptation of the selected generic measures so that they make sense in each unique cultural context. Although one of the prominent concerns in crafting the measures was to avoid any cultural or Western bias, the MPICE Metrics

Framework could not totally capture the full range of cultural diversity that exists or be free of unintended biases. One method of addressing any residual bias is the tailoring process. The purpose is to adapt the down-selected measures to each cultural context, especially by recognizing that different structures and processes may be used to achieve a given function.

A more detailed explanation of the steps involved in the tailoring process will be provided in the forthcoming Handbook, along with an explanation of how to gather and analyze the data required using the four methodologies identified in MPICE. The MPICE Handbook will be released with the MPICE Metrics Framework Version 2.0 in the near future.

SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT

STATE I OBJECTIVE: Armed opposition groups responsible for political violence have largely been defeated, subordinated to legitimate government authority, or disarmed and reintegrated into society. National security forces, increasingly operating lawfully under legitimate government authority, provide a safe and secure environment for citizens, *assisted by a sustainable level of involvement by international forces (e.g., combat troops and police).*

STATE II OBJECTIVE: National security forces, operating lawfully under legitimate government authority, maintain a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and provide a safe and secure environment for all citizens, *without the operational involvement of international forces.*

GOALS:

I. Diminish Drivers of Conflict

- A. Political Violence Diminished
- B. Threat from Ex-combatants Diminished
- C. Popular Support for Violent Factions Diminished
- D. Use of National Security Forces for Political Repression Diminished
- E. Criminalization of National Security Forces Diminished
- F. External Destabilization Diminished

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

- A. Compliance with Security Agreements Strengthened
- B. Performance of National Security Forces Strengthened
- C. Subordination and Accountability to Legitimate Government Authority Strengthened
- D. Public Confidence in National Security Forces Strengthened
- E. Consent for Role of International Security Forces Strengthened

SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

A. Political Violence Diminished^a

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do armed opposition groups (e.g., militias, guerrilla forces, insurgents, death squads, private security forces, gangs, or terrorists) engage in violence to advance political agendas or to oppose the peace process?^b</i>	Number and frequency of attacks against government forces and officials. ^c	QD	–
	Number and frequency of attacks against international forces and nongovernmental organizations.	QD	–
	Number of casualties (civilian vs. military) resulting from attacks. ^d	QD	–
	Number of attacks against infrastructure. ^e	QD	–
	Recruitment by armed groups.	QD, EK	–
	The abduction of children and women into armed factions.	QD, EK	–
	Percentage of national territory that is controlled by armed factions. ^f	QD	–
	Percentage of population not under control of the government. ^g	QD	–
<i>Do armed opposition groups engage in illegal trafficking in weapons and military equipment and maintain hidden arms caches?</i>	Number of usable arms caches discovered (attributed to identity group).	QD	d
	Amount of illegal weapons (heavy weapons, small arms, and munitions) and equipment seized by government and international forces (attributed to identity group).	QD	d
<i>Has the command and control structure of armed opposition groups been permanently dismantled?</i>	Recruitment and training of new combatants.	EK	–
	Response of demobilized combatants to orders from a former commander to take up arms (i.e., accept or refuse).	EK	–

2 Safe and Secure Environment

	Structures under the control of violent factions continue to be used to intimidate, coerce, and assassinate political rivals.	EK	–
<i>Is there partisan infiltration of military and intelligence services?</i>	Extent to which the defense department/ministry is controlled by partisan political actors.	EK	–
	Percentage of military and intelligence services members who are not loyal to the legitimate government.	EK	–

B. Threat from Ex-combatants Diminished

<i>Do ex-combatants and members of their support base believe that peace holds more promise than combat?</i>	The degree to which ex-combatants (leaders and rank-and-file) and members of their support base believe their personal safety is guaranteed (e.g., against prosecution, revenge killings, or punishment from former commanders) if they give up arms.	S/PD	+
	The degree to which ex-combatants (leaders and rank-and-file) and members of their support base express confidence in peace and/or political processes.	S/PD, CA	+
	The degree to which ex-combatants (leaders and rank-and-file) and members of their support base believe the peace and/or political process fairly represents their self interests and the interests of their families.	S/PD	+
<i>Have former combatants and their support base disarmed, demobilized, and reintegrated into society?</i>	Number of heavy weapons placed in cantonment as a percentage of heavy weapons in possession (both government and opposition forces).	QD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
	Ratio of individual weapons and ammunition relinquished to number of demobilizing combatants (both government and opposition forces).	QD	+
	Percentage of ex-combatants (both government and opposition forces) who have met demobilization requirements established in the peace settlement.	QD, EK	+
	Percentage of eligible combatants (both government and opposition forces) registered for reintegration programs.	QD	+
	Number and percentage of ex-combatants employed or included in the official security sector.	QD	d
	Number and percentage of ex-combatants returned to their original communities or resettled elsewhere.	QD	+
	Incidence of involvement of ex-combatants in violent crime.	QD, EK	-
	Incidence of attacks or intimidation or discrimination against ex-combatants.	QD, CA	-
	Level of participation in the political process and civil society by ex-combatants (leaders and rank-and-file).	S/PD	+

4 Safe and Secure Environment

C. Popular Support for Violent Factions Diminished

<i>Do armed opposition groups receive support from sympathizers in the population?</i> ^h	Percentage of military-aged population that expresses an inclination to support or join a violent faction (by identity group).		–
	Intensity of popular support (passive sympathy, devotion, or active support) given to violent factions (by identity group).	S/PD	–
	Degree of collaboration (passive sympathy, devotion, or active support) between various political-social institutions (e.g., tribal associations, religious groups, social welfare networks, educational centers, local media associations, or financial institutions) and violent factions.	S/PD, EK	d
<i>Is support for violent armed factions coerced?</i>	Percentage of the population that feels intimidated by the threats or actions of violent factions (by identity group).	S/PD	–
	Accusations of treason against individuals within their own identity group for cooperating with opposing identity groups or supporting the peace process.	CA, EK	–
	Menacing letters, threats of harm, and punishment for cooperating with opposing identity groups or supporting the peace process.	EK, S/PD	–
<i>Is there popular approval for the use of force against violent armed factions?</i>	Percentage of people who approval of the use of force against the violent faction with which they affiliate.	S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
	Incidents of public dissent (e.g., demonstrations, funeral processions, or symbolic marches) in response to the use of force by state security forces and/or the international mission against violent factions.	QD/CA	–
D. Use of National Security Forces for Political Repression Diminished			
<i>Are security forces used to repress political opposition groups?</i> ¹	Number of assassinations or attempted assassinations of opposition group members attributed to state security forces.	QD, CA	–
	Number of arbitrary arrests and disappearances of opposition group members attributed to state security forces.	QD, CA	–
	Incidents of torture attributed to state security forces.	EK, CA	–
	Percentage of the public who report that they or their family members have suffered from abuses or excessive use of force at the hands of state security forces.	S/PD	–
<i>Are overt state-sponsored or covert state-supported private militias used to attack political opponents?</i>	Number of assassinations or attempted assassinations of opposition group members attributed to overt state-sponsored or covert state-supported private militias.	QD, CA	–
	Number of arbitrary arrests and disappearances of opposition group members attributed to overt state-sponsored or covert state-supported private militias.	QD, CA	–
	Incidents of torture attributed to overt state-sponsored or covert state-supported private militias.	EK, CA	–

6 Safe and Secure Environment

E. Criminalization of National Security Forces Diminished

<i>Is the leadership of the security forces (military and intelligence) linked to organized criminal networks, diversion of official resources, or other illicit activities?</i>	Heads of military and intelligence services are known or reported to collaborate with organized crime groups.	EK, CA, S/PD	–
	Heads of military and intelligence services profit from illicit exploitation of natural resources.	EK, CA	–
	Heads of military and intelligence services control or derive profit from illegal trafficking in commodities or persons.	EK, CA	–
	Heads of military and intelligence services control and divert revenue from customs duties.	EK	–
	Extent to which personnel rosters are inflated with phantom soldiers.	EK	–
	Extent to which soldiers fail to receive the pay and compensation to which they are entitled.	S/PD, EK	–

F. External Destabilization Diminished

<i>Does interference by foreign states or transnational actors (e.g., diasporas, political movements, transborder communications media, illicit commercial enterprises, private security forces, terrorist networks) fuel conflict or undermine peace efforts?¹</i>	Number of foreign fighters killed or captured (by affiliation).	QD, EK	d
	Number (type and impact) of armed incursions by neighboring states.	QD, EK	–
	Number (type and impact) of armed incursions by non-state actors from neighboring states.	QD, EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do armed opposition groups exploit cross-border sanctuaries as a base for operations, source of recruitment, or location for weapons caches?</i>	Flow of funding from foreign states or transnational actors to violent factions.	EK	–
	Flow of weapons from foreign states or transnational actors to violent factions.	EK	–
	Evidence of organizational linkages between Diaspora or affinity groups and warring factions.	EK	–
	Number (type and impact) of armed incursions by non-state actors from neighboring states.	QD, EK	–
	Number of insurgents based in neighboring states.	EK	–
	Refugee camps in neighboring states exploited as sanctuaries and recruitment grounds.	EK	–
	Number of arms smugglers interdicted at border.	QD, EK	d
<i>Do linkages exist between armed opposition groups and transnational criminal networks?</i>	Involvement of transnational criminal networks in operational activities of armed opposition groups.	EK	–
	Flow of arms from transnational criminal networks to armed opposition groups (by recipient).	EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- WGI*, Variable: Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism – the likelihood that the government will be destabilized by unconstitutional or violent means, including terrorism.
- WITS* is an excellent resource for this section. *MAROB*, Variable: MILITIAFORM can be used to find organizations with military wings, and the variables ORGST8, and DOMORGVIOLENCE relate to organizations' violent activities, including insurgency.
- MAR*, Variable: REB – Rebellion.

8 Safe and Secure Environment

- d. *MAROB*, Variables: *ORGST7* – whether the organization attacks civilians, *DNSECGOV* – whether the targets of attacks are non-security government workers, and *DSECGOV* – whether the targets of the attacks are security government workers.
- e. *MAROB*, Variable: *DCIVINFRA* and *DGOVINFRA* – whether the target of attacks is civilian infrastructure or government infrastructure, respectively.
- f. *BTI*, Variable: *Monopoly on the Use of Force* – extent to which the state's monopoly on the use of force covers the entire territory.
- g. *MAROB*, Variable: *ORGST9* – whether organization controls movement and infrastructure in rebel territory.
- h. *MAROB*, Variable: *DOMORGPROT* – coded according to the size of the largest protest sponsored by the organization.
- i. *MAR*, Variable: *Government Repression of a Group* (divided into repression against General Civilians, those involved in Non-Violent Collective Action, and those involved in Violent Collective Action); *MAROB*, Variable: *STATEVIOLENCE* – whether the state uses violence against the organization.
- j. *MAR*, Variables: *KINMILSUP*, *STAMILSUP*, and *NSAMILSUP* – Military support for the group from kindred group members, foreign state actors, or non-state actors, respectively; *MAROB*, Variables: *DIANVMILSUP*, *DIAVMILSUP*, *FORSTNVMILSUP*, *FORSTMILSUP*, *INGOVMILSUP*, and *INGOVMILSUP* – Whether non-violent or violent military support was provided by members of the diaspora, a foreign state, or international nongovernmental organizations, respectively.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

A. Compliance with Security Agreements Strengthened

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are cases of noncompliance with cooperative security agreements resolved?</i>	Relative number of cases of compliance versus noncompliance. (Itemize each cooperative security arrangement, associated timelines, and degree of compliance with each.)	QD, EK	+
	Percent of noncompliance cases investigated and resolved (by former warring faction).	QD, EK	+

B. Performance of National Security Forces Strengthened

<i>Do the security forces maintain control over national territory?</i>	Percentage of national territory that is under control of the government.	QD	+
	Number of checkpoints or roadblocks set up by armed opposition groups.	QD	-
	Percent of national territory controlled by external forces.	QD	-
<i>Is there a safe and secure environment?</i>	Percentage of residents who feel more secure today than they did six months before (by province and identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of residents who believe that they will be more secure in the months ahead than they are today (by province and identity group).	S/PD	+
	Safe and sustainable resettlement in mixed identity group neighborhoods.	QD, EK	+
	Use of public/private institutions, such as schools, banks, markets.	EK, QD	+

10 Safe and Secure Environment

<i>Do citizens have freedom of movement throughout national territory regardless of their identity group?</i>	Number of publicly held community-based celebrations.	QD, EK	+
	Amount spent by businesses on private security. ^a	EK, QD	-
	Degree to which members of formerly warring factions and competing identity groups can travel freely in areas controlled by their rivals.	EK	+
<i>Are the roles and missions of security forces appropriate to the officially stated security threat?</i>	Percentage of the population who feels they can travel safely within the country (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Cost and amount of time required to negotiate checkpoints.	S/PD, EK	-
	A division of labor exists between the police and military services, with the former performing public safety roles and the latter involved in national security missions.	EK	+
	A national security strategy and threat assessment exist.	EK	+
	The force structure matches the national security strategy and officially stated threat assessment.	EK	+
<i>Are the intelligence services effective?</i>	Training and operating procedures are designed to meet officially stated current and anticipated security threats.	EK	+
	Laws/rules/principles exist to regulate intelligence services.	EK	+
	Extent to which threats to internal and external security have been prevented or disrupted because of intelligence-led operations.	EK	+
	Extent to which prosecution and conviction for crimes relating to threats to internal or external security have been supported by intelligence services.	EK	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are border control and customs services effective?</i>	Availability of actionable intelligence and other information regarding the illicit transit of goods and services across the borders.	EK	+
	Extent to which national borders—land, sea, and air—are under domestic border control surveillance.	EK, QD	+
	Extent of bribery of border officials to secure transit of illicit goods through ports of entry.	S/PD, EK	–
	Amount of revenue collected by customs officials.	QD	d
	Percentage of arrests for illicit border activity leading to convictions.	QD	+
	Level of cooperation with neighboring states regarding illicit border crossings.	EK	+

C. Subordination and Accountability to Legitimate Civilian Authority Strengthened

<i>Are security forces subordinate to legitimate civilian government authority?</i>	Any security force official can be held accountable for serious misconduct either by a military tribunal or a civilian judicial process.	EK	+
	The roles and missions of military and intelligence services are clearly defined and are observed.	EK	+
	Degree to which the military officer and noncommissioned officer (NCO) corps regard use of the military for partisan political purposes as strictly forbidden.	S/PD, EK	+
	Degree to which the military officer and NCO corps accept that they do not have the legal right to overthrow civilian leadership.	S/PD, EK	+

12 Safe and Secure Environment

<i>Do military and intelligence services respect human rights?</i> ^b	Protections against violations of privacy (e.g., unlawful surveillance and wiretaps) exist in law and are enforced by the courts.	EK	+
	Civilian structures and procedures exist and are used to direct and control the military and intelligence services effectively (e.g., command and control structures, internal control processes, periodic inspections and audits, etc.).	EK	+
	The extent of legislative authority over the military and intelligence services (may include approving budgets, access to off-budget program expenditures, power to investigate misconduct by members of the military and intelligence services, and approval of senior appointments).	EK	+
	Members of military and intelligence services are aware of domestic and international codes of conduct and standards regarding human, political, and civil rights.	S/PD, EK	+
	Members of military and intelligence services accept and respect domestic and international codes of conduct and standards regarding human, political, and civil rights.	S/PD, EK	+
	Violations of standards regarding human, political, and civil rights are investigated, adjudicated, and sanctioned.	EK, QD	+
	Citizens perceive the military and intelligence services respect human rights.	S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Does the government exercise effective control over private security companies (PSCs), including private guard services and personal protection agencies?</i>	Regional and international oversight mechanisms (e.g., regional human rights courts, UN special rapporteurs) function, and their recommendations are acted upon.	EK	+
	Members of military and intelligence services convicted of abuses are dismissed from duty.	EK, QD	+
	Number of armed forces and intelligence services personnel tried and convicted of human rights abuses.	EK, QD, CA	d
	PSCs are licensed and registered.	EK	+
	Unlicensed PSCs are disbanded.	EK	+
	Regulations governing PSCs' possession of firearms and use of force are enforced.	EK	d
<i>Do internal oversight mechanisms exist for monitoring, investigating, and prosecuting misconduct by military forces, including human rights abuses and war crimes, and are they effectively used?</i>	Number of incidents of extortion, intimidation, assault, and murder committed by PSC members.	CA, QD	-
	Number of PSCs having members convicted for extortion, intimidation, assault, and murder.	CA, QD	d
	An Inspector General (IG) (or similar system) conducts inspections, and its findings are acted upon by the chain of command.	EK	+
	A military justice system holds officers and NCOs accountable and punishes them for misconduct.	EK, QD	+
<i>Is civil society able to redress human rights abuses by the military and intelligence services?</i>	The IG or similar process includes effective safeguards against undue command influence.	EK	+
	Individuals and groups adversely affected by the conduct of military and intelligence services are able to seek and obtain redress through domestic institutions.	EK, S/PD	+

14 Safe and Secure Environment

Opposition politicians and civil society organizations are able to assemble and express concerns about misconduct by military and intelligence services and press for investigation and reform without interference.	EK	+
The media engages in investigative reporting about misconduct of the military and intelligence services without fear of reprisal.	CA, EK	+

D. Public Confidence in National Security Forces Strengthened

<i>Are citizens confident that the military and intelligence services are impartial?</i>	Perception that the military and intelligence services are used for partisan political purposes.	S/PD	–
<i>Are citizens confident in the national security forces?</i>	Perception by public that they are/will be protected by national security forces (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Perception that national security forces function in the best interest of the people (by identity group).	S/PD	+

E. Consent for International Forces Strengthened

<i>Are international security forces perceived as contributing to the establishment of a safe and secure environment?</i>	Perception that international security forces are contributing to an improved security situation (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Degree to which international security forces are seen as impartial (by identity group).	S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

a. *Enterprise Surveys* (The World Bank, 2009), <https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/custom> (accessed July 7, 2009), Variables: Percent of Firms Paying for Security and Percent of Firms Identifying Crime, Theft, and Disorder as Major Constraints.

b. *BTI*, Variable: Civil Rights Ensured – extent to which civil rights are guaranteed and protected, and to what extent can citizens seek redress for violations of these liberties?

POLITICAL MODERATION AND STABLE GOVERNANCE

STATE I OBJECTIVE: Competition for power and political grievances that spawn violent conflict are being addressed and channeled into nonviolent processes and participatory institutions *with a level of continuing international involvement and oversight that is sustainable.*

STATE II OBJECTIVE: Political institutions and participatory processes function legitimately and effectively *without international intervention* to manage competition for power peacefully and mitigate incidents of political violence.

GOALS:

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

(If present, these factors must be diminished)

- A. Competition for Exclusive Power Diminished
- B. Political Grievances Diminished
- C. External Destabilization Diminished

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

(If weak or non-existent, these factors must be strengthened)

- A. Peace Process Strengthened
- B. Delivery of Essential Government Services Strengthened
- C. Governmental Legitimacy, Responsiveness, and Accountability Strengthened
- D. Political Parties Strengthened
- E. Respect for Minority Rights and Electoral Rights Strengthened
- F. Citizen Participation and Civil Society Strengthened
- G. Free and Responsible Media Strengthened

POLITICAL MODERATION AND STABLE GOVERNANCE

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

A. Competition for Exclusive Power Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>To what extent do political elites/leaders and identity groups perceive the political process in exclusive (i.e., "zero-sum") terms?^a</i>	Perception among identity group members that loss of power (e.g., to other identity groups) will eliminate the prospect of regaining power in the future.	S/PD	–
	Perception among identity group members that loss of power (e.g., to other identity groups) will threaten their economic status, viability, or livelihoods in the future.	S/PD	–
	Public rhetoric from political elites/leaders asserting that their rivals have negotiated the peace settlement in bad faith (i.e., that the settlement is a trick or that their rivals will manipulate the peace settlement to assert control over security forces).	CA, EK	–
	Number of assaults and assassinations perpetrated by members of one of the former warring factions against leaders of other identity groups. ^b	QD, EK	–
	Number of assaults and assassinations perpetrated by members of one of the former warring factions against other members of their own identity group.	QD, EK	–
	Revisions to the constitution or equivalent document to permit continuation in power of the incumbent.	EK	–
	Revision of the electoral code to favor the incumbent.	EK	–

<i>To what extent are political elites/leaders polarized on the basis of their identity?</i>	Importance of identity group membership as a requirement for political leadership.	S/PD	–
	Prominence of inflammatory and exclusionary rhetoric in the discourse of political elites/leaders.	CA	–
B. Political Grievances Diminished			
<i>Are there unresolved war aims?</i>	Assessment of the peace settlement to determine the extent to which issues that have instigated violent conflict remain unresolved or are treated ambiguously (e.g., resource-rich areas not under effective government control, geographic flashpoints not under impartial management).	EK	–
<i>Are atrocities committed against opposition identity groups on a systematic basis?</i>	Number of incidents of political violence, to include extrajudicial killings, disappearances, massacres, vandalism, and "ethnic cleansing" (by identity group). ^c	QD, CA	–
	Prosecution rates for incidents of political violence, to include extrajudicial killings, disappearances, massacres, vandalism, "ethnic cleansing" (by identity group).	QD	–
<i>Do state authorities or dominant groups engage in political exclusion, repression of dissent, or scapegoating on the basis of group identity?^d</i>	Representation of identity group members in state entities (ministries) or institutions controlled by the state (schools, parastatals, etc.) relative to their share of the total population. ^e	QD	d
	Official disruption of public assemblies, marches or demonstrations organized by opposition groups. ^f	QD	–
	Prevalence of hate rhetoric and scapegoating in the discourse of dominant groups, (by identity group).	CA	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

C. External Destabilization Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do perpetrators of political violence find sanctuary and support in neighboring states?</i>	Perpetrators of political violence find sanctuary in neighboring countries.	EK	–
	Refusal by neighboring states to extradite indicted members of armed factions.	EK	–
	Refusal of neighboring states to take measures to control the common or shared border.	EK	–
<i>Are other states or nonstate actors able to manipulate local political affairs?</i>	Domestic political actors received political direction and/or resources from authorities or groups based in other states/regions.	EK	–
	Volume of inflammatory print and broadcast propaganda originating in other states that is disseminated domestically.	CA	–
	Actions by provocateurs from hostile states.	QD, EK	–
	Level of support within diaspora for the use of violence by warring factions/perpetrators of political violence to achieve political aims.	S/PD, CA	–
	Level of support within external affinity groups for the use of violence by warring factions/perpetrators of political violence to achieve political aims.	S/PD, CA	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

20 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

- a. Minorities at Risk Project, *Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior Dataset (MAROB)*, (College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, 2008), <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar> (accessed July 6, 2009). This dataset includes organizations in North African and Middle Eastern countries only. Variables: VIOLRHETDOM – coded according to the highest level of violence justified by the rhetoric of the leaders of an organization, and SUPREMACIST – whether an organization advocates superiority of racial/ethnic group and advocates for exclusive political power.
- b. The *Worldwide Incidents Tracking System (WITS)*, (Washington, DC: United States Office of National Intelligence, 2009), <http://wits.nctc.gov/Main.do> (accessed July 7, 2009), provides a comprehensive, up-to-date list of terrorist incidents by country. See also Minorities at Risk Project, *Minorities at Risk Dataset (MAR)*, (College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, 2009), <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar> (accessed July 6, 2009), Variable: Intercommunal Conflict, see especially CCGROUP1SEV – the severity of conflict perpetrated by different groups.
- c. David L. Cingranelli and David L. Richards, *The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset*, (Version 2009.02.24, 2009), <http://www.humanrightsdata.org> (accessed July 6, 2009). Variables: Disappearance, Extra-judicial Killing, and Physical Integrity Rights Index. See also the Center for Systemic Peace's *Major Episodes of Political Violence, 1946–2008*, (2008), <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm> (accessed July 6, 2009), Variable: ETHVIOL – Magnitude of ethnic violence in the given year; *MAROB*, Variable: ORGST10 – whether ethnic cleansing or genocide takes place as part of a minority organization's strategy; and *WITS*.
- d. *MAR*, Variable: Political Discrimination Index (POLDIS) – whether an organization representing an identity group is politically discriminated against by the state.
- e. *MAR*, Variable: EXECREP – whether the group is represented in the executive branch of the central government.
- f. *MAR*, Variable: Government Repression of a Group against non-violent collective actors.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

A. Peace Process Strengthened^a

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is there a viable process for addressing continuing violent conflict and ambiguities that the peace process failed to resolve?</i>	Dispute resolution mechanisms exist and are being used to clarify or resolve remaining vital issues among parties to the conflict.	EK	+
	A consultative process exists to incorporate elites/factions that were not original participants in the peace process.	EK	+
	Communication between the heads of key international missions and the various faction leaders is active.	EK	+
<i>Do political leaders/elites accept and support the peace settlement?</i>	Percentage of parties to the conflict that have signed a peace settlement. ^b	QD	+
	Number and severity of violations of the peace settlement by faction (e.g., ceasefire, cessation of operations, disarmament, and demobilization of troops).	QD, EK	
	Faction leaders renounce use of violence.	CA, EK	+
	Faction leaders condemn the use of violence.	CA, EK	+
	Faction leaders implement power-sharing arrangements without recourse to violence.	EK	+
	Degree of support for the peace settlement in the domestic mass media.	CA	+
	Implementation of the peace process is meeting popular expectations (by identity group).	S/PD	+
<i>Does the population accept and support the peace settlement and/or process?</i>	Number of marches and public demonstrations that express opposition to the peace process.	QD, EK	-

22 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

	Popular support for the peace process supersedes popular support for obstructionists of the peace process (by identity group).	EK, CA	+
	Influential figures (e.g., clerics, social icons) publicly repudiate acts of violence and other obstructionist behavior (by identity group).	EK, CA	+
<i>Is the peace settlement being implemented?</i>	Extent to which the provisions of the peace settlement have been implemented.	EK	+
	Perception of the general public that the peace settlement is being implemented.	S/PD	+
	Perception of the international community that the peace settlement is being implemented.	EK	+
	The composition of state security forces reflects the peace settlement. ^c	EK, QD	+
<i>Is international engagement adequate to sustain the peace process?</i>	Neighboring states are committed to the success of the peace process and the resulting power-sharing arrangement.	EK, CA	+
	Regional and major powers provide consistent and even-handed political attention and adequate resources to support the peace process.	EK	+
	International entities and nongovernmental organizations provide adequate resource support to sustain the peace process.	EK	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

B. Delivery of Essential Government Services Strengthened^d

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are public expectations for provision of essential public services and utilities being met?</i>	Perception of the quality of life following international intervention (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Level of public satisfaction with accessibility to essential government services and utilities (by identity group).	S/PD	+
<i>Are the various levels of government capable of providing essential services, utilities, and functions?^e</i>	Percentage of population or percent of territory receiving essential government services and utilities (by level of government).	QD	+
	Number of essential government functions that are being performed by international actors.	QD	d
	Distribution of essential public services to identity groups relative to their percentage of the total population.	QD	d
<i>Does a professional civil service exist?^f</i>	Percentage of government employees with training and education requisite for their positions.	QD	+
	Perception of the degree of corruption in the civil service (by identity group).	S/PD	d
	Perception of the degree of nepotism/cronyism in the civil service (by identity group).	S/PD	d

C. Governmental Legitimacy, Responsiveness, and Accountability Strengthened

<i>Does the constitution or equivalent document provide for peaceful succession of power and avoidance of monopolization of power?</i>	Assessment by international monitoring organizations of the legitimacy and transparency of elections or other government leadership selection processes.	EK	+
	Public perception of the legitimacy and transparency of the government leadership selection process.	S/PD	+

24 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

	Evaluation of elections by independent domestic monitors.	EK	+
	Executive terms in office are limited by constitution or equivalent document.	EK	+
	Succession is rule-based.	EK	+
	The process for modification of the constitution or equivalent document is participatory and requires involvement of more than the chief executive.	EK	+
<i>Is there confidence in state institutions?</i>	Perception that the government is responsive to individual needs (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
	Confidence in the government's ability to improve the situation (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
<i>Is the legislature representative of and responsive to the populace?</i>	Perceptions by gender and identity group members that vital concerns can be addressed and protected by the legislative process.	S/PD	+
	In practice, the ruling party or coalition of parties is distinct from the state.	EK	+
	Legislators seek to broaden their appeal by forming coalitions that respond to issues that cut across identity groups.	EK, CA	+
<i>Is the budget process transparent?</i>	The budget is published and available to the public.	EK	+
	Degree of openness of the budget process to the media and public.	EK, S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is government accountable?</i> ^g	Rating of government accountability systems according to international standards and best practices (e.g., the International Monetary Fund's Code of Best Practices for Fiscal Transparency).	QD, EK	+
	Where applicable, judicial review of the actions of the executive and legislative branches is effective and enforced.	EK	+
	A domestic ombudsman, oversight body, or independent audit organ is able to investigate and expose government abuses.	EK, QD	+
	Perceptions of the public that the actions of political officials are transparent and accountable.	S/PD	+
	Misconduct by senior government officials (e.g., head of state, ministerial-level officials, legislators, and/or judges) has been investigated and appropriately punished (by identity group). ^h	S/PD, QD	+
<i>Is the legislature able to provide effective oversight of the executive branch?</i>	The legislative branch is able to use its legal authorities to expose and counteract abuse of executive powers (e.g., investigations, hearings, revisions to budget submissions, etc.).	EK	+
	Degree to which the enacted budget is followed: level of underfunding, overspending, or nonbudgeted spending.	EK	+
D. Political Parties Strengthenedⁱ			
<i>Do political entities demonstrate a commitment to a nonviolent, responsive, and accountable electoral process?</i>	Former warring factions participate in party formation.	CA, EK	+

26 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

	Perception by party members that parties are responsive to their interests.	S/PD	+
	A system of campaign finance regulation exists and is enforced.	EK	+
<i>Does the public demonstrate a commitment to a non-violent, responsive, and accountable electoral process?</i> ^j	Participation in elections (by identity group). ^k	QD	+
	Rejection of violence against election sites/administration by the general public.	S/PD	+
<i>Are party formation, campaigning and conduct in government inclusionary (across identity groups)?</i> ^l	Diversity of the political base of major parties (by identity group).	S/PD, EK	+
	Parties form governing coalitions that cross identity group lines.	EK	+
	Percentage of independent voters in the electorate. ^m	QD	+

E. Respect for Minority Rights and Electoral Rights Strengthened

<i>Do minority groups and disenfranchised populations enjoy guarantees for fundamental civil and political rights?</i>	Freedom of religion is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+
	Freedom of assembly is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+
	Freedom of press is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+
	Freedom of speech is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+
	Freedom of association is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
	Freedom of movement is effectively protected under law (by identity group and gender).	EK, CA	+
	Perception that it is possible to exercise political and civil rights freely and without fear of retribution (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of citizens who feel they could file a human rights complaint without fear of reprisal (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of citizens who have confidence that they can obtain a fair hearing (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of citizens who have confidence that the government has a commitment to pursuing human rights cases (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+

F. Citizen Participation and Civil Society Strengthened^a

<i>Is there citizen participation in local government?</i>	Citizen participation in volunteer positions in local government, including service on unpaid citizen advisory bodies.	S/PD	+
<i>Do citizen values support an active civil society?</i>	Citizen values support active citizen participation in the public sphere and are favorable to the growth of civil society.	S/PD	+
<i>Are citizens informed about government abuse?</i>	Citizen awareness of their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities to influence the policies and actions of the government (by identity group and gender).	S/PD	+
<i>Are citizens capable of serving as a check on government abuse?^o</i>	Demonstrated capability of civil society organizations to mobilize members to protest against government abuse.	EK	+

28 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

	Resources and know-how of independent civic groups to educate citizens about the democratic process and lobby for democratic reforms.	QD, EK	+
<i>How robust are civil society organizations?</i>	Number of civil society organizations. ^p	QD	+
<i>Do civil society organizations provide oversight and scrutiny of government actions?</i>	Number/percentage of reports that civil society activists have been imprisoned without reason, threatened, physically harmed, or killed.	QD, CA	-
	Number of complaints filed by civil society organizations before anticorruption agencies, relative to number addressed by the agency (by identity group).	QD	-
	Government-imposed obstacles to formation of civic groups.	EK	-
<i>Do organizations exist in civil society that represent and advocate for minority, women, and other marginalized groups?</i>	Level of activity (e.g., demonstrations, petitions, lobbying) of NGOs representing the interests of minority, women, and other marginalized groups. ^q	EK, QD	+

G. Free and Responsible Media Strengthened^r

<i>Do the media provide scrutiny of government?</i>	Extent of editorial criticism and news unfavorable to the government in power.	CA, EK	+
	Number of opposition and nonofficial media outlets and readership.	QD, EK	+
	Violence and threats against journalists related to their political coverage.	QD	-
	Existence of official censorship.	CA, EK	-

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do effective restraints exist to curb media incitement of violence?</i>	Amount of inflammatory rhetoric in public media.	CA	–
	Standards of professional integrity and ethics in journalism exist and are used to address incendiary language or hate speech.	EK	+
<i>Are external media accessible?</i>	Number of foreign periodicals available in the conflicted country, including circulation/readership.	QD	+
	Number of external broadcast stations and services accessible in the state/region, and size of viewing/listening audience.	QD	+
	Extent of Internet access and connections.	QD, EK	+
	Measures by the government to filter access to Internet users in country. ⁵	EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- MAROB*, Variables: ORGSUCIMPL – the degree to which the government has implemented agreements with the organization, and ORGIMPL – the degree to which the organization has implemented agreements with the state.
- For a list of the signatories a peace agreement, see the *Peace Agreements Digital Collection*, (United States Institute of Peace), <http://www.usip.org/resources-tools/digital-collections> (accessed July 7, 2009). See also *The Transitional Justice Peace Agreements Database* (University of Ulster, Transitional Justice Institute, and International Conflict Research Institute), <http://www.peaceagreements.ulster.ac.uk/index.html> (accessed July 7, 2009).
- For data on the composition of the security forces, see Country Indicators for Foreign Policy, *Conflict Risk Assessment* (Ottawa, Canada: The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University, 2009) <http://www.carleton.ca/cgi-bin/cifp/data.pl> (accessed July 7, 2009). Variable: Militarization
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) 2008*, (Center for Applied Policy Research, 2008), <http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/> (accessed July 6, 2009), Criterion: Democracy Performs – whether democratic institutions, including the administrative system and the system of justice, are capable of performing. The *Economic Intelligence Unit (EIU)*, (The Economist, 2009), <http://www.eiu.com/> (accessed July 7, 2009), Indicator: Functioning of Government (additional indicators may be of assistance, but please note that this dataset requires payment).
- Daniel Kaufmann, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi, *Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), 1996–2008*, (The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://info.worldbank>.

30 Political Moderation and Stable Governance

- org/governance/wgi/sc_country.asp (accessed July 7, 2009). Variable – Government Effectiveness – the quality of public services, the capacity of the civil service and its independence from political pressures; and the quality of policy formulation. See also *BTI*, Variable: Basic Administration – the extent to which basic administrative structures exist,
- f. *Selected World Development Indicators (WDI) Dataset* (The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://go.worldbank.org/6HAYAHG8H0> (accessed July 7, 2009), Variable: CPIA Quality of Public Administration Rating. The complete *World Development Indicators* is available online for an annual subscription of \$200.
 - g. *WDI*, Variable: CPIA Transparency, Accountability, and Corruption in the Public Sector Rating.
 - h. *BTI*, Variable: Abuse of Office Persecuted – extent to which there are legal or political penalties for officeholders who abuse their positions (note: not by identity group).
 - i. *MAR*, Variable: Group Organization for Joint Political Action – whether an identity group's interests are promoted by political or military means; *MAROB*, Variable: ORGST3 Electoral Politics – whether organization currently has members in office or has announced intention to run members for office; *BTI*, Variables: Free Elections – the extent to which leaders are determined by free and fair elections, and Party Formation – the extent to which there is a stable, moderate, socially rooted party system that articulates and aggregates societal interests.
 - j. *BTI*, Criterion: Democratic Norms.
 - k. *EIU*, Variable: Political Participation (payment required).
 - l. *EIU*, Variable: Electoral Process and Pluralism (payment required).
 - m. *BTI*, Criterion: Association/Assembly Rights – extent to which independent political and/or civil groups associate and assemble freely.
 - n. *WGI*, Variable: Voice and Accountability – the extent to which a country's citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media.
 - o. *BTI*, Criterion: Civil Society – extent to which political leadership enables the participation of civil society in the political process.
 - p. *BTI*, Criterion: Interest Groups – extent to which there is a network of cooperative associations or interest groups to mediate between society and the political system.
 - q. *MAR*, Variable: Group Organization for Joint Political Action. *MAROB*, Variables: ETHORG and GENDINC can also be used to identify ethnic and gender-equality advocacy organizations, respectively.
 - r. See for example *Freedom of the Press*, (Washington, DC: Freedom House, 2009), <http://www.freedomhouse.org/> (accessed July 9, 2009).
 - s. *Internet World Stats* (Miniwatts Marketing Group, 2009) <http://internetworldstats.com/> (accessed July 7, 2009).

RULE OF LAW¹

STATE I OBJECTIVE: Impunity, injustice, and criminalization of state institutions are diminished to the point that domestic justice systems, both formal and informal, *supported by a sustainable level of essential international involvement*, provide an accepted process for resolving disputes peacefully by maintaining public order and safety, bringing perpetrators of major crimes to justice, holding governing authorities accountable through an independent judiciary, protecting fundamental human rights, and applying the law equally, in increasing compliance with international norms and standards.²

STATE II OBJECTIVE: Domestic justice systems, both formal and informal, *without international involvement*, provide a well functioning and accepted process for resolving disputes peacefully by maintaining public order and safety, bringing perpetrators of crimes to justice, holding governing authorities accountable through an independent judiciary, protecting fundamental human rights, applying the law equally and efficiently, and providing equal access to justice, in compliance with international norms and standards.³

GOALS:

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

- A. Injustice Diminished
- B. Impunity Diminished
- C. Criminalization of State Institutions Diminished

¹ The development of these measures for the rule of law was immensely enhanced by the expert professional scrutiny of David Bayley, Alex Berg, Scott Carlson, David Edelstein, Deborah Isser, Richard Mayer, Laurel Miller, Margaret Prothig, Alex Their, James Walsh, and Ed Zedlewski.

² As delineated in O'Connor, Vivienne, and Colette Rausch. *Model Codes for Post-Conflict Criminal Justice: Model Criminal Code* (Vol. I). Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007 and *Model Codes for Post-Conflict Criminal Justice: Model Code of Criminal Procedure* (Vol. II). Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2008.

³ Ibid.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

- A. Public Order and Safety Strengthened
- B. Administration of Justice Strengthened
- C. Judicial Independence and Government Accountability Strengthened
- D. Respect for Human Rights Strengthened
- E. Equality Before the Law Strengthened
- F. Societal Support for Rule of Law Strengthened

RULE OF LAW

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

A. Injustice Diminished^a

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is the legal system used as an instrument of repression?</i>	Percentage of citizens who fear law enforcement agencies as instruments of repression or that they will be treated unfairly if arrested (by province and identity group). ⁴	S/PD	–
	Detainees/prisoners are subjected to torture, cruel, or inhuman treatment, beatings, or psychological pressures (by identity group). ^{b, 5}	EK, S/PD, QD	–
	Percentage of known prison population detained beyond the period specified in the law who have not had their case reviewed by an appropriate authority (by identity group). ^{c, 6}	QD	–
<i>Is there discrimination in the treatment of disempowered or opposition groups throughout the legal process (by identity group)?</i>	Percentage of prison population (by identity group) relative to their proportion of the overall population.	QD	–
<i>Are traditional/nonstate justice systems used as an instrument of repression or discrimination?</i>	Traditional or other nonstate justice systems give preference to specific identity groups. ⁷	EK	–
	Traditional or other nonstate justice systems have been co-opted or distorted, resulting in discriminatory treatment of specific identity groups. ⁸	EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Note: The footnotes in the Rule of Law End State provide references to international treaties or covenants that establish standards that relate to the measures. The footnotes are located with the table notes at the end of each table.

B. Impunity Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Can political elites be held accountable for crimes they commit?</i>	Ability or willingness of the legal system to investigate, prosecute, and convict perpetrators of politically destabilizing crimes (e.g., intergroup murder, use of political violence against rivals, and terrorism) when political leaders/elites are suspected of involvement in these crimes. ⁹	EK	+
	Perceptions of law enforcement officials and victims of politically destabilizing crimes (e.g., intergroup murder, use of political violence against rivals, and terrorism) that suspects involved in these crimes are untouchable and that cases are abandoned for this reason. ¹⁰	S/PD, CA	–
	Ratio of incidence of politically destabilizing crimes to investigations, prosecutions, and convictions for these crimes.	QD	–
<i>Is justice obstructed in cases of crimes conducted by political elites?</i>	Percentage of legal cases in which witnesses recant testimony. ¹¹	QD	–
	Number of witnesses, police, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and their family members who suffer assaults or assassination. ¹²	QD	–
	Percent of judges with personal security details, or who have taken other security precautions.	S/PD, EK, QD	–

C. Criminalization of State Institutions Diminished

<i>Do parallel or informal governing structures sustained by illicit revenue exist within formal government institutions?</i>	Political leaders/ruling elites are involved in or linked to criminal looting of natural resources, drug trade, human trafficking, money laundering, or smuggling of arms and contraband. ¹³	EK	–
	Public perception that organized crime has a substantial influence on the development of national policies, operation of ministries, or allocation of resources. ¹⁴	S/PD	–
	Known criminals or individuals linked to crime syndicates occupy key government positions.	EK	–
	Extent to which government expenditures are unaccounted for or are hidden. ¹⁵	EK	–
	Militias/paramilitary groups allied with the government operate with government-issued equipment and/or funding.	EK	d

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

a. The American Bar Association's assessments of countries where they work are publicly available on their website <http://www.abanet.org/rol/publications.shtml> (accessed July 6, 2009).

b. *CIRI*, Variable: Torture

c. Roy Walmsley, *World Pre-Trial / Remand Imprisonment List* (London, United Kingdom: King's College London, January 2008), <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/depsta/law/research/icps/publications.php?id=6> (accessed July 7, 2009). Note that this does not specify the population detained beyond the period specified, nor is there a breakdown by identity group.

⁴Article 9–11, 14–16, 26, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

⁵Article 5, Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Article 7, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or

Degrading Treatment or Punishment; Article 3(1), 17, 87, 130, Third Geneva Convention “relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War”; Article 2, 5, Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials; Article 1, Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners; Principle 1, 21–22, Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons Under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment; Principle 2, 4, Principles of Medical Ethics relevant to the Role of Health Personnel, particularly Physicians, in the Protection of Prisoners and Detainees Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

⁶ Principle 11, 37–38, Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons Under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment; Rule 7.1, 14.1, 20, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules, General Assembly 1985).

⁷ Article A (5, 7), Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power; Article 14, 16, 26, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; Article 6(3), 7, Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice; Article 3, 4(2), 7, Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief; Article 3, Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women; Article 2, 15, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Article 6–8, Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Article 14(1), 26, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; Article 4, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; Article 2, Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity; Article 8(6), 18–19, 25, 30(2), 30(6–7), United Nations Convention Against Corruption; Article B(19), Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Article 32–33, United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

¹² Article 16–18, Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers; Article 32–33, United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

¹³ Article 5, 8, 14, 20, 30, United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

¹⁴ Article 15–20, 30, United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

¹⁵ Article 5, 9, 14, 20, 23, 30, United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

A. Public Order and Safety Strengthened^a

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do national and local law enforcement agencies enforce the law and maintain public order (by province or equivalent locality)?</i>	Percentage of population who have been the victims of violent crime in the past month/year	S/PD	–
	Safe and sustainable return of displaced persons and refugees to former neighborhoods. ¹⁶	QD, S/PD	+
	Use of public/private institutions, such as schools, banks, etc. for their intended purposes. ¹⁷	QD, EK	+
	Level of market activity. ¹⁸	QD, EK	+
	Amount spent by businesses on private security. ^b	QD, S/PD	–
<i>Are law enforcement agencies held accountable for serious misconduct (by province or equivalent locality)?</i>	Percentage of complaints of serious misconduct, such as excessive use of force by law enforcement agencies, that are properly investigated and prosecuted or pursued through administrative procedures. ¹⁹	EK, QD	+
	Percentage of public complaints that are investigated and sanctions that are imposed by an independent agency with subpoena power. ²⁰	QD, EK	+
	Codes of conduct emphasizing adherence to law and to international standards of human rights are enforced by the courts and/or by supervisors in law enforcement agencies. ²¹	EK, CA	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Does the public have confidence in law enforcement agencies?</i>	Survey questions: "Whom do you trust to protect your personal safety?" (Police as opposed to other relevant alternatives such as a violent opposition group). "Do you feel safer in your neighborhood today compared to six months ago?" "Do you feel safe walking in your neighborhood?" "How would you rate security conditions today?" "Have you been the victim of a crime?" "Did you report the crime to the police?" "Were you satisfied with the response?" "Do you teach you children to contact the police if they feel they are in danger and need help?"	S/PD	+
B. Administration of Justice Strengthened			
<i>Does the legal system (formal and informal) provide a nonviolent mechanism for the resolution of disputes (by identity group)?</i>	Percentage of citizens who say that they have access to and are willing to use formal court systems to resolve criminal disputes (by identity group)	S/PD	+
	Percentage of citizens who say that they have access to and are willing to use traditional, customary, or informal systems of justice to resolve criminal disputes (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of population who perceive they have been treated fairly by the formal court system in the past and/or expect to be treated fairly in the future (by province and identity group). ²²	S/PD	+

<i>Does the criminal justice system perform essential functions effectively?</i>	Percent of population who perceive they have been treated fairly by the traditional, customary, or informal court system in the past and/or expect to be treated fairly in the future (by province and identity group).	S/PD	+
	Extent to which citizens resort to the use of the formal legal system to settle inter-group conflicts.	QD, S/PD	+
	Extent to which citizens resort to the use of the traditional, customary or informal legal systems to settle intergroup conflicts.	QD, S/PD	+
	<u>Criminal Laws and Procedures:</u>		
	Criminal laws and procedures address contemporary criminal activity and provide effective means of law enforcement for combating terrorist financing, trafficking, transnational and organized crime, (e.g., extradition, mutual legal assistance), cyber crime, etc.	EK	+
	<u>Entry into the system:</u>		
	Average time after detention until formal charges are brought. ²³	QD	-
	Percentage of those arrested, detained, or charged with a crime who have access to legal representation. ²⁴	QD, S/PD	+
	Percentage of pretrial detention facilities operating in compliance with international human rights standards.	EK	+
	<u>Prosecution and pretrial services:</u>		
	Average time from entry into system on serious crimes charges until seeing a lawyer.	QD	-
	Number of convictions for serious crimes as a percentage of indictments for serious crimes per province.	QD	d

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Does the civil justice system (where there is a separate civil justice system) perform essential functions effectively?</i>	<u>Adjudication:</u>		
	Average time between filing of formal charges and trial.	QD	–
	Percentage of those accused of serious crimes not represented at trial.	QD	–
	<u>Sentencing and sanctions:</u>		
	Sentences in criminal cases comply with international standards for proportionality.	EK	+
	Prison terms and fines are enforced.	EK	+
	<u>Incarceration:</u>		
	The penal system is able to enforce sentences on political leaders/elites and the most dangerous criminals.	EK	+
	Percent of prison population beyond stated capacity of prison system. ^c	QD	–
	Number of prisoners who escape per year.	QD	–
	<u>Appeals:</u>		
	There is a fair and authentic appeals process (as indicated by cost, time required, and access).	QD, EK	+
	<u>Criminal laws and procedures:</u>		
	Civil laws and procedures address contemporary civil needs for adjudication, enforcement, and record keeping.	EK	+
	<u>Entry into the system:</u>		
	Percentage of those involved in a civil case who have access to legal representation.	QD, S/PD	+

<i>Are property disputes resolved and contracts enforced?</i> ^d	Percentage of citizens who say that they have access to court systems to resolve civil disputes.	S/PD	+
	Percentage of citizens who are aware of the forms of recourse available to them to resolve a dispute.	S/PD	+
	<u>Adjudication:</u>		
	Average time between filing of claim and adjudication.	QD	-
	Percent of claims that remain unadjudicated.	QD	-
	<u>Enforcement of judgments and orders:</u>		
	Percentage of judgments enforced relative to the number awarded.	QD	+
	<u>Appeals:</u>		
	There is a fair and authentic appeals process.	EK, S/PD	+
	Percentage of property dispute claims adjudicated relative to claims registered (by identity group and province). ²⁵	QD	+
<i>How complementary are formal and traditional/nonstate justice systems?</i>	Percentage of property dispute claims resolved relative to claims registered (by identity group). ²⁶	QD	+
	Perception of parties involved with property disputes that the process was fair and the case resolved satisfactorily (by identity group and province). ²⁷	S/PD	+
	Property settlements and contracts are enforced. ²⁸	QD	+
	Extent of inconsistencies in substance or process between traditional/nonstate justice systems and the formal legal system that lead to tension and confusion.	EK	-

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and penal system employees held accountable?</i>	Extent of inconsistencies between traditional/nonstate justice systems and international human rights standards.	EK	–
	Boundaries between formal and informal dispute resolution mechanisms are clear and uncontested.	EK, CA	+
	Restoration of traditional/nonstate justice systems that contribute to the peaceful resolution of disputes (if deliberately weakened or eliminated during the conflict).	EK	+
	Perceptions of the public about the integrity of judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and penal system employees.	S/PD	+
	Percentage of complaints against judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and penal system employees that result in disciplinary action.	QD	+
	Percentage of those involved in legal proceedings who report paying bribes to judges.	S/PD	–

C. Judicial Independence and Government Accountability Strengthened

<i>Is the judiciary independent?*</i>	The selection and promotion of judges is based on objective, merit-based criteria or elections as opposed to identity group membership, political affiliation, or patronage.	EK	+
	Extent to which removal of judges is limited to specified conditions such as gross misconduct.	EK	+
	Judicial expenditures are not controlled by the executive.	EK	+

<i>Are governing authorities held accountable?</i>	Government officials have been tried and convicted of abuse of authority. ^f	EK	+
	In cases where the state is one of the litigants, outcomes are not automatically in the state's favor.	QD, EK	+
D. Respect for Human Rights Strengthened^g			
<i>Do civilian government authorities respect human rights?</i>	Number of political prisoners.	EK, QD	-
	Percentage of prisons and detention centers operating in compliance with international human rights standards.	EK	+
	Frequency with which lawyers suffer retribution on account of their representation of controversial clients.	EK	-
<i>Are human rights codified by the government?</i>	Laws conform to international human rights standards. ²⁹	EK	+
	Human rights (e.g., freedom of religion, assembly, press, speech, association and movement, and other civil rights) are effectively protected under law. ³⁰	EK, CA	+
<i>Are measures to protect human rights (e.g., human rights commission, human rights court, or ombudsman) effective?</i>	Percentage of people who feel they could file a human rights complaint without fear of reprisal (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of people who have confidence that they will obtain a fair hearing (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of people who perceive that the government is committed to pursuing human rights cases (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of human rights cases that result in remedies (by identity group).	QD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

E. Equality before the Law Strengthened

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is the law applied equally?</i>	Percentage of victims who reported crimes to law enforcement authorities who were satisfied with the response (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Perception of the population that the judicial system and law enforcement agencies apply the law equally to all identity groups.	S/PD	+
	Assessments of the fairness of the judicial system.	EK	+
	The staffing of the judiciary, law enforcement agencies, and penal system is reflective of the demographic composition of the broader society.	QD, S/PD	+
<i>Is there access to justice?</i>	Right to legal counsel is recognized by law.	EK	+
	Laws, codes, or other normative acts set forth a standard time frame by which persons detained shall be given access to a lawyer.	EK	+
	Individuals are regularly informed of their right to counsel at the time of arrest or detention.	EK	+
	Extent of availability of legal aid or public defense.	EK	+
	Percentage of population less than one half-day removed from nearest courthouse or police post.	QD	+
	Number of interpreters per 100,000 minority language population.	QD	+
	Percent of court cases dropped due to inability of victim to pay.	QD, S/PD	-

F. Societal Support for Rule of Law Strengthened

<i>Are social attitudes and norms supportive of peaceful resolution of disputes (by identity group)?</i>	Extent of voluntary compliance with the law.	S/PD	+
	Percentage of the population who would consult with a formal legal advisor and use the formal court system if they have a dispute.	S/PD	+
	Knowledge of population about their legal and civil rights and the legal process, including how to access the legal system.	S/PD	+
	Belief that justice is administered fairly by members of other identity groups (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Efforts to arrest identity group leaders who commit serious crimes are violently resisted by their identity group.	EK	–
<i>How professional is the legal profession?</i>	There is a process of accreditation to enter the legal profession and for sanctioning misconduct.	EK	+
	Laws and normative acts establish the independence of the profession and set forth professional standards and ethics that are binding.	EK	+
	Cases have been successfully brought to court involving claims that the independence of lawyers has been violated through interference or intimidation by state authorities or nonstate actors.	EK	+
	Number of practicing lawyers and other legal advisors (such as notaries) per capita (by identity group). ^h	QD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
	Continuing legal education programs and practical training/apprenticeships are available to the legal profession (by identity group).	QD	+
	Presence and strength of professional associations for members of the legal profession.	EK	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- a. *WGI*, Variable: Rule of Law – the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, including the quality of contract enforcement and property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.
- b. *Enterprise Surveys* (The World Bank, 2009), <https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/custom> (accessed July 7, 2009), Variables: Percent of Firms Paying for Security and Percent of Firms Identifying Crime, Theft, and Disorder as Major Constraints.
- c. *United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems* (New York, NY: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2009), <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/United-Nations-Surveys-on-Crime-Trends-and-the-Operations-of-Criminal-Justice-Systems.html> (accessed July 9, 2009). Statistics: Total Persons Incarcerated, Total Number of Spaces (Beds) Available for Adults, and Total Number of Spaces (Beds) Available for Juveniles.
- d. *BTI*, Criterion: Property Rights – extent to which government authorities ensure well-defined rights of private property and regulate the acquisition of property; and *WDI*, Indicator: CPIA Property Rights and Rule-Based Governance Rating.
- e. *BTI*, Criterion: Independent Judiciary.
- f. *BTI*, Criterion: Abuse of Office Prosecuted (not by identity group)
- g. Amnesty International and the U.S. State Department both produce country reports on human rights. See <http://www.amnesty.org/en/human-rights/human-rights-by-country> (accessed July 7, 2009) and <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2008/index.htm> (accessed July 7, 2009) respectively.
- h. National bar association websites often include this information. For a list of many such websites, see the International Bar Association's list of members at http://www.ibanet.org/barassociations/bar_associations_home.aspx

¹⁶ Article 44–45, Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; The Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Commission resolutions 1999/47 of 27 April 1999, 2000/53 of 25 April 2000 and 2001/54 of 24 April 2001.

¹⁷ Article 52, 53, Protocol I (1977) to Geneva Convention of 1949; Article 19, Geneva Convention of 1949; 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

48 Rule of Law

¹⁸ Article 1, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

¹⁹ Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials; Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials (Eight United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders 1990)

²⁰ Article 8, Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Article 9, 14 (3), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

²⁴ Ibid. Article 2.

²⁵ Article 11.1, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural rights.

²⁶ Article 11.1, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural rights.

²⁷ Article 14, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

²⁸ Article 2.3, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

²⁹ Universal Declaration of Human Rights; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. See also Serious Crimes Handbook, Chp.3, and Model Codes.

³⁰ Ibid.

SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY

STATE I OBJECTIVE: Illicit wealth does not determine who governs, conflict no longer pays, and inequality between groups in conflict is diminishing. An enabling environment for a market-based economy is being established, employment is being generated, and revenues for provision of essential public services are being collected and protected. *International involvement and oversight that may be needed to foster an enabling environment can be maintained until economic sustainability is attained.*

STATE II OBJECTIVE: An enabling environment for a market-based economy is established and is capable of preventing capture by predatory power structures. The formal economy is growing, generating increasing employment relative to the informal economy, and revenues sufficient for provision of essential state services are being collected and protected. *Economic performance meets qualifications for integration into international economic regimes.*

GOALS:

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

(If present, these factors must be diminished)

- A. Political Impact of Illicit Wealth Diminished
- B. Economic Incentives for Conflict Diminished
- C. Economic Inequality between Groups in Conflict Diminished
- D. Effects of Economic Decline Diminished
- E. External Drivers of Conflict Diminished

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

(If weak or non-existent, these factors must be strengthened)

- A. Infrastructure Strengthened
- B. Fiscal Integrity Strengthened
- C. Regulatory and Corporate Governance Framework Strengthened
- D. Financial Institutions Strengthened
- E. Employment Strengthened
- F. Private Sector Strengthened
- G. Management of Natural Resources Strengthened
- H. Economic Performance and Self Reliance Strengthened

SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

A. Political Impact of Illicit Wealth Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>What is the magnitude of economic activity taking place in illicit markets?^a</i>	Estimated percentage of gross domestic product accounted for by illicit economic transactions.	EK	–
	Estimated amount of revenue generated by looting of natural resources.	EK	–
	Gap between prices for a market basket of essential goods and services in open vs. gray markets.	S/PD, EK, QD	–
<i>Are public offices corrupt?</i>	Ranking on international indices of corruption. ^b	EK, QD	–
	Existence of incentive structures that reward smuggling, rent-seeking, looting of natural resources, or other forms of large-scale criminal activity/corruption.	EK	–
	Public perception of the degree of corruption and abuse of office by government leaders (by identity group).	S/PD	–
	Degree to which local and international companies alter their investment plans due to the prevalence of corruption.	S/PD	–
	Percentage of citizens reporting that a gift or informal payment is required to obtain a government service.	S/PD	–
	Percentage of citizens reporting that a gift or informal payment is required to obtain a government job.	S/PD	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are there links between government officials and criminal syndicates?</i>	Percentage of citizens reporting that a gift or informal payment is required to avoid arrest or a fine by police or to pass through a police checkpoint.	S/PD	–
	Percentage of businesses reporting that a "gift" or informal payment was required to obtain a construction permit.	S/PD	–
	Percentage of businesses reporting that a "gift" or informal payment was required to obtain an import operating license.	S/PD	–
	Percentage of businesses reporting that a "gift" or informal payment was required to obtain an operating license.	S/PD	–
	Public perception of the extent of corruption in public offices.	S/PD	–
	Known criminals or individuals linked to crime syndicates occupy key government positions.	EK	–
	Number of senior government officials implicated by foreign governments or international law enforcement bodies (e.g., Interpol) in transnational criminal activity	QD	–
	Armed opposition groups maintain spheres of influence where they exercise de facto authority to collect "taxes" or exploit criminalized economic activity, etc.	EK	–
	Estimated amount of revenue generated by opposition groups by looting of natural resources, drug production, collection of "taxes," smuggling networks, trafficking in cultural/historical artifacts, etc.	EK	–
<i>Do warring or armed opposition groups generate illicit revenue?</i>			

54 Sustainable Economy

B. Economic Incentives for Conflict Diminished^c

<i>Are there economic incentives to continue conflict?</i> ^d	Government officials profit from continued conflict.	EK	–
	Faction leaders and government officials profit from the control of trade in commercial goods made illicit by international sanctions.	CA, EK	–
	Amount of relief supplies expropriated by armed opposition groups.	QD, EK	–

C. Economic Inequality between Groups in Conflict Diminished

<i>Is there group-based inequality (by identity group)?^c</i>	Per capita income of politically disadvantaged identity groups relative to the national average.	QD	+
	Literacy rates of politically disadvantaged identity groups relative to the national average.	QD	+
	Unemployment rates of politically disadvantaged identity groups relative to the national average.	QD	–
<i>Is group-based inequality a source of conflict?</i>	Perception of economic deprivation relative to other identity groups (by identity group).	S/PD	–
	Number of land occupations (by identity group).	QD	–
	Number of violent confrontations and extrajudicial killings over land, water, or grazing rights (by identity group).	CA, QD	–
	Prevalence of the use of private security forces to protect land/resources (by identity group).	CA, EK	–
<i>Do those sharing a group identity with ruling elites derive a disproportionate benefit from the resources that are extracted from society?</i>	Allocation of jobs in the public sector to those sharing an identity with ruling elites relative to their proportion in the general population (by identity group).	QD	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
	Distribution of government expenditures (by province and identity group).	QD	d
	Distribution of government subsidized food (by identity group).	QD	d
	Extent of any disparity in the cost (e.g., fees, taxes, charges) of public goods and services (by identity group).	QD	–
D. Effects of Economic Decline Diminished			
<i>Is the population suffering from the effects of a sharp economic decline (by identity group)?</i>	Infant mortality rates. ^f	QD	–
	Number of cases of malnourishment and exposure. ^g	QD	–
	Incidence of looting for staple products.	QD, CA	–
<i>Is there "brain drain" (by identity group)?</i>	Professionals, technical experts, intellectuals, and entrepreneurs leaving the country. ^h	EK, QD	–
	Applications for visas by professionals, technical experts, intellectuals, and entrepreneurs including applications for visas in categories that allow for work or permanent residence. ⁱ	QD	–
E. External Drivers of Conflict Diminished			
<i>What is the extent of funding for armed opposition groups from diaspora populations and affinity groups?</i>	Evidence that support (funding, arms) is provided clandestinely by diaspora or affinity groups to warring factions.	EK	–
<i>Do foreign governments support warring factions financially or materially?</i>	Dollar value of arms transferred to the target country by foreign governments (by recipient).	EK	–
	Amount of financial or in-kind support provided by foreign governments to armed opposition groups.	EK	–

What is the degree of looting of natural resources by external actors?

Extent of control of territory containing natural resources by forces belonging to or supported by foreign governments.	QD, EK	–
Value of natural resources purchased and marketed by multinational corporations without payment of customs duties.	EK	–
Annual amount of the value of natural resources exported.	QD, EK	+
Annual amount of the value of the same natural resource items counted above that are exported by neighboring countries.	QD, EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- a. For country information, see *World Drug Report*, (New York, NY: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2009), <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/WDR-2008.html> (accessed July 9, 2009); and Financial Market Integrity Group, *Anti-Money Laundering and Combating Financial Terrorism Assessments* (Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://go.worldbank.org/T5D7DR4EN0> (accessed July 9, 2009).
- b. *Corruption Perceptions Index*, (Berlin, Germany: Transparency International, 2008), http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi (accessed July 9, 2009); *WGI*, Indicator: Control of Corruption – the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as “capture” of the state by elites and private interests; *Index of Economic Freedom (IEF)*, (Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation, 2009) accessed July 9, 2009). Component: Freedom from Corruption; *BTI*, Criterion: Anti-corruption – extent to which the government can successfully control corruption.
- c. See the World Bank's reports related to inclusive economic growth at <http://go.worldbank.org/2AZ9SA3610> (accessed July 7, 2009).
- d. *MAROB*, Variable: RESOURCE – whether expropriation and marketing of scarce resources are sources of income for an organization.
- e. *MAR*, Variable: Economic Discrimination Index; *BTI*, Criterion: Socioeconomic Barriers – extent to which significant parts of the population are fundamentally excluded from society due to poverty and inequality combined (e.g., income gaps, gender, education, religion, ethnicity).
- f. World Factbook (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2009), <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2091rank.html> (accessed July 7, 2009); WHO Statistical Information Service, *Mortality Table* (World Health Organization, 2009), <http://apps.who.int/whosis/database/mort/table2.cfm> (accessed July 7, 2009).
- g. FAO Statistics, *Food Security Statistics*, (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2009), <http://faostat.fao.org/site/562/default.aspx> (accessed July 9, 2009).
- h. OECD Stat Extracts, *International Migration Database* (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2009), <http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx?lang=en> (accessed July 9, 2009). Click on “Demography and Population” then “Migration Statistics” to view the available databases. The OECD database includes data on emigration rates for highly educated persons.
- i. *MAR*, Variable: EMIG – Emigration for political or economic reasons.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

A. Infrastructure Strengthened

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>What is the level of availability of electrical power?</i>	Level of public satisfaction with electrical power delivery (by identity group and region).	S/PD	+
	Gross electrical power output compared to pre-conflict levels. ^a	QD	+
	Extent of reliance on non-network, site-specific electrical power generation units (by identity group and region).	EK, S/PD	d
	Prevalence, duration, and extent of brownouts and cutbacks in electrical power (by identity group and region). ^b	QD	–
	Percentage of electricity generated from external sources.	QD	–
<i>What is the level of availability of essential services?^c</i>	Percent of essential services (e.g., water, sewage, telephone, trash removal, public transportation) functioning compared with pre-conflict levels (by identity group and region).	QD	+
	Distribution of essential services to identity groups relative to their percentage of the total population.	QD	d
	Level of public satisfaction with essential service delivery (by identity group and region).	S/PD	+
	Prevalence, duration, and extent of interruptions in delivery of essential services (by identity group and region). ^d	QD	–

B. Fiscal Integrity Strengthened^a

<i>How effective are independent oversight systems to ensure the integrity of state revenues and expenditures and to prevent diversion by predatory power structures?</i>	A means for the conduct of regular independent audits of state fiscal operations exists.	EK	+
	Percentage of state-entity budgets/fiscal operations audited. ^f	QD	+
	Percentage of questionable financial practices investigated, prosecuted, and punished.	QD	+
<i>What is the integrity of public expenditures?^g</i>	Size of fiscal deficit in relation to GDP. ^h	QD	–
	Delays in payments of salaries to government employees (by job type and identity group of employee).	QD	–
<i>What is the capacity for government revenue generation?</i>	Amount of government revenue generated.	QD, EK	+
<i>What is the integrity of government revenue generation?</i>	Integrity of government revenue generation (by department and/or function).	EK	+

C. Regulatory and Corporate Governance Framework Strengthened

<i>How effectively regulated are commercial and financial transactions?</i>	Strength of regulatory infrastructure regarding corporate investment, trade, hiring and procurement, and exploitation of the environment.	EK	+
	Evaluation of state enforcement of commercial and financial regulations.	EK	+
<i>Do regulatory and corporate governance systems effectively constrain black-market activities from adversely affecting the economy?</i>	Conviction rates relative to investigations of black marketers.	QD	d
	Amount of illicit drug revenues and other transnational criminal transactions as a percentage of the GDP.	QD	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>How effective are controls on money laundering and suspicious financial transactions?</i>	Strength of legal and administrative systems for monitoring and adjudicating cases of money laundering and suspicious financial transactions.	EK	+
	Number of convictions for money laundering and suspicious financial transactions investigated and number of convictions.	QD	d
	Amount of assets seized as a result of enforcement of suspicious financial transaction laws.	QD	+
<i>Is privatization of publicly owned businesses conducted transparently and with safeguards to deter their capture by predatory power structures?</i>	Presence of a transparency mechanism that includes, for example, public posting of offers of public property, bids and tenders for the purchase of such property, identity of purchasers, financing of sales, and any modifications to legal language regarding the subsequent use of property required (e.g., right of resale, restrictions on the use of assets).	EK	+
	Percentage of privatization sales/transfers compliant with a transparency regime.	QD	+
	Public disclosure of transfers that includes book and market value of assets transferred and identity of individuals and groups acquiring assets, and percentage of privatized firms whose equity is publicly traded and whose operations are officially reported.	EK	+
	Availability of public property that is transferred by means of equity shares priced to allow widespread ownership of the privatized firm.	EK	+

Do systems of enterprise governance provide effective public scrutiny and accountability of publicly owned companies?ⁱ

Scope of state regulation of internal enterprise governance.	EK	+
Scope of state enforcement mechanisms of internal enterprise governance.	EK	+
Scope of reporting of financial status and operations.	EK	+
Compliance with the enterprise governance regime.	EK	+

D. Financial Institutions Strengthened

<i>Are financial institutions independent of external subsidies?</i>	Amount of external financial subsidies.	QD	-
<i>How strong are domestic public and private financial institutions?ⁱ</i>	Monetization of the economy.	EK	+
	Use of the national currency.	EK	+
	Stability of the exchange rate of the national currency.	QD	+
	Strength of the central bank or like mechanism.	EK	+

E. Employment Strengthened

<i>What is the level of employment and underemployment of groups associated with conflict (i.e., ex-combatants, military-aged youth, and disenfranchised groups)?</i>	Unemployment rates among ex-combatants and military-aged youth (by identity group). ^j	QD	-
	Underemployment rates among ex-combatants and military-aged youth (by identity group).	QD	-
	Perception of the availability and desirability of jobs in the licit vs. illicit sectors among ex-combatants and military-aged youth (by identity group).	S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.
Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>What are national employment and underemployment trends?</i>	Rate of growth in employment in the formal sector. ^k	QD	+
	Number employed in the informal sector.	QD	–
	Survey of job prospects by sector.	S/PD	+
	Rate of underemployment.	EK	–
<i>What is the caliber of the work force?</i>	Perception of business owners and entrepreneurs of the match between laborers' skills and their employment needs (by identity group and sector).	S/PD	+
F. Private Sector Strengthened^l			
<i>Is the private sector growing?</i>	Number of businesses registered.	QD	+
	Amount of business activity reported (e.g., annual reports).	QD	+
<i>Do the laws and societal attitudes help enable market activity?</i>	Perception by domestic and foreign businesses that the laws favor free and open markets.	S/PD	+
	Entrepreneurial attitudes and understanding of free-market principles by business persons, government officials, and the general public.	S/PD	+
<i>Is there access to credit?</i>	Capital loaned to consumers.	QD	+
	Capital loaned to microlending.	QD	+
	Capital loaned to small businesses.	QD	+
	Capital loaned to large private firms.	QD	+
	Capital loaned to government enterprises.	QD	+
	Amount of lending by domestic banks to domestic businesses (as percent of GDP). ^m	QD	+

<i>Is there access to external markets?</i>	Foreign direct investment (FDI) (as percent of GDP). ⁿ	QD	+
	Foreign capital (other than FDI) (as percent of GDP).	QD	+
	Exports subject to high tariffs, quotas, and nontariff restrictions. ^o	QD	-

G. Management of Natural Resources Strengthened

<i>Is there sustainable and effective management of natural resources?</i>	Degree of compliance with any international regimes for certification of natural resource commodity origins to restrict entry of "looted" resources into trade.	EK	+
	Percentage of mines, forests, wells, etc. brought under transparent government regulation.	QD	+
	Level of investment (public and private sector) in renewable natural resources.	QD	+

H. Economic Performance and Self-Reliance Strengthened

<i>What is overall economic performance?</i> ^p	Per capita income adjusted for inflation. ^q	QD	+
	GDP growth rate adjusted for inflation. ^r	QD	+
	Per capita national debt. ^s	QD	-
	Savings and investments as a percentage of the GDP. ^t	QD	+
	Rate of unemployment and underemployment (national and provincial). ^u	QD	-
	Trend in business bankruptcy.	QD	-
	Income distribution, as measured by the Gini Coefficient (national and provincial). ^v	QD	+
	Poverty levels (national and provincial). ^w	QD	-
	Inflation rate. ^x	QD	-

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is the government financially self-reliant?</i>	Public perception of the health of the economy (national and provincial).	S/PD	+
	Percent of government expenditures funded by external sources.	QD	–
	Ratio of public borrowing and debt to government income.	QD	–
	Debt and debt service costs relative to Gross National Product. ^y	QD	–
	"Graduation" (vs. relief) from special debt servicing arrangements (e.g., Paris Club).	EK	+
<i>How diverse is the economy (i.e., reliance on other than primary commodities)?</i>	Debt rating. ^z	QD	+
	Primary commodity production/income as a percent of GDP.	QD	–
	Diversity in the profile of national production by sector (agriculture, mining, manufacture, finance, etc.).	QD	+
<i>Is there sufficient confidence in the economy to support current account imbalances?</i>	Performance of government bonds in international capital markets. ^{aa}	QD	+
	Progress toward meeting standards of regional economic/trade organizations.	EK	+
	Number of bilateral and multilateral trade agreements.	EK	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- WDI*, Indicator: Energy Production and Use; *Statistics by Country/Region*, (Paris, France: International Energy Association, 2009), <http://www.iea.org/Textbase/stats/index.asp> (accessed July 9, 2009).
- Enterprise Surveys (ES)*, (Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/Custom/> (accessed July 9, 2009). Topic: Infrastructure – Indicators: Number of Power Outages in a Typical Month and Average Duration of Power Outages (hours).
- BTI*, Criterion: Social Safety Nets – extent to which social safety nets exist and compensate for poverty and other risks such as old age, illness, unemployment or disability.

64 Sustainable Economy

- d. *ES*, Topic: Infrastructure – Indicators: Average Number of Incidents of Water Insufficiency in a Typical Month and Average Duration of Insufficient Water Supply (hours).
- e. Public Expenditure and Fiscal Accountability, *Public Finance and Management Country Assessments*, (Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, 2008), http://www.pefa.org/assessment_reportmn.php (accessed July 9, 2009).
- f. *Budget Practices and Procedures Survey*, (Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://webnet4.oecd.org/budgeting/Budgeting.aspx> (accessed July 9, 2009). Question: 4.i Requirement for Audit of Government Accounts by the Supreme Audit Institution; Open Budget Initiative, *Open Budget Index Country Reports*, (International Budget Project, 2009) <http://www.openbudgetindex.org/countryData/> (accessed July 9, 2009). Question: Availability of Audit Report.
- g. *BTI*, Criterion: Efficiency – Extent to which the government makes efficient use of available economic and human resources.
- h. *WDI*, Indicator: Cash surplus/deficit (percent of GDP).
- i. *BTI*, Criterion: Macrostability – extent to which the government's fiscal and debt policies support macroeconomic stability.
- j. *MDGI*, Indicator: Unemployment rate of young people aged 15–24 years, by each sex and total (does not specify ex-combatants).
- k. ILO Bureau of Statistics, *LABORSTA*, (Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organisation, 2009), <http://laborsta.ilo.org/> (accessed July 9, 2009). Statistic: Employment, General Level (monthly).
- l. *BTI*, Criterion: Private Companies – extent to which private companies are permitted and state companies are undergoing a process of privatization consistent with market principles; *Doing Business*, (Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, 2009), <http://www.doingbusiness.org> (accessed July 6, 2009). Ranking: Ease of Doing Business; see also *IEF*, Component: Business Freedom – a measure of the ability to start, operate, and close a business that represents the overall burden of regulation, as well as the efficiency of government in the regulatory process (based on data from *Doing Business*).
- m. *BTI*, Criterion: Banking System – extent to which a solid banking system and a capital market system have been established; *Doing Business*, Ranking: Getting Credit – a measure that combines measures of the legal rights of borrowers and lenders and the sharing of credit information.
- n. *WDI*, Indicator: Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows; *IEF*, Component: Investment Freedom – a measure of a country's overall investment climate based on its policies toward the free flow of investment capital (foreign investment as well as internal capital flows).
- o. International Trade and Tariff Data, *WTO Statistics Database*, (World Trade Organization, 2009), <http://stat.wto.org> (accessed July 9, 2009). Profile: Tariff Profiles – information on the market access situation of members, observers and other selected economies; *Doing Business*, Rankings: Cost to Export (US\$ per container) and Time to Export (days).
- p. *BTI*, Criterion: Economic Performance – How does the economy, as measured in quantitative indicators, perform?
- q. *WDI*, Indicator: GNI Per Capita, Atlas method.
- r. *WDI*, Indicator: GDP Growth (Annual Percent).
- s. *WDI*, Indicator: External Debt Stocks, Total.
- t. *World Factbook*, Fact: Investment.
- u. *LABORSTA*, Statistics: Unemployment (for national unemployment only).
- v. *MDGI*, Indicator: 1.3 Share of Poorest Quintile in National Consumption; *WDI*, Indicator: Gini Coefficient (available from full *WDI* with subscription only).
- w. *MDGI*, Indicator: 1.1 Proportion of Population below \$1 (PPP) Per Day (not provincial, but available for urban and rural populations).
- x. *State of the World's Children, 2009*, (New York, NY: United Nations Children's Fund, 2009), <http://www.unicef.org/sowc09/statistics/statistics.php> (accessed July 10, 2009). Statistic: Average Annual Rate of Inflation (Percent, 1990–2007).
- y. *WDI*, Indicators: External Debt Stocks (Total), and Total Debt Service (Percent of goods, services, and income).
- z. Available from Standard and Poor's (<http://www2.standardandpoors.com/>) and Moody's (<http://www.moody.com>) (with login only, both accessed July 10, 2009).
- aa. Market Data Center, *Global Government Bonds*, (New York, NY: The Wall Street Journal, 2009), <http://online.wsj.com/mdc/page/marketsdata.html> (accessed July 10, 2009).

SOCIAL WELL-BEING

STATE I OBJECTIVE: Societal cleavages, social disintegration, population displacement, and demographic pressures no longer actively fuel violent conflict. Local institutions, *with the support of a sustainable level of international assistance*, provide access to basic necessities (i.e., food, water, shelter) and deliver social services (i.e., health care, education, and sanitation) in an increasingly equitable manner. Local reconciliation processes have recognized and are addressing past abuses and are promoting peaceful coexistence. Development of social capital provides a basis for internal comity, and consent for the peace process is prevalent.

STATE II OBJECTIVE: Social institutions can manage societal conflict peacefully. Access to basic necessities and delivery of social services are sufficiently equitable to preserve peace *without international intervention*. Social comity is sustainable.

GOALS:

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

(If present, these factors must be diminished)

- A. Societal Cleavages Diminished
- B. Social Disintegration Diminished
- C. Population Displacement Diminished
- D. Demographic Pressures Diminished
- E. External Destabilization Diminished

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

(If weak or non-existent, these factors must be strengthened)

- A. Access to Basic Needs Strengthened
- B. Provision of Basic Social Services Strengthened
- C. Peace Process Strengthened
- D. Reconciliation Processes Strengthened
- E. National Identity and Social Capital Strengthened

SOCIAL WELL-BEING

I. Diminish the Drivers of Conflict

A. Societal Cleavages Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Does societal polarization precipitate violent conflict (by identity group)?^a</i>	Perception that race polarizes society.	S/PD	–
	Perception that ethnic identity polarizes society.	S/PD	–
	Perception that religion polarizes society.	S/PD	–
	Perception that class/caste polarizes society.	S/PD	–
	Perception that tribal affiliation polarizes society.	S/PD	–
	Incidence of hate crimes and attacks on symbols of group identity.	QD, CA	–
	Group acceptance of exclusionary social practices.	S/PD	–
	Readiness to use violence to achieve sociopolitical ends, including killing of noncombatants/innocent civilians.	S/PD	–
	Prevalence of zero-sum culture.	CA	–
<i>Are disenfranchised groups marginalized through government policy or social discrimination?</i>	Perceptions of discrimination in government policies (by identity group).	S/PD	–
	Practices by social elites that restrict mobility and voice/ social standing to excluded groups.	EK	–
	Isolation/distance of excluded groups from centers of power/ influence.	EK, CA	–
	Prevalence of laws and policies that either enforce or prohibit expressions of group identity. ^b	EK	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is society polarized on the basis of ideology?</i>	Competing worldviews exist in the population.	CA, S/PD, EK	–
	Resentment and antagonism between groups with different worldviews is a rationale for resorting to violence.	S/PD	–
	Prevalence of intolerance of competing worldviews.	S/PD	–
B. Social Disintegration Diminished			
<i>Have informal and/or traditional social support structures (households, extended family, clan, and tribes) disintegrated (by identity group)?</i>	Individuals perceive themselves as disconnected from society (distrust, discontent, pessimism, alienation, estrangement).	S/PD	–
	Prevalence of family breakup.	QD, EK	–
	Prevalence of homelessness.	QD	–
	Number of street children.	QD	–
	Extent to which illicit power structures have replaced informal social support networks as a source of basic needs and social services.	EK, CA	–
C. Population Displacement Diminished			
<i>Have refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) either returned to their homes or resettled elsewhere?^c</i>	Number of refugees and IDPs who have returned to their homes voluntarily.	QD	+
	Number of refugees and IDPs who have resettled in locations other than their original homes.	QD	d
	Number of refugees and IDPs who remain in camps.	QD	–

Number of refugees and IDPs who remain embedded in host communities.	QD	-
Perceptions of refugees and IDPs that security conditions are suitable for return or resettlement.	S/PD	+
Perceptions of refugees and IDPs that the ability to meet basic needs in their home country is suitable for return or resettlement.	S/PD	+

D. Demographic Pressures Diminished

<i>Has population growth created pressures conducive to conflict?</i>	Percentage of employment-aged youth who are unemployed or underemployed. ^d	QD	-
	A "youth bulge" exists (percentage of population between 15 and 29). ^c	QD	-
	Perception by identity group members that divergent rates of population growth or the influx of migrants creates a threat (to way of life, job security, access to resources) (by identity group).	S/PD	-
<i>Has urbanization created dislocations and pressures conducive to conflict?</i>	Percent of urban population without access to basic services (by identity group) ^f	QD	-
	Unemployment rate of urban population (by identity group).	QD	-
	Highly localized concentrations of urban poverty exist. ^g	QD, EK	-

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: - is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

E. External Destabilization Diminished

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Do identity group settlement patterns contribute to violent conflict?</i>	Correlation of cross-border settlement patterns with incidents of violent conflict.	QD	d

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

a. *BTI*, Criterion: Conflict – severity of ethnic, religious, and social conflicts.

b. *MAR*, Variable: Political Discrimination Index; *MAROB*, Variable: STORGREPRESS; *BTI*, Variable: Citizenship Agreement – the extent to which civic rights are available to all population groups.

c. UNHCR, *Statistical Online Population Database*, (New York, NY: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2009), <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/populationdatabase> (accessed July 6, 2009).

d. *LABORSTA*, Statistic: Unemployment; ILO Bureau of Statistics, *Key Indicators of the Labour Market*, (Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organisation), <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/strat/kilm/index.htm> (accessed July 7, 2009).

e. *International Data Base*, (Washington, DC: United States Census Bureau, 2009), <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/> (accessed July 10, 2009); UN Population Division, *World Population Prospects*, (New York, NY: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2009), <http://esa.un.org/unpp/> (accessed July 10, 2009).

f. *WDI*, Indicator: Improved Sanitation Facilities (Percent of Urban Population with Access).

g. *MDGI*, Indicator: 7.10 Proportion of Urban Population Living in Slums.

II. Strengthen Institutional Performance

A. Access to Basic Needs Strengthened

<i>Are the domestic systems that assure food security functioning (by identity group)?</i>	Access to care for malnourishment and exposure.	QD	+
	Perception of heads of households that, under normal conditions, they are able to meet their food needs either by growing foodstuffs/raising livestock or purchasing food on the market.	S/PD	+
	Perception of heads of households that emergency food needs can be met through support from extended family, kinship networks, or village support systems.	S/PD	+
	Strength of domestic official relief for meeting emergency food needs.	EK	+
<i>Are the domestic systems that provide water and sanitation functioning (by identity group)?</i>	Percentage of households with easy access to potable water. ^a	QD, EK	+
	Percentage of households with easy access to sanitation. ^b	QD, EK	+
<i>Are the domestic systems that provide shelter functioning (by identity group)?</i>	Number of individuals/families without shelter.	QD	–
	Number of households in makeshift/temporary housing provided by official domestic systems.	QD	d

B. Provision of Basic Social Services Strengthened

<i>Is health care accessible (by identity group)?</i>	Perception that health care is accessible.	S/PD	+
	Ratio of practicing doctors, nurses, and health care workers to population. ^c	QD	+
	Time it takes to reach a health care facility. ^d	QD	–

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Is health care system effective (by identity group)?</i>	Willingness of health care providers to tend to a member of another identity group.	S/PD	+
	Cost of health care relative to income (by identity group).	QD, EK	–
	Infant mortality rate. ^e	QD	–
	Maternal mortality rate. ^f	QD	–
	Average lifespan. ^g	QD	+
<i>Is education accessible (by identity group)?^h</i>	Premature death.	QD	–
	Percentage of youth enrolled in primary schools, secondary schools, and college (by identity group and gender). ⁱ	QD	+
	Perception that teachers are neutral (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Percentage of the population who have graduated from college, including both indigenous and external (by identity group).	QD	+
	Cost of education as a percentage of income.	QD	–
<i>Is the education system effective (by identity group)?</i>	Literacy rates (by age group and gender). ^j	QD	+
	Satisfaction with schooling among families with children in school.	S/PD	+
	Extent of classroom integration of identity groups. ^k	QD	+

C. Peace Process Strengthened

<i>What is the degree of satisfaction with the peace process?</i>	Perception that the risks of cooperating with international and local efforts to advance the peace process are worth assuming.	S/PD	+
	Perception that the peace process will protect, restore, and respect core social values, norms, and practices.	S/PD	+
	Perception that the peace process will enhance the overall quality of life of family members, close associates, and community.	S/PD	+
	Perception that the peace process will improve tolerance and social interaction among groups that had been party to the conflict.	S/PD	+
	Perception that the peace process will afford people an appropriate say in local decisions in their community on key issues affecting daily life.	S/PD	+
	Perception that the peace process will advance one's underlying worldview.	S/PD	+

D. Reconciliation Processes Strengthened

<i>To what extent has the legacy of past abuses been recognized, addressed, and reconciled?</i>	Public satisfaction in the way past abuses have been dealt with (by identity group).	S/PD, EK	+
	Extent to which victims have been afforded the opportunity to act as witnesses in formal reconciliation processes.	EK, S/PD	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

Indicator	Measure	Methodology	Preferred Trend
<i>Are compromise, tolerance, and peaceful coexistence values that are apparent across identity groups?</i>	Extent to which perpetrators have acknowledged past wrongs.	EK, CA	+
	Extent to which victims have forgiven perpetrators.	EK, S/PD	+
	Degree of tolerance and readiness to compromise with members of other identity groups.	S/PD	+
	Public support for moderate leaders and their values.	S/PD	+
	Prevalence of rhetoric promoting tolerance and peaceful coexistence (vs. division and conflict) in formal schooling (e.g., textbooks), religious education, local media (print, radio, TV, Internet).	CA	+
	Prevalence of civil society groups that promote peaceful co-existence and tolerance.	EK	+

E. National Identity and Social Capital Strengthened

<i>To what extent does the populace feel connected to a common national identity that transcends identity group differences?</i>	Existence of social cohesion based on perceived shared national identity.	EK, CA	+
	Perception that group identity is stronger than a shared national identity.	S/PD	–
<i>To what extent is there a sense of trust and reciprocity in society, among individuals and groups?</i>	Degree of trust in and willingness to collaborate with others (by identity group).	S/PD	+
	Sense of solidarity with others and expectation of/ reliance on help from others (by identity group).	S/PD	+

<i>To what level (e.g., immediate family, neighborhood, nation, global community) does a sense of affiliation with social groupings extend?</i>	Extent of trust and confidence in social groupings and institutions from the lowest to highest levels.	S/PD, EK	+
<i>Do informal social networks have the capacity to foster collaboration, dispute resolution, and peacefulness within society?</i>	Level of participation in civic and community organizations that cross social cleavages.	S/PD, EK	+
	Number of initiatives by group leaders and individuals of influence to use informal dispute resolution mechanisms to avert conflict.	CA, EK	+

Methodology: CA = content analysis; EK = expert knowledge; QD = quantitative data; S/PD = survey/polling data.

Preferred Trend: – is negative or declining; + is positive or increasing; d indicates that trend depends on other conditions.

- a. *MDGI*, Indicator: 7.8 Proportion of Population Using an Improved Drinking Water Source.
- b. *MDGI*, Indicator: 7.9 Proportion of Population Using an Improved Sanitation Facility.
- c. *Global Atlas of the Health Workforce* (Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2009), <http://apps.who.int/globalatlas/DataQuery/default.asp> (accessed July 10, 2009).
Data: Human Resources for Health – Absolute Numbers.
- d. *Global Atlas of the Health Workforce*, Data: Human Resources for Health – Density.
- e. *MDGI*, Indicator: 4.2 Infant Mortality Rate.
- f. *MDGI*, Indicator: 5.1 Maternal Mortality Rate.
- g. *World Factbook*, Fact: Life Expectancy.
- h. *BTI*, Criterion: Equal opportunity – Extent to which equality of opportunity to access public services such as education exists.
- i. *BTI*, Criterion: Education /R & D – extent to which there are solid institutions for basic, secondary and tertiary education, as well as for research and development; *MDGI*, Indicator: 3.1 Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education.
- j. *SOWC*, Indicator: Youth Literacy Rate; *World Factbook*, Fact: Literacy Rate.
- k. See UNESCO's International Bureau of Education country assessments at <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/> (accessed July 6, 2009).

