

The Practitioner's Toolkit

Centre for Administrative Service

Table of Contents

Right-click and select 'Update Field' to generate the Table of Contents.

Right-click the table above and select “Update Field” to generate page numbers.

Preface

The Practitioner's Toolkit contains the working instruments by which the centre of government conducts its operational craft. Each instrument is a template, with instructions, scoring rubrics, and a worked example, designed to be printed and used.

The toolkit is organized in four tiers. The daily instruments (1-4) are used continuously. The periodic instruments (5-7, 14) are used monthly or quarterly. The event instruments (8-12) are used when the situation demands. The personal instruments (13, 15) are used by the principal individually. The supporting documents (A-D) guide the staff in the toolkit's maintenance and use.

The instruments are modular: the centre uses the ones it needs, when it needs them. The instruments work together: the daily instruments feed the periodic, the periodic feed the event, and all inform the personal. The centre that maintains the instruments maintains its operational readiness.

Corrections and proposed revisions should be submitted through the standard review process.

Instrument 1 — The Stakeholder Map: Working Template

The comprehensive working document that captures every actor on whom the government depends, the state of each relationship, and the action required for each.

1.1 Purpose

The stakeholder map is the standing record of every actor on whom the government depends for the achievement of its objectives. The map holds one entry per actor, with the entry recording the actor's identity, the resources the actor commands, the actor's position toward the government's objective, the influence the actor can bring to bear, the present state of the relationship, and the action the centre plans to take. The map is held by the centre and maintained by the officials the principal assigns to the task, and the map is the document the principal reads before any major decision that touches the actors it records. The government depends on actors it does not command, and the centre that does not know whom it depends on, and on what terms, operates blind.

The map serves three functions. It is the inventory of dependencies, naming the actors whose cooperation, consent, or restraint the government requires. It is the assessment of each dependency, recording the centre's judgment of the actor's position, influence, and relationship state at the moment of the entry's last update. And it is the action register, recording the next move the centre plans for each actor, the date by which the move is to be made, and the official responsible for making it. A map that records only the inventory functions as a list; a map that records the assessment without the action register functions as a diagnosis; the working map holds all three together, and the discipline of holding them together is the discipline by which the map remains an instrument of government.

1.2 The Template

Each entry in the stakeholder map is a single record carrying seventeen fields, organised in three groups: identification, assessment, and maintenance. The identification group names the actor and locates the actor in the structure of power. The assessment group records the centre's judgment of the actor's position, interest, influence, and relationship state. The maintenance group records the contact history, the planned action, and the official responsible for the entry. The field set is fixed across all entries so that the map can be read as a whole and so that entries can be compared and aggregated, and no field is left blank; an unknown value is recorded as unknown, with a note explaining why.

The Actor Name field records the actor's name as the actor is known in the formal record, with the full name preferred to the familiar name and the title of address recorded where it carries weight. The Position/Title field records the office the actor holds, with the formal title preferred to the colloquial, and where the actor holds multiple offices the field records the office most relevant to the government's objective. The Institution field records the body in which the office is held,

with the full institutional name and, where useful, the parent body. The Category field classifies the actor against six types: economic, for actors commanding firms, capital, or markets; bureaucratic, for actors commanding offices of the state; social, for actors commanding constituencies through organisation, faith, profession, or following; external, for actors outside the jurisdiction; branch, for actors in a coordinate branch of government; and head of state, for the head of state and that office. Where an actor crosses categories, the primary category is recorded first and the secondary noted.

The Basis of Standing field records the source of the actor's position, distinguishing election, appointment, inheritance, wealth, expertise, seniority, and following, because the basis of standing determines the means by which the actor may be moved. The Constituency field records the people or interests the actor represents or mobilises, naming the constituency precisely: a sector, a region, a confession, a profession, a faction, or a public. The Resources Controlled field records the means the actor commands, naming them concretely: votes in a legislature, share of a market, capital under management, personnel under command, media reach, network of affiliates, control of a regulator's agenda, or legitimacy among a public. The three fields together establish the actor's weight, and the entry that records the name without the standing, the constituency, and the resources leaves the centre without the means to judge what the actor can do.

The Position Assessment field records the actor's stance toward the government's objective on the four-point scale of supportive, neutral, oppositional, and adversarial, with the basis for the rating recorded in the notes. The Interest field records what the actor wants from the government, stated plainly: a policy adopted, a policy reversed, an appointment made, a contract awarded, a regulatory decision taken, a concession granted, or the government's attention. The interest is the lever by which the actor's position may be moved, and the centre records the interest as the actor perceives it, held distinct from the interest the centre wishes the actor to hold. The discipline of recording the interest as the actor sees it is the discipline by which the assessment remains useful, because the centre that projects its own interest onto the actor misreads the terrain.

The Influence field records the actor's capacity to affect the outcome of the government's objective on the three-point scale of high, medium, and low, with the basis recorded in the notes. The Relationship State field records the present condition of the centre's dealings with the actor on the four-point scale of sound, strained, deteriorating, and broken. The two fields are held distinct: an actor may be highly influential and the relationship sound, or highly influential and the relationship broken, and the centre that conflates influence with relationship state misjudges both. The rating in each field is dated, signed by the assessing official, and supported by the evidence recorded in the notes, and the rating is revised at the cycle the maintenance protocol sets or immediately on a reassessment trigger.

The Relationship History field records the prior pattern of the centre's dealings with the actor in brief, naming the principal engagements, the commitments exchanged, the points of friction, and the commitments honoured or broken. The Last Contact field records the most recent engagement between the centre and the actor, with the date, the format (meeting, call, correspondence, public exchange), and the substance (what was discussed, what was agreed, what was left open). The Next Action field records the move the centre plans to take on the actor, stated as a concrete action with a defined outcome: a meeting to seek a commitment, a call to test a position, a briefing to shape an understanding, a concession to advance a relationship, or a withdrawal to reduce exposure. The

Next Contact Date field records the date by which the action is to be taken, treated as a commitment. The Owner field records the official in the centre responsible for maintaining the entry and executing the next action, with one owner per entry, named by position and by name. The Notes field records the evidence supporting the assessment, the qualifications on the ratings, the developments pending, and any matter the centre needs to hold in view.

1.3 The Influence Assessment Rubric

Influence is the actor's capacity to affect the outcome of the government's objective, whether by advancing it, obstructing it, or reshaping it. The rating is high, medium, or low, and the basis for the rating is recorded in the notes with the evidence named. The rating reflects the actor's capacity, held distinct from the actor's inclination: an actor may be highly influential and indifferent, or low in influence and deeply opposed, and the centre that rates inclination as influence misjudges the terrain. The rating is reviewed at the quarterly cycle and revised immediately on a change in the actor's resources, position, or standing.

High influence is assigned to an actor whose action or inaction can determine the outcome of the objective, or can impose costs on the government that the government cannot readily absorb. The high-influence actor commands a resource the government requires and cannot replace at short notice, or holds a position whose exercise the government cannot bypass: a legislative majority whose vote the government needs, a central bank governor whose decision on rates the government cannot override, a major employer whose investment the government's fiscal position depends on, a regulator whose approval the government's programme requires, a foreign government whose cooperation the border or trade policy requires, or a religious leader whose word moves a constituency the government must carry. The high-influence actor is the actor on whom the centre's principal personally engages, and the entry flagged high is the entry the principal reads at every review.

Medium influence is assigned to an actor whose action or inaction can affect the outcome of the objective materially but cannot determine it alone, and whose costs the government can absorb with effort. The medium-influence actor commands a resource that bears on the objective but is substitutable, or holds a position whose exercise the government can route around at some cost: a committee chair whose hearing can delay a bill but cannot block it, a regional employer whose withdrawal would hurt a district but not the national position, a professional body whose endorsement lends legitimacy but is not decisive, or a broadcaster whose coverage shapes opinion but does not set it. The medium-influence actor is the actor the centre's officials engage, with the principal engaged only when the relationship requires it.

Low influence is assigned to an actor whose action or inaction has limited bearing on the objective, whose costs the government can absorb readily, or whose position the government can disregard without material consequence. The low-influence actor commands no resource the government requires, holds a position of marginal bearing on the objective, or speaks for a constituency too small or too diffuse to affect the outcome: a local association whose interest is narrow, a small firm whose stake is minor, a commentator whose following is thin, or a foreign office of peripheral standing. The low-influence actor is the actor the centre monitors, with

engagement reserved for the moment the actor's position or resources shift in a way that changes the rating.

1.4 The Relationship Assessment Rubric

Relationship state is the present condition of the centre's dealings with the actor, recorded on the four-point scale of sound, strained, deteriorating, and broken. The rating is based on observable indicators, held distinct from the centre's preference for the actor, and the indicators are recorded in the notes with the dates. The rating reflects the relationship at the moment of the entry's last update, and a relationship that has shifted is re-rated at the next cycle or immediately on a trigger. The centre distinguishes the relationship state from the actor's position: an actor may be oppositional and the relationship sound, or supportive and the relationship strained, and the centre that conflates the two misreads both.

Sound is assigned when the relationship is functioning. The centre and the actor communicate regularly and on the substance, the commitments exchanged are honoured, the disagreements are named and worked, and the actor responds to the centre's approaches in good faith. The indicators include meetings held at the agreed cadence, correspondence answered within the expected time, commitments delivered as agreed, the actor's public stance consistent with the private stance, and the actor's officials accessible to the centre's officials. The sound relationship is the relationship the centre maintains, and the maintenance is the work of keeping it sound: the cadence held, the substance respected, the frictions named early.

Strained is assigned when the relationship is under stress but still functioning. The indicators include meetings postponed or shortened, correspondence delayed or perfunctory, commitments delivered late or partially, the actor's public stance drifting from the private stance, and a pattern of friction on matters that previously passed easily. The strained relationship is the relationship the centre must attend to, and the work is the work of diagnosis: the centre identifies the source of the strain, judges whether the source is substantive or circumstantial, and takes the action the diagnosis indicates. A strained relationship that is attended to returns to sound; a strained relationship left unattended moves to deteriorating.

Deteriorating is assigned when the relationship is losing function. The actor refuses or avoids meetings, correspondence goes unanswered, commitments are broken, the actor's public stance turns against the government, and the actor begins to coordinate with the government's opponents. The transition from strained to deteriorating is marked by the actor's shift from friction to obstruction, and the trigger is most often a single event the centre can name: a commitment broken, a public rebuke, a meeting refused, or a coalition formed against the government. The deteriorating relationship is the relationship the centre escalates to the principal, and the action shifts from maintenance to repair: the centre judges whether the relationship can be restored, what the restoration would cost, and whether the cost is worth bearing.

Broken is assigned when the relationship no longer functions and is not expected to function in the near term. The indicators include the actor's open hostility, the actor's active coordination with the government's adversaries, the actor's use of the institutions the actor commands against the government, the severing of the channels the centre previously used, and the absence of any

basis for engagement. The broken relationship is the relationship the centre contains, and the work shifts from repair to management of the damage: the centre limits the actor's capacity to harm the government's objective, protects the channels the centre still holds, and waits for the opening the centre may use when the relationship can be revisited. The broken relationship is flagged for the principal's attention at once, and the principal decides whether to engage, to contain, or to accept the loss.

1.5 The Position Assessment Rubric

Position is the actor's stance toward the government's objective, recorded on the four-point scale of supportive, neutral, oppositional, and adversarial. The rating reflects the actor's stance, held distinct from the actor's power: an actor may be supportive and low in influence, or adversarial and high in influence, and the centre that conflates stance with power misjudges both. The rating is based on the actor's words and actions, recorded in the notes with the dates and the sources, and the rating is revised when the actor's stance shifts.

Supportive is assigned when the actor actively favours the government's objective, advocates for it, and uses the resources the actor commands to advance it. The indicators include public statements in favour, private commitments to support, the mobilisation of the actor's constituency or resources on the objective's behalf, and the actor's willingness to expend political capital to carry the objective. The supportive actor is the ally, and the centre's work is the work of reinforcement: the centre holds the actor's support, gives the actor the means to advocate, and ensures the actor's contribution is recognised. The supportive actor who is taken for granted is the supportive actor who drifts, and the centre that does not maintain the support loses it.

Neutral is assigned when the actor neither favours nor opposes the government's objective, whether from indifference, from a balance of interests, or from a decision to wait. The indicators include the absence of public statements, the refusal to commit when pressed, the balancing of the government's request against the actor's other relationships, and the actor's attention directed elsewhere. The neutral actor is the actor the centre can move, and the centre's work is the work of conversion: the centre identifies the interest that would move the actor from neutral to supportive, judges the cost of the move, and takes the action the judgment indicates. The neutral actor left unattended tends to drift toward oppositional when the government's opponents engage and the centre does not.

Oppositional is assigned when the actor opposes the government's objective, works against it within the established channels, and seeks to change the government's course by argument, by negotiation, or by pressure applied through legitimate means. The indicators include public statements against, the mobilisation of the actor's resources to resist the objective, the use of hearings, consultations, and procedural means to delay or amend, and the actor's willingness to negotiate a revised course. The oppositional actor is the opponent the centre can engage: the oppositional actor seeks a different outcome, not the government's downfall, and the channels remain open. The centre's work with the oppositional actor is the work of negotiation, accommodation, or managed confrontation, and the oppositional actor who is engaged may be moved to neutral or to supportive on a revised course.

Adversarial is assigned when the actor seeks to defeat the government, to remove the government's capacity to act, or to replace the government itself. The indicators include the actor's framing of the government as illegitimate, the actor's coordination with the government's enemies, the actor's willingness to damage the public interest to damage the government, and the closure of the channels of negotiation. The distinction between oppositional and adversarial lies in the actor's aim: the oppositional actor seeks a different outcome, the adversarial actor seeks the government's removal, and the distinction matters because the centre engages the two differently. The adversarial actor is flagged for the principal's attention, and the centre's work shifts from engagement to defence of the government's position and capacity to act.

1.6 Instructions for Maintenance

The stakeholder map is maintained by the officials the principal assigns to the task, with one official designated as the map's custodian and one owner assigned to each entry. The custodian holds the map as a whole, ensures the cycle is held, the entries are reviewed on schedule, and the principal's review is prepared. The owner of each entry is the official responsible for the actor, responsible for maintaining the entry's fields, executing the next action, and reporting the developments the principal needs to know. The custodian and the owners are named in the map, and the map that does not name its custodian and its owners is the map whose maintenance no one owns.

The map is maintained on three cycles. The monthly cycle reviews the current-state fields of every active entry: the Last Contact, the Next Action, the Next Contact Date, and the Notes, with the owner confirming the fields are current or revising them. The quarterly cycle reviews the full entry of every actor, with each field confirmed, revised, or marked for escalation, and the principal reads the entries of every high-influence actor and every actor whose relationship state is deteriorating or broken. The annual cycle reviews the foundational fields of every entry: the Basis of Standing, the Constituency, the Resources Controlled, the Interest, and the Relationship History, with the owner reconsidering each from the foundation and the custodian confirming the inventory is complete.

The reassessment triggers are the events that require immediate update, regardless of the cycle. A personnel change in the actor's office, a public statement that shifts the actor's stance, a legislative or electoral outcome that changes the actor's resources, a crisis that activates the actor, a shift in the relationship between two actors the centre observes, or a breach of a commitment the centre or the actor has made, each triggers an immediate update of the entry affected. The owner updates the entry within two working days of the trigger, signs and dates the update, and notifies the custodian. The trigger that is not acted on is the trigger that leaves the centre reading a past state as a present state.

The escalation protocol governs the conditions under which an entry is flagged for the principal's attention. An entry is flagged when the influence is high and the relationship state is strained, deteriorating, or broken; when the position is adversarial regardless of influence; when a reassessment trigger has shifted the actor's stance, resources, or relationship state in a way that affects the government's objective; or when the next action the owner proposes exceeds the

owner's authority. The flag is set by the owner, reviewed by the custodian, and presented to the principal at the next review or immediately when the matter is urgent. The principal's decision on the flagged entry is recorded in the notes, with the action the principal directs and the official directed to take it.

The confidentiality handling governs the map's access, storage, and disclosure. The map is held at the classification the centre's security protocol assigns, with access limited to the principal, the custodian, the owners, and the officials the principal designates. The map is stored on the centre's secured systems, with printed extracts controlled and accounted for, and no entry is disclosed outside the access list without the principal's authorisation. The map's existence is acknowledged, but the map's contents are held close: the centre does not confirm the actors recorded, the ratings assigned, or the actions planned, and the official who discloses an entry outside the access list has breached the protocol.

1.7 Worked Example

Two worked examples follow, each showing the template applied to a different type of actor. The first is the head of a major business association in a mid-sized jurisdiction, an economic actor with high influence and a strained relationship. The second is a senior justice on the constitutional court, a branch actor with medium influence and a sound relationship. The examples are fictional; the detail is realistic; the fields are filled as the centre's officials would fill them on the day of the entry's last update.

Actor Name: Maria Fernandes. Position/Title: President. Institution: National Confederation of Industry. Category: economic, with secondary category social, as the Confederation mobilises a professional constituency across the jurisdiction's manufacturing districts. Basis of Standing: election by the Confederation's member associations, with the standing renewed at the triennial congress. Constituency: the Confederation's member firms, the manufacturing workforce, and the regional chambers aligned with the Confederation. Resources Controlled: the Confederation's policy positions, its media access, its capacity to coordinate member firms' investment and employment decisions, and its seat on the jurisdiction's tripartite wage council.

Position Assessment: oppositional, on the government's proposed labour reform, with the basis recorded as the Confederation's public statement of 14 March and the President's private communication to the minister of 18 March. Interest: the reversal of the reform's provisions on collective bargaining, or failing that their substantial amendment, with the Confederation's preferred text attached to the notes. Influence: high, on the basis of the Confederation's capacity to coordinate member firms' responses, its seat on the wage council, and its media reach. Relationship State: strained, on the indicators of the postponed meeting of 20 March, the delayed response to the minister's letter, and the President's public stance drifting from the private assurance.

Relationship History: the centre and the Confederation have engaged on three labour reforms over the past decade, with the first passed over the Confederation's opposition, the second amended to the Confederation's specification, and the third withdrawn; the President has held office for four years and has honoured the commitments made in the second reform's negotiation. Last Contact: 18 March, meeting, the minister and the President, two hours, the substance the reform's collective-

bargaining provisions, the President's objection stated, no agreement reached, the President's offer of revised text accepted. Next Action: the minister to meet the President with the government's revised text by 5 April, with the objective of moving the position from oppositional to neutral. Next Contact Date: 5 April. Owner: the minister's chief of staff, by name and position. Notes: the President's standing in the Confederation is strong; the member firms are divided, with the export-oriented firms amenable and the domestic-market firms opposed; the wage council's quarterly meeting on 12 April is the next test; the entry is flagged for the principal's review at the quarterly cycle.

The second example adapts the template to a branch actor. Actor Name: Justice Daniel Okafor. Position/Title: Senior Justice. Institution: Constitutional Court, the senior justice on the bench's constitutional-law panel. Category: branch, with secondary category bureaucratic, as the senior justice administers the panel's docket. Basis of Standing: appointment by the head of state on the advice of the judicial council, with tenure to the mandatory retirement age. Constituency: the bench, the bar, the legal academy, and the constitutional-law community whose respect the senior justice holds. Resources Controlled: the senior justice's vote on the panel, the senior justice's influence on the panel's reasoning, the capacity to shape the court's doctrine through the opinions assigned, and the senior justice's standing in the legal profession.

Position Assessment: neutral, on the government's judicial-reform bill, with the basis recorded as the absence of public statement and the senior justice's private observation to the attorney general that the bill raises questions the court may be required to consider. Interest: the protection of the court's jurisdiction and the coherence of the constitutional doctrine, with the senior justice's concern that the bill's provisions on standing may be read to narrow the court's access. Influence: medium, on the basis of the senior justice's vote and reasoning on the panel, tempered by the panel's composition and the senior justice's position as one of several. Relationship State: sound, on the indicators of the regular contact between the attorney general's office and the senior justice's clerk, the honouring of the conventions of consultation, and the senior justice's accessibility to the attorney general on matters of mutual concern.

Relationship History: the centre and the senior justice have engaged on two prior bills, both of which the senior justice reviewed privately and one of which the court upheld; the conventions of consultation have been honoured, and the senior justice has not publicly opposed a government bill in twelve years on the bench. Last Contact: 22 March, courtesy call, the attorney general and the senior justice, forty-five minutes, the substance the judicial-reform bill's standing provisions, the senior justice's concerns noted, no commitment sought or given. Next Action: the attorney general to provide the senior justice with the bill's drafting history and the comparative material on standing provisions by 10 April, with the objective of addressing the senior justice's concern before the bill's second reading. Next Contact Date: 15 April, the attorney general's scheduled call. Owner: the attorney general's principal legal adviser, by name and position. Notes: the senior justice's concern on standing is shared by two other justices; the panel's composition for any challenge to the bill is not yet fixed; the bar association's position is awaited; the entry is reviewed at the quarterly cycle, with no flag for the principal at this stage.

Instrument 2 — The Dependency Dashboard: Working Template

A single-page instrument showing the state of each of the five resource dependencies at a glance, updated weekly, reviewed by the principal in five minutes.

2.1 Purpose

The dependency dashboard is a single-page instrument that records the present state of each of the five resource dependencies on which the government relies: the financial, the human, the informational, the institutional, and the political. Each dependency is shown as one row of a six-row table, with the sixth reserved for an emerging risk not yet rated among the five. The dashboard is maintained as a current document and is presented to the principal each week for the weekly review. The dashboard's function is to give the principal, in the span of five minutes, an accurate view of where each dependency stands, which is moving, and which requires the principal's attention.

The at-a-glance view serves a discipline the centre cannot dispense with. The government's dependencies are not static: ratings shift, key actors change position, actions in train succeed or stall, and emerging risks approach the threshold of concern. A dashboard that is read weekly by the principal in five minutes keeps the centre's working picture of the dependencies aligned with their actual state, and the alignment is the condition under which the principal's decisions are made on the dependencies as they are. The dashboard that is not read weekly drifts: the principal's picture of the dependencies lags the reality, and the lag is the condition under which the principal is surprised by a dependency that has moved without the principal's knowledge. The five-minute review is the discipline by which the lag is prevented.

The dashboard also serves the staff's maintenance discipline. The weekly update cycle requires the staff to gather the evidence for each row, revise the ratings as the evidence warrants, record the explanation and the action in train, and present the result to the principal. The cycle is the staff's standing opportunity to test the centre's working sense of each dependency against the evidence the week has produced. The staff that maintains the dashboard with rigour knows the dependencies as they are; the staff that maintains it as a formality knows the dependencies as the last week's record stated them. The dashboard's purpose is therefore twofold: to give the principal the current view, and to give the staff the standing exercise by which the current view is produced.

2.2 The Template

The template is the structure of fields applied to each of the five dependencies and to the emerging-risk row. The fields are seven: Dependency Name, Current Rating, One-Line Explanation, Key Actor(s), Action in Train, Action Owner, and Next Review Date. The Dependency Name records which of the five dependencies the row addresses — financial, human, informational, institutional, or political — and for the sixth row, the designation Emerging Risk.

The Current Rating records the state of the dependency as green, amber, or red, against observable criteria. The rating is the field the principal reads first, and the rating that does not correspond to the evidence is the rating that misdirects the principal's attention.

The One-Line Explanation records the reason for the rating in a single sentence the principal can read in seconds. The standard for the explanation is plainness: the explanation that conceals the cause behind a generality leaves the principal to infer what the staff already knows. The Key Actor(s) field records the actors on whom the dependency presently turns — the central bank governor, the finance committee chair, the intelligence chief, the constitutional court, the coalition partner — by name and office. The Action in Train field records the action the centre is presently taking to maintain, restore, or strengthen the dependency, stated as a verb and an object: securing the supplemental appropriation, replacing the director, briefing the editor, negotiating the protocol amendment, renewing the coalition terms.

The Action Owner field records the official accountable for the action in train, by name and office, and the owner is the official the principal holds answerable for the action's progress. The Next Review Date field records the date by which the row is to be reassessed, set against the cadence the dependency's volatility requires: a stable dependency reviewed in four weeks, a volatile dependency reviewed in one, a dependency in crisis reviewed daily until the crisis passes. The sixth row, Emerging Risk, records a dependency or actor that is not yet rated among the five but is approaching the threshold of concern: the rating is left blank, the explanation states the approach, and the next review date is set close — a week or less — to determine whether the risk has crossed into the rated five. The emerging-risk row is the dashboard's instrument for seeing what is not yet a problem and may become one.

2.3 The Rating Rubric

The financial dependency is rated green when the government's revenue, financing, and reserves are sufficient to fund the budget for the forecast period without extraordinary measures, and when the actors on whom the government relies for financing — the central bank, the treasury market, the principal lenders, the rating agencies — are functioning in their normal posture toward the government. The financial dependency is rated amber when the government is meeting its obligations but is relying on measures that are not sustainable: drawing down reserves, deferring payments, obtaining waivers, or depending on a single lender or a single revenue source whose continuity is not assured. The financial dependency is rated red when the government cannot meet its obligations without an action it has not yet secured — a supplemental appropriation, a rollover of debt, a disbursement from a lender, a release of funds by a counterparty — and the failure to secure the action would interrupt the government's operations within the forecast period.

The human dependency is rated green when the government's senior positions are filled, the officials in those positions are performing in their roles, and the pipeline of candidates for the positions that will fall vacant in the forecast period is sufficient. The human dependency is rated amber when one or more senior positions are filled by officials whose performance is below the standard the role requires, or when the pipeline for a critical position is thin and the position's vacancy would degrade the centre's capacity. The human dependency is rated red when a critical

position is vacant or occupied by an official who cannot perform the role, and the vacancy or the incapacity is presently degrading the centre's capacity to operate. The distinction between amber and red is the distinction between a problem the centre is managing and a problem the centre is suffering: amber is the director whose performance is declining and whose successor is being prepared; red is the director who has resigned and whose departure has left the function leaderless.

The informational dependency is rated green when the centre is receiving the information it requires to govern — the intelligence, the policy advice, the operational reporting, the public sentiment — in time, in full, and with the candour the centre's decisions require. The informational dependency is rated amber when the centre is receiving the information but with delay, with gaps, or with the softening that signals the staff's reluctance to carry the unwelcome finding. The informational dependency is rated red when the centre is not receiving the information it requires, or is receiving information that is materially false, and the absence or the falsity is presently degrading the centre's decisions. The rating is set against the standard of candour: the green rating requires that information flows and that the unwelcome finding reaches the principal in time to act, and the centre whose staff softens the unwelcome finding is rated amber at best.

The institutional dependency is rated green when the institutions on whose cooperation the government relies — the legislature, the judiciary, the audit office, the central bank, the subnational governments, the international bodies — are operating in their normal posture toward the government and the government's programme. The institutional dependency is rated amber when one or more of these institutions is in a posture of friction: the committee that delays the legislation, the court that signals an adverse ruling, the audit office that opens an inquiry, the subnational government that withholds cooperation. The institutional dependency is rated red when an institution is in a posture of opposition: the legislature that has voted against the government, the court that has struck down the measure, the audit office that has published a finding the government cannot accommodate, the subnational government that has refused implementation. The red rating on the institutional dependency is the rating that most often precedes a political crisis, and the dashboard that records the institutional red without escalation is the dashboard that has failed the principal.

The political dependency is rated green when the coalition and the public are sustaining the government at a level that permits the government to govern: the parliamentary majority is secure, the public approval is above the threshold the government's term has shown to be safe, and the principal's standing is intact. The political dependency is rated amber when the majority is narrowing, the public approval is declining toward the threshold, or the principal's standing is under sustained attack that has not yet turned the public. The political dependency is rated red when the majority has been lost on a critical vote, the public approval has fallen below the threshold, or the principal's standing has been damaged to the point that the principal's authority to govern is in question. The political red is the rating the principal most resists, and the staff's obligation is to record it when the evidence supports it, whatever the principal's preference.

2.4 Instructions for Maintenance

The dashboard is maintained by the official the principal designates as the dashboard custodian — typically the chief of staff, the cabinet secretary, or the principal private secretary — and the custodian is the single official accountable for the dashboard's accuracy, currency, and presentation. The custodian gathers the evidence for each row from the officials responsible for the dependency's management: the finance minister or budget director for the financial row, the head of the civil service or the central personnel office for the human row, the intelligence coordinator and the policy head for the informational row, the centre's institutional liaison officials for the institutional row, and the principal's political adviser for the political row. The custodian compiles the evidence, revises the ratings, drafts the explanations, and presents the dashboard to the principal at the weekly review.

The weekly cycle runs from the day of the review to the day before the next review. The custodian updates the dashboard on the day before the review, on the basis of the evidence gathered through the preceding week, and presents the dashboard to the principal at the review. The principal reads the dashboard in five minutes, raises questions on the rows that warrant attention, and directs the actions the rows require. The escalation protocol overrides the weekly cycle: any rating that moves to red, any emerging risk that crosses the threshold into the rated five, and any event that materially alters a dependency between reviews triggers an immediate escalation to the principal, outside the weekly cycle and at the hour the event is confirmed. The escalation is the custodian's authority and the custodian's obligation: the custodian who waits for the weekly review to report a red that has arisen on Wednesday has failed the principal by the time the review convenes.

The dashboard is handled under the confidentiality the dependencies' contents require. The dashboard names the key actors, records the actions in train, and states the ratings the principal may find unwelcome, and the disclosure of any of these would compromise the centre's management of the dependency. The dashboard is distributed in the smallest circle the review requires: the principal, the custodian, and the officials whose roles require them to see the rows they manage. The dashboard is not circulated in wider distribution, is not stored in systems the wider staff can access, and is not discussed outside the circle. The confidentiality handling is the custodian's responsibility, and the custodian who permits the dashboard to circulate beyond the required circle has compromised the centre's management of the dependencies the dashboard records.

2.5 Worked Example

The worked example below is a completed dashboard for the government of the Republic of Maravia, a fictional parliamentary republic, prepared by the cabinet secretary for the weekly review on a Friday in mid-October. The Financial dependency is rated green: the supplemental appropriation has passed, the treasury's reserves stand at three months of expenditure, and the principal lenders have confirmed the rollover of the maturing bonds. The Key Actor(s) field records the finance minister and the central bank governor; the Action in Train records the closure of the supplementary budget process; the Action Owner records the finance minister; the Next Review Date is set four weeks out. The Human dependency is rated amber: the director of the

intelligence service has given notice of retirement for the year's end, the succession has not been settled, and the pipeline of internal candidates is thin. The Key Actor(s) field records the director and the two internal candidates; the Action in Train records the preparation of the succession options for the principal's decision; the Action Owner records the cabinet secretary; the Next Review Date is set two weeks out.

The Informational dependency is rated green: the intelligence and the policy advice are flowing with the candour the principal's decisions require, and the week's reporting on the regional developments has been timely and unsoftened. The Key Actor(s) field records the intelligence coordinator and the head of the policy unit; the Action in Train records the standing weekly briefing; the Action Owner records the intelligence coordinator; the Next Review Date is set four weeks out. The Institutional dependency is rated red: the constitutional court has signalled an adverse ruling on the government's principal reform measure, to be delivered within the month, and the ruling would strike down the measure. The Key Actor(s) field records the chief justice and the attorney general; the Action in Train records the preparation of the legislative response and the engagement of the court's concerns; the Action Owner records the attorney general; the Next Review Date is set one week out.

The Political dependency is rated amber: the coalition majority has narrowed by two seats following two by-election losses, the public approval has declined toward the threshold the government's term has shown to be safe, and the principal's standing is intact but under attack from a faction within the coalition. The Key Actor(s) field records the coalition partner's leader and the faction's spokesperson; the Action in Train records the negotiation of the coalition's renewal terms and the engagement of the faction's grievances; the Action Owner records the principal's political adviser; the Next Review Date is set one week out. The Emerging Risk row records a regional development: the neighbouring government has signalled a revision of the bilateral water-sharing agreement that would affect the government's standing in the affected provinces. The rating is left blank; the One-Line Explanation records the signal and the provinces affected; the Key Actor(s) field records the foreign minister and the regional governors; the Action in Train records the preparation of the negotiating position; the Action Owner records the foreign minister; the Next Review Date is set one week out, at which the custodian will determine whether the risk has crossed into the rated five.

Instrument 3 — The Weekly Centre Briefing: Working Template

The one-page weekly briefing the principal receives from the centre's staff: the state of the dependencies, the state of the coalitions, the emerging risks, the upcoming engagements, and the decisions required.

3.1 Purpose

The weekly centre briefing is the one-page document the principal receives from the centre's staff at the close of each working week, comprising the state of the dependencies, the state of the coalitions, the emerging risks, the upcoming engagements, and the decisions required. The briefing exists to give the principal a five-minute orientation at the start of the working week, the orientation by which the principal allocates attention, sets the order of the engagements, and confirms the decisions the staff has prepared. The briefing exists equally as the staff's weekly prioritization discipline, the discipline by which the staff sorts the centre's affairs into the few matters that require the principal and the many matters the staff disposes of without the principal's attention. The one-page constraint is the device by which the staff is held to the prioritization, because the staff that cannot fit the week's matters on a single page has not done the work of choosing.

The one-page constraint forces the staff to compress, and the compression forces the staff to choose. The dependency that has not changed since the previous week drops out of the summary; the dependency that has moved to amber takes its place. The coalition member who has held steady drops out of the summary; the coalition member who has wavered takes the line. The risk that has remained latent drops out of the summary; the risk that has emerged takes its place. The discipline of the one page is the discipline by which the staff distinguishes the matter that requires the principal's attention from the matter that does not, and the staff that does not make the distinction has left the prioritization to the principal, which is the failure the briefing is meant to prevent.

The briefing is the principal's first reading on Monday morning and the staff's last composition on Friday afternoon. The principal reads the briefing in five minutes, marks the decisions, sets the order of the engagements, and turns to the first meeting of the week with the orientation the briefing has established. The staff composes the briefing through Friday afternoon, draws the dependencies from the dashboard, draws the coalitions from the coalition assessment, draws the risks from the risk register, draws the engagements from the calendar, and draws the decisions from the open decision log. The five sections are the five matters the principal cannot delegate, and the one page is the constraint by which the staff holds the principal's attention to the five.

3.2 The Template

The template comprises five sections in a fixed order, and the order is the order of the principal's weekly attention. The dependencies come first because the dependencies are the

conditions of the government's operation, the coalitions come second because the coalitions are the conditions of the government's authority, and the risks come third because the risks are the threats to the dependencies and the coalitions. The engagements come fourth because the engagements are the principal's application of attention to the first three, and the decisions come fifth because the decisions are the principal's application of authority to the first four. Each section has a fixed form, and the staff that departs from the form has burdened the principal with variation in place of information.

Section A, the Dependency State, is the one-line summary of each dependency the centre tracks, drawn from the dependency dashboard and presented in the order of the dependency's importance to the government's operation. Each line names the dependency, gives the state on the green, amber, or red scale, and flags any change since the previous week's briefing. A line for a dependency that has not changed reads, for example, "Central bank financing: green, unchanged." A line for a dependency that has moved reads, "Treasury bill market: amber, moved from green on widening spreads." The staff includes every dependency the dashboard tracks, because the principal reads the section for the state of the whole, and the omission of a dependency is the omission of the information the principal needs to read the whole.

Section B, the Coalition State, is the one-line summary of each coalition the government maintains, with any member whose state has changed and any emerging coalition risk flagged. Each line names the coalition, gives the overall health, and notes the member or the risk that has changed since the previous week's briefing. A line for a coalition that has held steady reads, "Governing coalition: stable; no member change." A line for a coalition in which a member has wavered reads, "Governing coalition: stable but watchful; regional party leader signalled reservation on the budget vote." The staff includes every coalition the government maintains, because the coalition is the condition of the government's authority, and the coalition whose state is not reported is the coalition whose state the principal cannot read.

Section C, the Emerging Risks, is the top three risks the staff has identified in the week, with a one-line assessment of each. Each line names the risk, gives the source, and gives the assessment in the form of the probability and the consequence. The staff selects the three risks by the product of probability and consequence, and the three that emerge at the top are the three the principal is told. The staff does not list the fourth, because the fourth is the risk the staff has judged below the principal's threshold, and the listing of the fourth has burdened the principal with the matter the staff should have disposed of. The staff does not list fewer than three, because the staff that has identified fewer than three risks in a week has not done the work of the scan.

Section D, the Upcoming Engagements, is the principal's scheduled engagements for the coming week, each with a one-line statement of the purpose and the preparation status. Each line names the engagement, gives the counterpart, gives the purpose, and gives the preparation status, whether ready, in preparation, or not yet started. A line reads, for example, "Tuesday 10:00: Finance Minister, budget gap closure; brief ready." The staff includes every engagement on the principal's calendar, because the principal reads the section for the shape of the week, and the omission of an engagement is the omission of the matter the principal must prepare for. The preparation status is the staff's report on its own work, and the engagement that is not yet started is the engagement the principal must chase the staff on.

Section E, the Decisions Required, is the decisions the principal must make in the coming week, each with a one-line statement of the decision and the deadline. Each line names the decision, gives the matter, gives the options the staff has prepared, and gives the deadline by which the principal must decide. A line reads, for example, “Cabinet reshuffle: three names shortlisted; decision by Thursday for swearing-in Friday.” The staff includes every decision that requires the principal's authority in the coming week, and the staff that lists a decision the principal has already made has burdened the principal with the matter that is closed. The decisions listed are the decisions the staff cannot make, and the staff that has listed a decision the staff could have made has failed the prioritization the briefing is meant to enforce.

3.3 The Prioritization Rules

The prioritization rules govern what goes on the one page, and the rules are three: what always goes on, what goes on when it changes, and what never goes on. What always goes on is the dependency state, the coalition state, the top three emerging risks, the upcoming engagements, and the decisions required. These are the matters the principal cannot delegate, and their inclusion is the staff's acknowledgement that the principal's attention is required. What goes on when it changes is the dependency that has moved, the coalition member whose state has changed, the risk that has emerged, the engagement that has been added or cancelled, and the decision that has been triggered. The change is the staff's signal to the principal, and the matter that has not changed is the matter the staff has held off the page.

What never goes on the page is the routine report, the administrative matter, the question the staff can answer, the engagement the staff can attend, and the decision the staff can make. The matter that never goes on is the matter the staff has disposed of, and the staff that has not disposed of it has left it for the principal, which is the failure the briefing is meant to prevent. The one-page constraint is the test of the prioritization, and the staff that cannot fit the week's matters on a single page has not done the work of choosing. The staff that exceeds the page adds the second page for the dependency that has not changed, the coalition that has held steady, the risk that has not emerged, the engagement that does not require the principal, and the decision that the staff could have made. The second page is the confession that the prioritization has failed, and the principal who receives the second page has received the staff's failure in place of the staff's work.

The prioritization is the staff's most consequential weekly judgment, and the staff that prioritizes well has given the principal the five minutes that orient the week. The staff that prioritizes poorly has given the principal the noise that displaces the orientation, and the principal who reads the noise has been made to do the work the staff was meant to do. The test of the staff's prioritization is the principal's conduct after the briefing: the principal who turns to the first meeting prepared has been well oriented; the principal who asks the staff for clarification has been poorly oriented. The briefing is the staff's weekly accounting to the principal, and the one page is the accounting's form.

3.4 Instructions for Production

The production of the briefing is the responsibility of the centre's staff, and the staff designates a single officer as the briefing's compiler. The compiler begins the draft on Thursday afternoon by drawing the dependencies from the dashboard, the coalitions from the coalition assessment, the risks from the risk register, the engagements from the calendar, and the decisions from the open decision log. The compiler circulates the draft to the staff on Friday morning, and the staff reviews the draft for accuracy, for prioritization, and for the one-page constraint. The compiler revises the draft through Friday afternoon, and the briefing is delivered to the principal by Friday evening, in time for the principal's Monday morning reading.

The principal's review of the briefing is the five minutes at the start of Monday, and the review has a fixed protocol. The principal reads Section A first, marks any dependency that has moved, and notes the engagements the dependency's state requires; Section B second, marking any coalition member whose state has changed; and Section C third, marking any risk the staff has flagged. The principal reads Section D fourth, confirms the engagements and the preparation status, and chases the staff on any engagement that is not yet started. The principal reads Section E fifth, makes the decisions or schedules the decision meetings, and confirms the deadlines to the staff.

The follow-up on the decisions is the staff's discipline for the week, and the staff that does not follow up has left the decision unmade. The staff tracks each decision the principal has made, confirms the decision's communication to the actors whose conduct the decision affects, and reports the decision's implementation in the following week's briefing. The staff tracks each decision the principal has scheduled, prepares the brief for the decision meeting, and ensures the principal has the materials the decision requires. The staff tracks each deadline, and the staff that allows a deadline to pass without the decision has failed the principal and the government. The follow-up is the staff's weekly accounting to the principal, and the accounting is the discipline by which the briefing's decisions become the government's conduct.

3.5 Worked Example

The worked example shows the briefing as it is composed for a fictional centre in a week in which one dependency has moved to amber, a coalition member is wavering, a risk is emerging, three engagements are scheduled, and two decisions are required. The example is presented in the form the briefing takes, with the five sections in the fixed order and the entries within each section in the order the staff has judged. The example is illustrative, and the staff that uses the example as a template fills in the names, the dependencies, and the risks of its own centre. The example's value is in the form, and the form is the discipline by which the staff composes the briefing each week.

Section A, the Dependency State. The Treasury bill market has moved to amber from green on widening spreads, with the refinancing window narrowing. The central bank financing, the external bond market, the parliamentary majority, the revenue base, and the security forces each remain green, with no change since the previous week. The change the staff has flagged is the Treasury bill market, and the staff has held the other dependencies to the one-line report their steady state allows.

Section B, the Coalition State. The governing coalition is stable but watchful; the leader of the regional party has signalled reservation on the budget vote. The cabinet and the senior civil service

are each stable, with no member change. The regional party leader's reservation is the change the staff has flagged, and the staff has noted the reservation as the emerging coalition risk the principal must address. The staff has held the cabinet and the senior civil service to the one-line report their steady state allows, because the staff has judged that the regional party's reservation is the coalition matter that requires the principal's attention.

Section C, the Emerging Risks. The first risk is the budget vote failure, with moderate probability and high consequence; the regional party leader's reservation has opened the path to a defeat on the floor. The second risk is the Treasury bill auction failure, with low probability and high consequence; the widening spreads have raised the risk of a poorly subscribed auction. The third risk is the regional party split, with low probability and moderate consequence; the leader's reservation has surfaced a factional division in the regional party. The staff has held the three to the top of the register, and the risks below the threshold have been left off the page.

Section D, the Upcoming Engagements. Tuesday at 10:00 the principal meets the Finance Minister on the budget gap closure, and the brief is ready. Wednesday at 14:00 the principal meets the leader of the regional party on the coalition management, and the brief is in preparation. Thursday at 09:00 the principal meets the central bank governor on the market conditions, and the brief is ready. The staff has listed the three engagements in the order of the week, and the preparation status flags the engagement the staff must complete before the principal's meeting.

Section E, the Decisions Required. The first decision is the budget gap measures, with three options shortlisted, an expenditure cut, a revenue measure, and a deficit acceptance, and the decision is required by Tuesday for the Finance Minister's preparation. The second decision is the cabinet reshuffle, with three names shortlisted for the regional portfolio, and the decision is required by Thursday for the swearing-in on Friday. The staff has listed the two decisions in the order of the deadlines, and the deadlines are the constraints by which the principal must allocate the week's authority.

Instrument 4 — The Relationship Cultivation Log: Working Template

The personal record the principal or chief of staff maintains for each key relationship: the history of contact, the commitments made and discharged, and the next step.

4.1 Purpose

The relationship cultivation log is the personal record the principal or chief of staff maintains for each key relationship in the government's coalition of support, and the record captures the history of contact, the commitments made and discharged by each side, and the next step the principal will take. The log exists because relationships lapse without attention, and the principal who relies on memory in place of a record has lost the relationship the principal has not entered in months. The discipline the log enforces is the maintenance of the record, the review of the record at the cadence the priority rubric sets, and the action the record triggers at the next contact. The purpose of the log is the cultivation of the relationship, and the cultivation is the work of months and years that the log makes visible to the principal who must do the work.

The log serves the three functions of the record of contact, the record of commitments, and the trigger for the next step. The record of contact captures the date, the format, the substance, and the duration of each engagement, so the principal and the chief of staff can reconstruct the relationship's state at any point in the term. The record of commitments captures the commitments the principal has made to the actor, the commitments the actor has made to the principal, and the commitments each side has discharged, so the obligations outstanding are visible at the next contact. The trigger for the next step captures the action the principal will take and the date by which the action will be taken, so the relationship has a forward motion the record enforces.

The log is the means by which the centre manages its personal relationships at scale, because the principal who manages thirty or fifty key relationships without a record has confused the relationships the principal remembers with the relationships the principal has. The log is personal to the principal and is maintained by the principal's personal staff, and the discipline is the regular review the principal and the chief of staff conduct against the entries. The relationships the principal does not cultivate are the relationships the principal loses, and the log is the protection against the loss the principal has not noticed.

4.2 The Template

The template comprises the fields for each relationship, and the fields are the actor's identification, the relationship's classification, the history of contact, the commitments made and discharged, the next step, and the principal's personal notes. The actor's identification comprises the actor's name, the position or title, and the institution, because the name alone is insufficient for the principal who must address the actor by the position the actor holds in the institution the actor leads. The relationship's classification comprises the relationship type and the relationship priority,

and the relationship type is recorded as core coalition, supportive, neutral, oppositional, or adversarial, while the relationship priority is recorded as Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3, based on the actor's importance to the government. The classification is the field the principal reviews at each assessment cycle, because the relationship that was supportive at the start of the term may have shifted to oppositional by the middle of it, and the principal who has not updated the classification has misread the relationship the log records.

The history of contact comprises the date, the format, the substance, and the duration of the last contact, and the field is the reconstruction of the most recent engagement the principal or the chief of staff has had with the actor. The format is recorded as the meeting, the phone call, the correspondence, or the event, because the format registers the depth of the engagement the contact achieved, and the principal who records the correspondence in place of the meeting has registered the relationship the principal has not cultivated. The substance is recorded in two or three sentences that capture the matters discussed and the positions taken, and the duration is recorded because the meeting of fifteen minutes and the meeting of two hours register different relationships regardless of the substance. The history of contact is the field the principal reads first at the next engagement, because the field tells the principal where the relationship was left and what the principal must pick up.

The commitments field records the commitments the principal has made to the actor, the commitments the actor has made to the principal, the commitments each side has discharged, and the commitments outstanding, because the relationship's health is registered in the discharge of the commitments as much as in the making of them. The commitments made are recorded with the date and the substance, and the commitments discharged are recorded with the date and the form of the discharge, because the principal's record of the discharge is the principal's protection against the charge of the unfulfilled commitment. The commitments outstanding are the field the principal reviews at each contact, because the outstanding commitment is the matter the principal must address at the next contact, and the principal who arrives at the contact without the record of the outstanding commitment has lost the relationship's thread. The commitments the actor has outstanding to the principal are recorded with equal care, because the principal's gentle reminder of the actor's outstanding commitment is the principal's means of collecting it without the confrontation that damages the relationship.

The next step field records the action the principal will take, the call, the meeting, the letter, or the gesture, and the next contact date by which the action will be taken, because the forward motion of the relationship is the discipline the log enforces. The notes field is the principal's personal assessment of the relationship's state and trajectory, recorded in two or three sentences, because the assessment is the principal's own reading of the actor's confidence, the actor's interests, and the actor's likely response to the government's next decision. The notes field is the field the principal writes personally, and the chief of staff who writes the notes in place of the principal has substituted the chief of staff's reading for the principal's. The notes are candid, and the candour is the condition of the field's usefulness, because the principal who writes the diplomatic note in place of the candid one has lost the field's purpose.

4.3 The Relationship Priority Rubric

The relationship priority rubric classifies each relationship as Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3, and the classification is based on the actor's importance to the government, the frequency of the personal engagement the relationship requires, and the level at which the relationship is maintained. The rubric is the discipline by which the principal allocates the principal's personal attention across the relationships the principal must manage, and the principal who treats every relationship as Tier 1 has dissipated the attention the genuine Tier 1 relationships require. The rubric is reviewed at each assessment cycle, and the relationship that has changed in importance is reclassified at the cycle, because the actor who was Tier 2 at the start of the year may be Tier 1 by the middle of it. The tiering of relationships is standard practice at the centres of mature governments, and the British Cabinet Office, the French presidency, and the Singapore Cabinet Office each maintain a graded stakeholder map that allocates the principal's personal engagement by the actor's importance.

Tier 1 comprises the relationships the principal must maintain personally and continuously, and the relationships are the actors whose support the government cannot lose without losing the capacity to govern. The Tier 1 relationships include the coalition partners, the finance minister and the central bank governor, the senior parliamentary figures, the leaders of the principal's party factions, the key cabinet ministers, and the heads of the major institutions on whom the government's programme depends. The principal maintains the Tier 1 relationships personally, and the frequency of the contact is weekly or more frequent, because the Tier 1 relationship that has gone two weeks without contact has begun to lapse. The Tier 1 relationship the principal delegates to the chief of staff has begun the descent to Tier 2, and the principal who delegates the Tier 1 relationship has shed the responsibility the tier requires.

Tier 2 comprises the relationships the principal maintains personally but less frequently, and the relationships are the actors whose support the government values but whose loss the government can absorb without immediate consequence. The Tier 2 relationships include the senior backbenchers, the regional and local leaders, the heads of the secondary institutions, the senior academics and commentators, the religious and community leaders, and the business figures whose sectors the government's programme touches. The principal maintains the Tier 2 relationships personally at the frequency of one to two months, and the chief of staff maintains the contact between the principal's engagements, because the Tier 2 relationship the principal has not engaged in three months has lapsed and requires the principal's personal recovery. The Tier 2 relationship the principal cultivates well is the relationship the principal can escalate to Tier 1 when the actor's importance has risen, and the cultivation is the work the log enforces.

Tier 3 comprises the relationships the chief of staff or a senior official maintains, with the principal's engagement as needed, and the relationships are the actors whose support the government tracks but whose cultivation does not require the principal's personal attention at every cycle. The Tier 3 relationships include the wider parliamentary party, the junior ministers, the rank-and-file officials, the wider business community, and the institutions the principal's office monitors but does not engage directly. The chief of staff or the senior official maintains the Tier 3 contact at the frequency of the quarter, and the principal is engaged when the relationship has changed in importance or when the actor's specific decision requires the principal's personal intervention. The Tier 3 relationship that has shifted to Tier 2 or Tier 1 is the relationship the chief of staff escalates

at the next review, and the escalation is the protocol by which the principal's attention is reallocated to the relationship the new importance requires.

4.4 Instructions for Maintenance

The log is maintained by the principal's personal staff, and the keeper of the log is the chief of staff or the principal's private secretary, because the log is the principal's personal record and the keeper is the official the principal trusts with the principal's personal reading of the relationships. The keeper records the entries at the close of each contact the principal or the chief of staff has had with the actor, because the entry recorded the day after the contact is more accurate than the entry reconstructed at the end of the week. The keeper reviews the entries at the cadence the priority rubric sets, and the review is the discipline by which the log enforces the cultivation the relationships require. The keeper prepares the review material for the principal and the chief of staff, and the material is the list of the relationships due for contact, the commitments outstanding past their due dates, and the relationships whose notes the principal must update.

The review cadence is weekly for the Tier 1 relationships, monthly for the Tier 2 relationships, and quarterly for the Tier 3 relationships, because the cadence matches the frequency at which the relationship requires the principal's or the chief of staff's attention. The weekly review of the Tier 1 relationships identifies the relationships that have gone the week without contact, the commitments outstanding that have passed their due date, and the next steps that have not been taken. The monthly review of the Tier 2 relationships identifies the relationships that have lapsed, the relationships that have changed in importance, and the relationships that require the principal's personal engagement at the next cycle. The quarterly review of the Tier 3 relationships identifies the relationships that have shifted to Tier 2 or Tier 1, the relationships that the chief of staff can shed, and the new relationships the principal's office has acquired.

The escalation protocol governs the reclassification of the relationships between the tiers, and the protocol requires the chief of staff to flag the relationship that has changed in importance at the next review and to recommend the reclassification to the principal. The principal confirms or rejects the reclassification, and the entry is updated to reflect the new tier, the new cadence, and the new pattern of the principal's engagement. The escalation is the discipline by which the log tracks the shifting terrain of the relationships, and the centre that does not escalate the Tier 2 relationship that has become Tier 1 has failed to cultivate the relationship at the frequency the relationship now requires. The de-escalation is the discipline by which the principal's attention is released from the relationship that has diminished in importance, and the de-escalation is the protocol the chief of staff recommends and the principal confirms at the same review.

The log is confidential to the principal and the principal's immediate office, and the log is not shared beyond the principal, the chief of staff, the private secretary, and the keeper. The confidentiality is the condition of the principal's candid notes, because the notes the principal writes on the actor's confidence, interests, and trajectory are the notes the principal cannot write if the notes are to be read by the actor or by the official outside the principal's office. The practice is standard at the centres of mature governments: the British Cabinet Office maintains the prime minister's personal engagement records under the principal private secretary's control, the French

presidency maintains the president's relationship files under the chef de cabinet, and the Singapore Cabinet Office maintains the prime minister's stakeholder map under the principal private secretary. The log is stored in the principal's office under the principal's control, and the copy is destroyed at the close of the principal's term, because the log is the principal's personal record and not the record of the office.

4.5 Worked Example

The first worked example is the Tier 1 entry for the president of the national confederation of industry, a relationship the principal has maintained since the second month of the term. The relationship type is core coalition, the relationship priority is Tier 1, and the entry records thirty-eight contacts over the principal's term to date. The last contact was the meeting of the past Tuesday, in the format of the private breakfast, in the duration of ninety minutes, and in the substance of the confederation's position on the government's industrial policy, the principal's request for the confederation's public support at the policy's launch, and the confederation's request for the government's concession on the energy levy. The principal's commitment made was the review of the energy levy within the finance ministry, with a response by the end of the month, and the actor's commitment made was the confederation's public statement of support at the policy's launch, to be issued on the morning of the launch.

The principal's commitment discharged is the confederation's access to the finance minister in the week following the breakfast, and the actor's commitment discharged is the confederation's statement issued on the morning of the launch. The principal's commitment outstanding is the response on the energy levy, due by the end of the month, and the actor's commitment outstanding is the confederation's continuation of the private channel on the labour-market reform the government has signalled for the autumn. The next step is the principal's call to the president on the day the finance ministry's response is ready, and the next contact date is set at ten days from the last contact. The principal's notes record that the relationship is in mature health, that the confederation's support has been consistent, that the president's standing within the confederation has strengthened over the term, and that the principal's response on the energy levy is the test the relationship faces at the next contact.

The second worked example is the Tier 2 entry for a senior professor of public policy at the national university, a relationship the principal cultivated in the first six months of the term and has allowed to lapse in the months since. The relationship type is supportive, the relationship priority is Tier 2, and the entry records nine contacts over the term to date. The last contact was the meeting of the past March, in the format of the working lunch, in the duration of seventy minutes, and in the substance of the professor's assessment of the government's reform of the senior civil service and the principal's request for the professor's continued advice on the implementation. The principal's commitment made was the invitation to the professor to join the implementation advisory group, and the actor's commitment made was the professor's agreement to join and to convene the group's first session.

The principal's commitment discharged is the invitation issued in April, and the actor's commitment discharged is the convening of the first session in May. The principal's commitment

outstanding is the principal's attendance at the group's first session, which was deferred in June and has not been rescheduled, and the actor's commitment outstanding is the group's interim report, which the professor has held pending the principal's attendance. The next step is the principal's personal letter to the professor, acknowledging the lapse, rescheduling the principal's attendance, and proposing the date, and the next contact date is set at fourteen days from the entry. The principal's notes record that the relationship has lapsed through the principal's neglect, that the professor's confidence in the government's seriousness on the reform has weakened, and that the principal's letter is the last opportunity to recover the relationship before the professor withdraws from the advisory group.

Instrument 5 — The Coalition Health Tracker: Working Template

The periodic assessment of the coalition's state: each member's contribution, cost, satisfaction, and risk, and the coalition's overall health rating.

5.1 Purpose

The coalition health tracker is the structured periodic assessment of the coalition that supports the government, conducted at the quarterly interval and after every event that materially alters a member's position. The tracker records each member's contribution, cost, satisfaction, and risk, and aggregates the member assessments into the coalition's overall health rating. The purpose of the tracker is to prevent the centre from being surprised by a coalition fracture: the fracture that is observed in the tracker as a slow erosion of satisfaction and a gradual escalation of risk is a fracture the centre can act on, and the fracture that is not observed is a fracture the centre meets as a sudden event. The quarterly assessment is the discipline that forces the principal to confront each member's state, to set the action each member requires, and to record the centre's commitments in a form the centre can be held to.

The tracker replaces the informal sense of the coalition that the centre carries between crises, and replaces it with a record that is dated, evidenced, and revisable. The informal sense is the source of the surprise: the centre that relies on the sense that the coalition is 'broadly holding' has rested on a picture that is not tested, and the picture that is not tested drifts from the reality the centre must act on. The principal who conducts the quarterly assessment has looked each member in the face; the principal who does not has looked away, and the looking away is the condition under which the fracture arrives as a surprise. The tracker is maintained between the quarterly assessments through the event-triggered review, and the maintenance is the work of the official the principal designates.

5.2 The Template

The template is the structured record of the coalition's state, organised in two parts: the member entries and the coalition overall assessment. Each member entry records the fields that together constitute the centre's working knowledge of the member, and the coalition overall assessment aggregates the member entries into the coalition's coherence, stability, vulnerabilities, opportunities, and overall rating. The template is maintained as a single document, and each field is completed in the form the rubrics in 5.3 and 5.4 set. The template is the operational instrument, and the centre that maintains the template has the discipline the quarterly assessment requires.

For each coalition member the template records the following fields. Member Name is the member's name as used in the centre's working correspondence. Position/Title is the office the member holds, in the government, the parliament, the institution, or the network. Institution is the body through which the member acts — the party, the ministry, the confessional body, the regional

administration, the branch of the security forces, or the external actor. Category is the member's category against the five: economic, bureaucratic, social, external, or branch. Contribution is what the member brings to the coalition — the resources, the legitimacy, the implementation capacity, and the constituency — stated plainly and in the order of weight. Cost is what the member demands in return — the policy concessions, the appointments, the access, and the resources — stated plainly and in the order of weight.

Satisfaction is the member's present satisfaction with what the coalition has delivered, assessed as high, medium, or low against the rubric in 5.3. Risk is the member's present disposition to remain in the coalition, assessed as stable, under strain, or fracturing against the rubric in 5.4. Action Required is what the centre needs to do before the next review to maintain, repair, or manage the member's position, stated as a concrete action with an owner and a date. Last Review Date is the date of the most recent assessment, and Next Review Date is the date by which the next assessment is due, set at the quarterly interval or sooner if the rubric requires. The fields together are the entry, and the entry that omits a field is an entry the centre has not completed.

The coalition overall assessment records the coalition's state as a whole. Coherence is the alignment of the members' interests with the government's programme, assessed as strong, moderate, or weak. Stability is the durability of the coalition under the pressures the term will impose, assessed as stable, under strain, or fracturing. Vulnerabilities are the top three conditions under which the coalition breaks, stated with the trigger, the member or members exposed, and the consequence. Opportunities are the top three conditions under which the coalition can be strengthened, stated with the action, the member or members involved, and the gain. Overall Rating is the coalition's present state, assessed as stable, under strain, or fracturing, and derived from the coherence, the stability, and the weight of the vulnerabilities against the opportunities.

5.3 The Satisfaction Assessment Rubric

The satisfaction assessment rubric sets the criteria by which a member's satisfaction is rated as high, medium, or low, and the criteria are observable indicators the centre can evidence. Satisfaction is the member's present disposition toward the coalition as measured by the gap between what the member expected and what the member has received, and the rubric translates the gap into the three ratings. The indicators are drawn from the member's public conduct, the member's private communications with the centre, the member's voting and endorsement record, and the member's responses to the centre's requests. The centre that rates the satisfaction on impression in place of the indicators has rated the satisfaction in a form the rubric cannot sustain.

High satisfaction is rated when the indicators show the member's expectations are being met or exceeded. The member votes with the government on the contested tests, endorses the programme without qualification, responds to the centre's requests with cooperation, and communicates in the register of partnership. The member's private communications register the expectations as fulfilled, and the member's conduct is the conduct of an ally. The member at high satisfaction is the member the centre can ask for more without the cost of a concession, and the centre that does not use the high-satisfaction position to extend the coalition's reach has wasted the position.

Medium satisfaction is rated when the indicators show the member's expectations are partially met and partially unmet. The member votes with the government on the major tests but abstains or defects on the tests the member has flagged, endorses the programme with qualifications the member has negotiated, and responds to the centre's requests with conditional cooperation. The member's private communications register specific unmet demands, and the member's conduct is the conduct of a partner whose terms are open. The centre that neglects the medium-satisfaction member has allowed the position to drift to low.

Low satisfaction is rated when the indicators show the member's expectations are substantially unmet. The member defects on the contested tests, distances the member's public statements from the government's programme, responds to the centre's requests with refusal or obstruction, and communicates in the register of grievance. The member's private communications register the coalition as a disappointment or a betrayal, and the member's conduct is the conduct of an actor whose exit is being prepared. The centre that defers the action on a low-satisfaction member has allowed the low satisfaction to become the fracture.

The indicators of eroding satisfaction are the indicators the centre reads between the assessments, and the reading is the discipline the maintenance requires. The eroding indicators include the member's first abstention on a test the centre had counted on, the first public qualification of a position the centre had counted as endorsement, the first refusal of a request the centre had expected to be granted, the first communication in the register of grievance, and the first contact with the actors outside the coalition the centre had not observed before. Each indicator is recorded with the date and the circumstance, and the accumulation across the quarter is the basis on which the satisfaction rating is revised downward at the next review. The centre that records the indicators as they occur has the picture the quarterly assessment requires, and the centre that relies on the sense the indicators have not been recorded has the picture the surprise arrives in.

5.4 The Risk Assessment Rubric

The risk assessment rubric sets the criteria by which a member's risk is rated as stable, under strain, or fracturing, and the criteria are the early indicators, the late indicators, and the triggers that move the rating to fracturing. Risk is the member's present disposition to remain in the coalition, distinct from satisfaction: the member may be dissatisfied but stable, or satisfied but under strain, and the rubric holds the two assessments separate. The risk rating is the assessment the centre acts on, because the risk rating names the fracture, and the centre that conflates the satisfaction with the risk has misread the member's position. The rubric is applied at each review and after every event the maintenance protocol requires.

Stable is rated when the indicators show the member's continued presence in the coalition is secure across the foreseeable horizon. The member has no public alternative to the coalition, the member's constituency and institutional base are aligned with the coalition's programme, the member's private communications register no consideration of exit, and the member's conduct in the contested tests is the conduct of a member whose position is settled. The stable member may be dissatisfied on specific policies, but the dissatisfaction is contained within the coalition and the member's continued presence is not in question. The centre's action for the stable member is the

maintenance action — the attention that preserves the position, the engagement that confirms the relationship, and the responsiveness that addresses the dissatisfactions before they accumulate.

Under strain is rated when the indicators show the member's continued presence in the coalition is contested within the member's own base or within the member's own calculation. The member faces a constituency or a faction that is pressing for exit, the member's private communications register a consideration of the alternatives, and the member's public statements register a distance from the government the member had not previously maintained. The member under strain has not decided to leave, but the member's position is no longer settled, and the centre's action is the repair action — the engagement that addresses the strain's source, the concession that reduces the pressure, or the demonstration that the coalition's value exceeds the alternative's. The member under strain is the member the centre can still hold, and the centre that treats the strain as the fracture has abandoned the member; the centre that treats the strain as the stability has lost the member.

Fracturing is rated when the indicators show the member's exit is in progress or is imminent. The member has made the contacts outside the coalition that prepare the exit, the member's private communications register the decision to leave or the decision is being finalised, and the member's conduct in the contested tests is the conduct of a member who is no longer committed. The fracturing member is the member the centre must manage as a departure, and the centre's action is the management action — the negotiation of the terms of the departure, the preparation of the coalition for the loss, the cultivation of the replacement, or the last engagement that may reverse the decision. The trigger that moves the rating to fracturing is the indicator that the decision to leave has been made or is being executed: the member's signed agreement with an alternative bloc, the public announcement of separation, the refusal of the coalition's offer in the form the centre had counted as the final offer, or the instruction to the member's faction to prepare for the break.

The early indicators of strain are the indicators the centre reads before the strain is visible in the contested tests. The early indicators include the member's silence in the meetings the member had previously spoken in, the absence from the events the member had previously attended, the private complaint about a decision the centre had counted as routine, the first contact with an actor outside the coalition the centre had not previously observed, and the first public statement that distances the member from a position the member had previously endorsed. The late indicators are the indicators the centre reads as the strain moves to the fracture: the open disagreement with the government in a public forum, the instruction to the member's faction to withhold support on a specific test, and the negotiated terms with an alternative bloc. The centre that reads the early indicators has the time the repair requires; the centre that reads only the late indicators has the time the management of the departure requires, and the time is shorter.

5.5 Instructions for Maintenance

The tracker is maintained by the official the principal designates — the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the chief of staff, or the official whose position places the coalition's management in the official's brief. The designated official is responsible for the completion of the template at the quarterly interval, for the event-triggered reviews between the quarters, for the

integrity of the entries, and for the presentation of the tracker to the principal at the review meeting. The official does not delegate the maintenance to a subordinate, because the maintenance is the work of the official whose position places the centre's working knowledge of the coalition in the official's hands, and the delegation is the abdication the surprise arrives in. The official maintains the tracker as the centre's record, and the centre's record is the record the principal signs.

The quarterly review cycle is the cadence at which the tracker is completed and presented. The four reviews each year are conducted at the end of each quarter, with the entries updated against the indicators the quarter has produced, the satisfaction and risk ratings revised against the rubrics, and the coalition overall assessment aggregated from the member entries. The completed tracker is presented to the principal at the quarterly review meeting, the principal's questions are recorded, the principal's decisions on the actions required are recorded, and the decisions are entered into the tracker as the centre's commitments. The quarterly review is the discipline the centre applies to itself, and the centre that defers the review has the picture the previous quarter produced, and the picture has drifted.

The event-triggered review is the review conducted between the quarterly reviews when an event materially alters a member's position. The events that trigger the review include the member's defection on a contested vote, the member's public break with the government, the member's loss of office or factional position, the member's indictment or exposure in scandal, and the external event — the economic shock, the foreign crisis, the regional disturbance — that affects the member's constituency or base. The event-triggered review is conducted within the week of the event, the affected member's entry is updated, the coalition overall assessment is revised if the event warrants, and the revision is presented to the principal at the next available meeting. The centre that waits for the quarterly review to record the event has allowed the picture to drift between the event and the review.

The escalation protocol is the rule by which the tracker triggers a coalition review meeting with the principal outside the quarterly cycle. The protocol sets three triggers: the move of any member's risk rating to fracturing, the move of the coalition's overall rating to fracturing, and the move of two or more members' risk ratings to under strain within the same quarter. Each trigger requires the designated official to convene a coalition review meeting with the principal within the week, to present the affected entries and the coalition overall assessment, and to set the actions the centre will take. The protocol is the rule the centre has agreed with itself in advance, and the centre that overrides the protocol has allowed the principal's preference or the centre's optimism to defer the response, and the deferral is the condition under which the strain becomes the fracture.

The confidentiality handling is the discipline by which the tracker's sensitivity is protected. The tracker is maintained as the centre's most sensitive document, with the access restricted to the principal, the designated official, and the officials the principal directs, and the storage on the centre's most secure system. The entries are not shared with the members the entries assess, the members' staffs, the ministers outside the centre, or the external actors whose relationships the entries record. The designated official maintains the access list, reviews the access log at the quarterly interval, and reports the access to the principal. The breach that exposes an entry destroys the centre's relationship with the member the entry assesses, and the discipline that prevents the breach is the discipline the centre maintains as strictly as the crisis response requires.

5.6 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed coalition health tracker for a fictional government, set at the end of the third quarter of the government's term. The government is a coalition of five members: the Liberal Party (the principal's party, holding the centre), the Agrarian Federation (an economic and regional member), the Civic Union (a social and urban member), the Security Establishment (a branch member represented by the minister of defence), and the Maritime Confederation (an external and economic member, representing the coastal regions and the trading interests). The example illustrates the tracker in a state of strain: two members stable, two under strain, one fracturing, and the coalition overall rated as under strain.

Member entry: the Liberal Party. Position/Title: the principal's party, holding the prime ministership and the finance ministry. Institution: the Liberal Party parliamentary group and the party's national council. Category: economic and bureaucratic. Contribution: 110 parliamentary votes, the legitimacy of the principal's office, the finance ministry's implementation capacity, and the party's national network. Cost: the prime ministership, the finance ministry, the principal's policy programme, and the party's patronage. Satisfaction: high. Risk: stable. Action Required: maintain engagement with the party's national council ahead of the annual conference; confirm the finance minister's medium-term fiscal plan before the next budget. Last Review Date: 30 September; Next Review Date: 31 December.

Member entry: the Agrarian Federation. Position/Title: the deputy prime ministership and the agriculture ministry. Institution: the Agrarian Federation parliamentary group and the federation's regional councils. Category: economic. Contribution: 38 parliamentary votes, the federation's endorsement in the rural constituencies, the agriculture ministry's implementation capacity, and the regional network. Cost: the deputy prime ministership, the agriculture ministry, the annual subsidy settlement, the irrigation programme, and the federation's vetoes on trade policy. Satisfaction: medium. Risk: under strain. The strain's source is the government's trade agreement negotiation, which the federation has flagged as a threat to the rural producers, and the regional councils have pressed the leadership to withhold support on the budget vote. Action Required: the principal to meet the federation's president within the fortnight; the trade minister to brief the leadership on the agreement's safeguards; the centre to prepare a rural investment package as the concession the federation can present to the regional councils. Last Review Date: 30 September; Next Review Date: 31 October (event-triggered, ahead of the budget vote).

Member entry: the Civic Union. Position/Title: the health ministry and the urban development ministry. Institution: the Civic Union parliamentary group and the union's municipal networks. Category: social. Contribution: 27 parliamentary votes, the union's endorsement in the urban constituencies, the implementation capacity of the two ministries, and the municipal network. Cost: the two ministries, the health service reform programme, the urban infrastructure fund, and the union's appointments to the municipal bodies. Satisfaction: high. Risk: stable. Action Required: confirm the health service reform's funding at the next budget; engage the union's leader on the principal's planned cabinet reshuffle before the reshuffle is announced. Last Review Date: 30 September; Next Review Date: 31 December.

Member entry: the Security Establishment. Position/Title: the ministry of defence and the chief of defence's chair. Institution: the armed forces and the defence ministry. Category: branch.

Contribution: the loyalty of the armed forces, the defence ministry's implementation capacity, the legitimacy the establishment's endorsement carries with the public, and the officer corps. Cost: the defence budget, the modernisation programme, the chief of defence's tenure, and the establishment's vetoes on foreign policy positions it judges adverse. Satisfaction: low. Risk: under strain. The strain's source is the government's regional security arrangement negotiation, which the establishment has judged as a concession to a rival power; the chief of defence has communicated the objection to the principal through the minister of defence, and the strain is contained within the security council. Action Required: the principal to meet the chief of defence within the week; the foreign minister to brief the security council on the arrangement's safeguards; the centre to prepare a defence modernisation acceleration as the concession the establishment can register. Last Review Date: 30 September; Next Review Date: 31 October (event-triggered, ahead of the arrangement's signature).

Member entry: the Maritime Confederation. Position/Title: the trade ministry and the maritime authority. Institution: the Maritime Confederation's chambers and the coastal regional councils. Category: external and economic. Contribution: the confederation's endorsement in the coastal constituencies, the legitimacy the endorsement carries with the trading partners, the trade ministry's implementation capacity, and the maritime network. Cost: the trade ministry, the maritime authority, the port modernisation programme, and the confederation's vetoes on trade policy positions it judges adverse. Satisfaction: low. Risk: fracturing. The fracture's source is the government's trade agreement, which the confederation has judged as a concession that displaces the coastal producers' exports; the confederation's president has signed a memorandum of understanding with the opposition bloc contemplating the confederation's departure after the budget vote, and the chambers have begun the consultation the departure would require. Action Required: the principal to meet the confederation's president within the week; the centre to prepare the offer that would reverse the decision — the port modernisation acceleration, the coastal producers' compensation fund, and the confederation's seat on the trade negotiation's oversight committee; the centre to prepare the coalition for the loss — the votes the loss would cost, the smaller blocs that would replace the votes, and the public communication that would frame the departure. Last Review Date: 30 September; Next Review Date: 15 October (event-triggered, ahead of the budget vote and the chambers' consultation).

Coalition overall assessment. Coherence: moderate — the members' interests align on the fiscal programme and the security posture, but diverge on the trade agreement, with the Agrarian Federation, the Maritime Confederation, and the Security Establishment each objecting on different grounds. Stability: under strain — the Maritime Confederation's fracture is the immediate threat, the Agrarian Federation's strain is the near-term threat, and the Security Establishment's strain is the medium-term threat, and the three together test the coalition's capacity to hold the budget vote. Vulnerabilities: first, the Maritime Confederation's departure after the budget vote, which would cost 22 of the confederation's votes and the trade ministry; second, the Agrarian Federation's defection on the budget vote, which would cost the rural endorsement and the agriculture ministry's implementation capacity; third, the Security Establishment's public break with the government on the regional security arrangement, which would cost the public's confidence on the security posture. Opportunities: first, the Civic Union's high satisfaction and willingness to expand the

coalition's urban programme, extending the coalition's reach in the urban constituencies the government has targeted; second, the principal's party's strong position and capacity to absorb the loss of the Maritime Confederation's votes through by-elections the party is favoured to win; third, the opposition bloc's internal divisions, which limit the opposition's capacity to absorb the Maritime Confederation's departure and reduce the confederation's leverage. Overall Rating: under strain — the coalition is held together by the principal's party's strength and the Civic Union's commitment, but the Maritime Confederation's fracture, the Agrarian Federation's strain, and the Security Establishment's strain together place the coalition under strain that the centre's actions in the next quarter must address.

Instrument 6 — The Power Audit: Working Template

The annual structured assessment of the government's actual power position: the trajectory of each dependency, each actor category, the coalition, the opposition, and the adversaries.

6.1 Purpose

The power audit is the annual structured assessment of the government's actual power position. The audit records the trajectory of each of the five dependencies, the government's position in each of the six actor categories, the coalition's trajectory, the opposition's trajectory, and the adversaries' trajectory, and aggregates the trajectories into the overall power position assessment: ascending, stable, or declining. The purpose of the audit is to give the principal the one annual judgement that orients the government's strategy for the year ahead — whether the government's power is growing, holding, or eroding — and to ground that judgement in the evidence the centre has gathered across the year. The audit that the centre does not conduct leaves the principal with the informal sense of the government's position, and the informal sense is the picture the surprise arrives in.

The audit is the instrument that consolidates the work the centre has maintained through the year — the stakeholder map, the dependency dashboard, the coalition health tracker, and the centre's working knowledge of the opposition and the adversaries. The annual assessment is the discipline that forces the centre to read the year's evidence as a whole, to set the trajectory each line has followed, and to derive the overall assessment from the trajectories, not from the impression. The principal who has the audit has the orientation the year requires; the principal who does not has the orientation the last crisis produced, and the orientation the last crisis produced is not the orientation the year requires. The audit is the centre's annual reckoning with the government's power.

6.2 The Template

The template is the structured record of the audit, organised in five parts: the dependency trajectories, the actor-category positions, the coalition trajectory, the opposition and adversaries trajectories, and the overall power position assessment. Each part records the fields the audit requires, and the overall assessment is derived from the parts and not asserted against them. The template is completed as a single document, and the completion is the work the designated official conducts across the year's final month and presents to the principal at the annual review. The template is the operational instrument, and the centre that completes the template has the discipline the annual assessment requires.

The dependency trajectories record the trajectory of each of the five dependencies: financial, human, informational, institutional, and political. For each dependency the template records the trajectory as strengthening, stable, or weakening; the evidence, drawn from the dependency dashboard's record across the year and stated as the three or four indicators that together establish

the trajectory; and the action required, stated as the concrete action the centre will take in the year ahead. The action is set as the strengthening of a weakening dependency, the maintenance of a stable dependency, or the exploitation of a strengthening dependency. The trajectory is the judgement the centre derives from the evidence, and the evidence the centre cannot cite is the evidence the centre has not gathered.

The actor-category positions record the government's position in each of the six actor categories: economic, bureaucratic, social, external, branches, and head of state. For each category the template records the position as improving, deteriorating, or stable; the evidence, drawn from the stakeholder map's record across the year; and the action required. The economic category records the government's position with the concentrated economic actors whose resources the government requires; the bureaucratic category with the permanent officials whose implementation the government depends on; the social category with the social forces whose endorsement legitimises the programme. The external category records the government's position with the external actors whose cooperation or restraint the government requires; the branches category with the legislature, the judiciary, and the subnational governments whose constitutional roles the government operates within; and the head of state category with the head of state whose constitutional role the government must navigate.

The branches category and the head of state category are assessed with the same analytical register as the other categories: the centre records the position as improving, deteriorating, or stable on the indicators the categories produce, and the centre that accords either category a privileged framing in the assessment has distorted the assessment. The assessment that records deference in place of evidence has distorted the picture the principal will act on. The category positions together are the centre's working assessment of the government's standing across the actor landscape, and the position the centre cannot evidence is the position the centre has not assessed.

The coalition trajectory records the coalition's state across the year: expanding, contracting, or stable, with the evidence drawn from the coalition health tracker's quarterly assessments and stated as the changes in membership, satisfaction, and risk the year has produced. The opposition trajectory records the opposition's state across the year: growing, receding, or stable, with the evidence stated as the changes in the opposition's coalition, electoral position, and obstructive capacity. The adversaries' trajectory records the adversaries' state across the year: gaining ground, losing ground, or stable, with the evidence stated as the changes in the adversaries' capacity, positioning, and actions against the government.

The overall power position assessment records the judgement the audit produces: ascending, stable, or declining, with the principal contributing factors stated and ranked. The ascending assessment is recorded when the trajectories show the government's power growing across the dependencies and the actor categories, with the coalition holding or expanding and the opposition and adversaries held or losing ground. The stable assessment is recorded when the trajectories show the government's power holding, with the gains and the losses in balance. The declining assessment is recorded when the trajectories show the government's power eroding, with the weakening dependencies and the deteriorating categories outweighing the strengthening, or the coalition contracting, or the opposition or the adversaries gaining ground. The overall assessment is

the judgement the centre derives from the parts, and the centre that asserts the assessment against the parts has not conducted the audit.

6.3 The Trajectory Assessment Rubric

The trajectory assessment rubric sets the criteria by which the dependencies, the actor categories, the coalition, the opposition, and the adversaries are rated, and the criteria are observable indicators the centre can evidence. The rubric translates the year's evidence into the trajectories the audit records, and the centre that rates the trajectory on impression in place of the indicators has rated the trajectory in a form the rubric cannot sustain. The indicators are drawn from the records the centre has maintained across the year — the dependency dashboard, the stakeholder map, the coalition health tracker, and the centre's working knowledge — and the indicators the centre cannot cite are the indicators the centre has not gathered.

A dependency is rated as strengthening when the indicators show the government's dependence on the actors it does not command has decreased. For the financial dependency, the indicators include the broadening of the revenue base, the lengthening of the financing horizon, the diversification of the lenders, and the deepening of the reserves. For the human dependency, the indicators include the improvement in the quality of the officials the centre can appoint, the reduction in the positions the centre cannot fill, and the strengthening of the loyalty the centre can rely on. For the informational dependency, the indicators include the improvement in the timeliness and the quality of the information the centre receives, the reduction in the softening the centre encounters, and the broadening of the sources the centre can draw on. For the institutional dependency, the indicators include the strengthening of the institutions the government operates through, the reduction in the institutional resistance the government encounters, and the improvement in the government's capacity to implement. For the political dependency, the indicators include the broadening of the constituency the government can mobilise, the strengthening of the endorsements the government holds, and the reduction in the political costs the government pays for its programme.

A dependency is rated as weakening when the indicators show the government's dependence has increased. For the financial dependency, the indicators include the narrowing of the revenue base, the shortening of the financing horizon, the concentration of the lenders, and the depletion of the reserves. For the human dependency, the indicators include the deterioration in the quality of the officials the centre can appoint, the increase in the positions the centre cannot fill, and the erosion of the loyalty the centre can rely on. For the informational dependency, the indicators include the deterioration in the timeliness and the quality, the increase in the softening, and the narrowing of the sources. For the institutional dependency, the indicators include the weakening of the institutions, the increase in the institutional resistance, and the deterioration in the implementation capacity. For the political dependency, the indicators include the narrowing of the constituency, the erosion of the endorsements, and the increase in the political costs. A dependency is rated as stable when the indicators show no material change in either direction, and the stability is the rating the centre records when the strengthening and the weakening indicators are in balance.

An actor category is rated as improving when the indicators show the government's position with the category's actors has strengthened, deteriorating when the indicators show the position has weakened, and stable when the indicators show no material change. The improving indicators include the government's gains in the endorsements, the access, and the cooperation the category's actors provide, and the deteriorating indicators include the government's losses in the same. The coalition is rated as expanding when the indicators show the coalition has gained members or capacity, contracting when the indicators show the coalition has lost members or capacity, and stable when the indicators show no material change. The opposition is rated as growing when the indicators show the opposition has gained in coalition, electoral position, or obstructive capacity, receding when the indicators show the opposition has lost, and stable when the indicators show no material change. The adversaries are rated as gaining ground when the indicators show the adversaries have gained in capacity, positioning, or effect, losing ground when the indicators show the adversaries have lost, and stable when the indicators show no material change.

6.4 Instructions for Conduct

The audit is conducted by the official the principal designates — the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the chief of staff, or the official whose position places the centre's working knowledge of the government's power in the official's brief. The designated official is responsible for the gathering of the evidence, the completion of the template, the integrity of the trajectories, and the presentation of the audit to the principal at the annual review. The official conducts the audit with the staff the centre requires — the officials who maintain the stakeholder map, the dependency dashboard, and the coalition health tracker — and the conduct is the work the centre agrees with itself to do at the year's end. The official does not delegate the conduct to a subordinate, because the conduct is the work of the official whose position places the centre's annual reckoning in the official's hands.

The annual cycle is the cadence at which the audit is conducted and presented. The audit is conducted across the year's final month, with the evidence gathered from the records the centre has maintained, the trajectories derived from the evidence, and the overall assessment derived from the trajectories. The completed audit is presented to the principal at the annual review meeting in the year's final week, the principal's questions are recorded, the principal's decisions on the actions required are recorded, and the decisions are entered into the audit as the centre's commitments for the year ahead. The annual review is the discipline the centre applies to itself, and the centre that defers the review has the picture the previous year produced, and the picture has drifted.

The preparation is the work the staff conducts across the year's final month. The staff gathers the evidence from the stakeholder map, the dependency dashboard, and the coalition health tracker, and the gathering is the systematic reading of the year's records against the rubric the audit applies. The staff compiles the evidence into the draft trajectories, the draft trajectories are reviewed by the designated official for the integrity of the judgements, and the reviewed trajectories are entered into the template. The preparation is the discipline that ensures the audit is grounded in the evidence the centre has gathered, and the centre that conducts the audit without the preparation has the audit the impression produces.

The principal's review is the meeting at which the principal reads the audit, questions the trajectories, and decides the actions the year requires. The principal reads the audit in advance, the designated official presents the trajectories and the overall assessment, and the principal's questions test the evidence the trajectories rest on and the judgement the overall assessment derives. The principal's decisions on the actions required are the centre's commitments for the year ahead, and the commitments are recorded in the audit and entered into the centre's working plans. The principal who conducts the review has engaged with the government's power position; the principal who defers the review has deferred the engagement the year requires.

The action plan that follows a declining assessment is the plan the centre produces when the audit records the government's power as declining. The plan sets the dependencies the centre will strengthen, the actor categories the centre will repair, the coalition the centre will hold or rebuild, and the opposition and adversaries the centre will counter, with the actions, the owners, the dates, and the indicators by which the centre will measure the recovery. The plan is presented to the principal at the annual review, the principal's decisions on the plan are recorded, and the plan is reviewed at the quarterly interval across the year ahead. The declining assessment is the judgement the centre acts on, and the centre that records the declining assessment without the action plan has recorded the decline without the response.

6.5 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed power audit for a fictional government, set at the end of the government's second year. The government is a coalition led by the principal's party, holding the prime ministership and the finance ministry, with four coalition members. The example illustrates the audit in a state of decline: two dependencies weakening, two stable, one strengthening; two actor categories deteriorating, three stable, one improving; the coalition contracting; the opposition growing; the adversaries gaining ground; and the overall power position assessed as declining.

Financial dependency: weakening. The evidence: the revenue base has narrowed as the slowdown has reduced the tax receipts, the financing horizon has shortened as the lenders have signalled reluctance on the rollover beyond six months, and the reserves have fallen from three months to six weeks of expenditure. Action required: prepare a medium-term fiscal consolidation, the finance minister to engage the lenders on a rollover extension, and identify the expenditure reductions that will restore the reserves. Human dependency: weakening. The evidence: three senior positions in the security and the economic ministries have been vacant for more than four months, the candidates the centre has approached have declined, and the loyalty of two senior officials has been questioned in the centre's working knowledge. Action required: the principal to engage the candidates on the security and economic positions, the centre to broaden the candidate pool, and the centre to address the loyalty concerns through the officials' review. Informational dependency: stable. The evidence: the timeliness and the quality of the information the centre receives have held, the softening has not increased, and the sources have not narrowed. Action required: maintain the sources and the cadence.

Institutional dependency: weakening. The evidence: the constitutional court has struck down two principal reform measures in the year, the subnational governments have obstructed the implementation of the infrastructure programme in three regions, and the legislature's committees have delayed three principal bills. Action required: the centre to prepare the legal redesigns the court's rulings require, the principal to engage the subnational leaders on the infrastructure programme, and the centre to negotiate the bills' passage with the legislature's committee chairs. Political dependency: strengthening. The evidence: the principal's approval has risen three points across the year, the constituency the government can mobilise has broadened in the urban centres, and the endorsements the government holds have strengthened with the civic organisations. Action required: exploit the strengthening position to extend the government's programme in the urban constituencies.

Economic category: deteriorating. The evidence: the concentrated economic actors have reduced their cooperation with the government's programme, two of the principal business associations have publicly criticised the fiscal stance, and the lenders have signalled the reluctance noted in the financial dependency. Action required: the finance minister to engage the business associations on the fiscal stance, the centre to prepare the concessions that would restore the cooperation, and the centre to identify the alternative economic actors the government can cultivate. Bureaucratic category: stable. The evidence: the permanent officials have continued to implement the government's programme without open resistance, but the quality of the implementation has not improved. Action required: the centre to address the implementation gaps through the officials' review. Social category: stable. The evidence: the civic organisations have continued to endorse the government's programme, but the endorsement has not broadened beyond the urban centres. Action required: the centre to extend the engagement to the rural civic organisations.

External category: deteriorating. The evidence: two neighbouring governments have revised their water-sharing agreements in the government's disfavour, a major partner has reduced the development assistance, and the regional security arrangement the government has pursued has been received with the restraint the security establishment has flagged. Action required: the foreign minister to engage the neighbouring governments on the water-sharing revisions, the centre to identify the alternative partners for the development assistance, and the centre to address the security establishment's concerns on the regional arrangement. Branches category: deteriorating. The evidence: the constitutional court's adverse rulings, the subnational obstruction, and the legislature's delays have together weakened the government's position with the branches. Action required: the actions set in the institutional dependency's action required. Head of state category: improving. The evidence: the head of state has publicly endorsed the principal's leadership on two occasions in the year, and the head of state's office has cooperated with the centre on the constitutional appointments. Action required: maintain the engagement through the principal's quarterly meetings with the head of state.

Coalition trajectory: contracting. The evidence: the coalition has lost one member — the Maritime Confederation's departure after the budget vote, recorded in the coalition health tracker — and the centre has not replaced the lost votes. The remaining members' satisfaction has held at medium, and two members' risk ratings have moved from stable to under strain. Action required:

identify the smaller blocs that could replace the lost votes, the principal to engage the two members under strain, and prepare the public communication that frames the coalition's state.

Opposition trajectory: growing. The evidence: the opposition bloc has gained eighteen seats in the by-elections across the year, the opposition has absorbed the Maritime Confederation's departure, and the opposition's obstructive capacity in the legislature has increased. Action required: identify the contested seats the government can win at the next election, counter the opposition's obstructive capacity through the legislative programme's prioritisation, and address the issues the by-elections have flagged.

Adversaries trajectory: gaining ground. The evidence: the adversary has increased the disinformation operations against the government, the adversary has strengthened the positioning in the neighbouring government that revised the water-sharing agreement, and the adversary has cultivated the opposition's external contacts. Action required: coordinate the counter-disinformation response with the information services, the foreign minister to address the adversary's positioning in the neighbouring government, and monitor the opposition's external contacts.

Overall power position assessment: declining. The principal contributing factors, ranked. First, the weakening financial dependency, with reserves at six weeks and lenders signalling reluctance, most immediately constrains the government's capacity to act. Second, the weakening institutional dependency, with the court's adverse rulings, the subnational obstruction, and the legislative delays, most directly erodes the capacity to implement. Third, the contracting coalition, with the Maritime Confederation's departure and two members under strain, most threatens the parliamentary position. Fourth, the growing opposition, with the by-election gains and the obstructive capacity, most constrains the government's programme. Fifth, the adversaries gaining ground, with the disinformation and the neighbouring positioning, most exposes the government externally. The one strengthening dependency — the political — and the one improving category — the head of state — are the positions the centre can build on, and the action plan will set the actions by which the centre uses the strengthening positions to arrest the decline.

Instrument 7 — The Network Map Update: Working Template

The periodic update of the network map: the relationships among actors, the identification of new hubs and brokers, the assessment of influence flows, and the detection of shifts in the landscape.

7.1 Purpose

The network map update is the structured periodic revision of the record of the relationships among the actors the centre tracks, conducted at the quarterly interval and after every event that materially alters the actor landscape. The update records each relationship pair, identifies the new hubs and brokers, assesses the flows of influence through the network, and detects the shifts in the landscape the quarter has produced. The purpose of the update is to prevent the centre from being surprised by shifts in the actor landscape that were visible but not tracked, because the shift observed in the map as a weakening alliance or a new cluster is a shift the centre can act on, and the shift not observed is a shift the centre meets as a sudden event. The quarterly update is the discipline that forces the centre to confront the landscape's state, to set the action each shift requires, and to record the centre's commitments in a form the centre can be held to.

The map replaces the informal picture of the landscape the centre carries between events, and replaces it with a record that is dated, evidenced, and revisable. The informal picture is the source of the surprise: the centre that relies on the sense that the landscape is 'broadly stable' has rested on a picture that is not tested, and the picture that is not tested drifts from the landscape the centre must act on. The official who conducts the quarterly update has looked the landscape in the face; the official who does not has looked away, and the looking away is the condition under which the shift arrives as a surprise. The map is maintained between the quarterly updates through the event-triggered review, and the maintenance is the work of the official the principal designates.

The map is distinct from the stakeholder map and the coalition health tracker, and the three instruments serve the three separate functions the centre requires. The stakeholder map records the centre's relationships with the actors; the coalition health tracker records the state of the coalition's members; the network map records the relationships among the actors the centre tracks, including the relationships the centre is not party to. The centre that conflates the three has lost the network map's specific function: the observation of the landscape the centre must navigate but does not command. The map's value is in the observation of the relationships the actors maintain with each other, and the value is realised only when the map is maintained and updated at the cadence the discipline requires.

7.2 The Template

The template is the structured record of the landscape, organised in two parts: the relationship pairs and the landscape overall assessment. Each relationship pair records the fields that together constitute the centre's working knowledge of the relationship between two actors, and the landscape overall assessment aggregates the pairs into the new hubs, the new brokers, the clusters formed, the

clusters fractured, and the landscape's overall state. The template is maintained as a single document, and each field is completed in the form the rubric in 7.3 sets. The template is the operational instrument, and the centre that maintains the template has the discipline the quarterly update requires.

For each relationship pair the template records the following fields. Actor A and Actor B are the two actors in the pair, named as the centre's working correspondence names them, with the position and the institution recorded for each. Relationship Type is the type of the relationship, recorded as alliance, rivalry, dependency, information flow, or financial flow, because the five types together cover the relationships the centre must track. Strength is the relationship's present strength, assessed as strong, moderate, or weak against the rubric in 7.3. Direction is the relationship's direction, recorded as mutual, A-to-B, or B-to-A, because the alliance the two actors maintain as equals differs from the dependency one actor imposes on the other, and the direction registers the asymmetry.

Change Since Last Update is the relationship's direction of change since the most recent update, recorded as strengthening, stable, weakening, new, or dissolved, because the change is the field the centre acts on, and the relationship that is weakening is the relationship the centre must address before the weakening becomes the dissolution. Significance for the Centre is the relationship's importance to the centre's position, assessed as high, medium, or low, because the relationship the centre cannot afford to ignore is the relationship the centre tracks at the quarterly interval, and the relationship the centre can afford to let drift is the relationship the centre tracks at the looser cadence. Action Required is the action the centre needs to take before the next update, stated as a concrete action with an owner and a date, because the field is the centre's commitment, and the entry without an action is the entry the centre has not completed.

The landscape overall assessment records the landscape's state as a whole. New Hubs Identified are the actors that have become the centres of gravity the landscape has not previously contained, stated with the actor, the basis of the hub status, and the significance for the centre. New Brokers Identified are the actors that have become the intermediaries the landscape has not previously contained, stated with the actor, the relationships the actor mediates, and the significance for the centre. Clusters Formed are the new groupings of actors that have coalesced around a common interest or a common adversary, and Clusters Fractured are the existing groupings that have dissolved or split, each stated with the members, the binding interest or the cause of the fracture, and the significance for the centre. Overall Landscape Assessment is the landscape's present state, assessed as stable, shifting, or turbulent, and derived from the changes across the relationship pairs and the weight of the new hubs, the new brokers, the clusters formed, and the clusters fractured.

7.3 The Relationship Strength Rubric

The relationship strength rubric sets the criteria by which a relationship pair is rated as strong, moderate, or weak, and the criteria are observable indicators the centre can evidence. Strength is the relationship's present intensity as measured by the frequency, the depth, and the substance of the interaction between the two actors, and the rubric translates the intensity into the three ratings.

The indicators are drawn from the actors' public conduct together, their joint and separate communications, their shared institutional positions, and their transactions, whether informational, financial, or operational. The centre that rates the strength on impression in place of the indicators has rated the strength in a form the rubric cannot sustain, and the rating that is not evidenced is the rating the centre cannot defend at the next review.

An alliance is rated strong when the two actors act together on the contested tests, share the strategic assessments, coordinate the public positions, and pool the resources the joint action requires. The strong alliance is observed in the joint statements, the coordinated votes, the shared staff, the merged campaigns, and the formal agreements that bind the two actors to each other. An alliance is rated moderate when the two actors act together on the tests the two share an interest in but withhold the coordination on the tests the two do not, and the moderate alliance is observed in the selective cooperation, the issue-by-issue alignment, and the absence of the binding agreement. An alliance is rated weak when the two actors share the rhetorical alignment but do not act together on the contested tests, and the weak alliance is observed in the public expressions of the partnership unaccompanied by the joint action that would confirm it.

A rivalry is rated strong when the two actors act openly against each other on the contested tests, mobilise the resources against each other, coordinate the opposing positions, and treat the contest as the defining engagement. The strong rivalry is observed in the public confrontations, the opposing votes, the counter-campaigns, the legal challenges, and the institutional obstruction the two actors impose on each other. A rivalry is rated moderate when the two actors oppose each other on the specific tests but maintain the cooperation on the other matters, and the moderate rivalry is observed in the issue-specific opposition within the broader working relationship. A rivalry is rated weak when the two actors maintain the rhetorical opposition but do not act against each other, and the weak rivalry is observed in the public criticism unaccompanied by the contested action; the centre that treats the weak rivalry as the strong has over-read the opposition the rivalry presents.

A dependency is rated strong when the dependent actor cannot act without the supplier's resource, whether the resource is the financing, the personnel, the infrastructure, the authorisation, or the information, and the supplier's withdrawal would halt the dependent's operation. The strong dependency is observed in the sole-source contracts, the single-channel authorisations, the exclusive personnel arrangements, and the irreplaceable infrastructure. A dependency is rated moderate when the dependent actor has alternatives to the supplier's resource, but the alternatives carry the cost or the delay that makes the supplier the preferred source, and the moderate dependency is observed in the preferred-supplier arrangements and the default-channel practices. A dependency is rated weak when the dependent actor has the alternatives at parity with the supplier, and the relationship rests on the present convenience, with no structural tie binding the dependent to the supplier.

An information flow is rated strong when the two actors share the information routinely, in volume, and on the matters the centre tracks, and the flow is observed in the joint briefings, the shared databases, the seconded analysts, and the regular exchanges. An information flow is rated moderate when the two actors share the information on the specific matters the two share an interest in, and the flow is observed in the issue-specific exchanges within the broader separation. A financial flow is rated strong when the volume is material to both actors, the flow is recurring,

and the relationship is observed in the audited transfers, the disclosed contracts, and the budget allocations; a financial flow is rated moderate when the volume is material to one actor, the flow is occasional, and the relationship is observed in the project-specific transactions. The weak information flow and the weak financial flow are observed in the rare, episodic exchanges the centre can register but cannot rely on, and the centre that treats the weak flow as the strong has misallocated the attention the strong flow requires.

7.4 Instructions for Maintenance

The map is maintained by the official the principal designates — the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the chief of staff, the intelligence coordinator, or the official whose position places the landscape's observation in the official's brief. The designated official is responsible for the completion of the template at the quarterly interval, for the event-triggered reviews between the quarters, for the integrity of the entries, and for the presentation of the map to the principal at the review meeting. The official does not delegate the maintenance to a subordinate, because the maintenance is the work of the official whose position places the centre's working knowledge of the landscape in the official's hands, and the delegation is the abdication the surprise arrives in. The official maintains the map as the centre's record, and the centre's record is the record the principal signs.

The quarterly update cycle is the cadence at which the map is completed and presented. The four updates each year are conducted at the end of each quarter, with the relationship pairs updated against the indicators the quarter has produced, the strength and change ratings revised against the rubric, and the landscape overall assessment aggregated from the pairs. The completed map is presented to the principal at the quarterly review meeting, the principal's questions are recorded, the principal's decisions on the actions required are recorded, and the decisions are entered into the map as the centre's commitments. The quarterly update is the discipline the centre applies to itself, and the centre that defers the update has the picture the previous quarter produced, and the picture has drifted.

The map is integrated with the stakeholder map, the coalition health tracker, and the relationship cultivation log, and the integration is the discipline by which the four instruments form the centre's combined picture. The stakeholder map provides the actor identifications the network map pairs, the coalition health tracker provides the coalition-member relationships the network map records, and the relationship cultivation log provides the principal's personal engagements with the actors the network map places. The integration is maintained at the quarterly cycle: the network map's actor list is reconciled with the stakeholder map, the coalition-member pairs are reconciled with the coalition health tracker, and the principal's personal engagements are reconciled with the relationship cultivation log. The integration prevents the four instruments from drifting apart, and the centre that maintains the integration has the combined picture the separate instruments cannot produce.

The escalation protocol is the rule by which the map triggers a principal-level review outside the quarterly cycle. The protocol sets three triggers: the move of any relationship pair's significance to high combined with a weakening or dissolving change, the identification of a new hub whose

significance for the centre is high, and the move of the overall landscape assessment to turbulent. Each trigger requires the designated official to convene a landscape review meeting with the principal within the week, to present the affected entries and the landscape overall assessment, and to set the actions the centre will take. The protocol is the rule the centre has agreed with itself in advance, and the centre that overrides the protocol has allowed the principal's preference or the centre's optimism to defer the response, and the deferral is the condition under which the shift becomes the surprise.

The confidentiality handling is the discipline by which the map's sensitivity is protected. The map is maintained as the centre's most sensitive document, with the access restricted to the principal, the designated official, and the officials the principal directs, and the storage on the centre's most secure system. The entries are not shared with the actors the entries assess, the actors' staffs, the ministers outside the centre, or the external actors whose relationships the entries record. The designated official maintains the access list, reviews the access log at the quarterly interval, and reports the access to the principal. The breach that exposes an entry destroys the centre's capacity to observe the relationship the entry records, because the actor whose relationship is exposed adjusts the conduct the centre has been observing, and the discipline that prevents the breach is the discipline the centre maintains as strictly as the coalition health tracker requires.

7.5 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed network map update for a fictional jurisdiction, set at the end of the third quarter of the government's term. The update records seven relationship pairs among the actors the centre tracks, the identification of a new hub, the identification of a new broker, and the formation of a cluster, with the overall landscape assessed as shifting. The jurisdiction is a parliamentary republic with a fragmented party system, a powerful regional tier, a significant state-owned enterprise sector, and an active civil-society network. The example illustrates the map in a state of motion: two pairs weakening, one pair strengthening, one pair new, three pairs stable, one new hub identified, one new broker identified, and one cluster formed.

Relationship pair: the National Farmers' Federation and the Coastal Exporters' Association, recorded as an alliance of moderate strength and mutual direction, weakening since the last update, with high significance for the centre. Action Required: the centre to meet the two actors' leaders separately within the fortnight to assess whether the weakening is recoverable, and the agriculture minister to prepare the joint rural-export package the two actors had previously discussed. The weakening is observed in the two actors' separate abstentions on the trade committee votes the two had previously coordinated, the public divergence on the port modernisation bill, and the absence of the joint statement the two had issued at the previous quarter.

Relationship pair: the State Energy Corporation and the Sovereign Wealth Fund, recorded as a financial flow of strong strength and A-to-B direction (the Fund to the Corporation), stable since the last update, with high significance for the centre. Action Required: the finance minister to brief the principal on the Fund's exposure to the Corporation before the next budget cycle, and the centre to prepare the contingency for the Fund's withdrawal of the revolving facility. The stable strong flow is observed in the Fund's recurring revolving facility to the Corporation, the audited transfers

at the quarter's close, and the Corporation's confirmed dependence on the facility for the operating capital the Corporation requires.

Relationship pair: the Regional Governors' Council and the Ministry of Interior, recorded as a rivalry of strong strength and mutual direction, strengthening since the last update, with high significance for the centre. Action Required: the principal to convene the governors' council chair and the interior minister together within the month to set the boundaries the contest has crossed, and the centre to prepare the legislation that clarifies the respective authorities. The strengthening is observed in the council's legal challenge to the ministry's directive on the regional security coordinators, the ministry's counter-challenge on the council's procurement authority, and the public exchanges the two have escalated through the quarter.

Relationship pair: the Senior Academics' Network and the Civil Liberties Union, recorded as a new alliance of moderate strength and mutual direction, new since the last update, with medium significance for the centre. Action Required: the centre's policy unit to assess the network's and the union's joint programme on the judicial-reform bill, and the centre to prepare the engagement the two actors' leaders will require. The new pair is observed in the joint statement the two issued on the bill at the quarter's opening, the shared staff the two have seconded to the campaign, and the coordinated public events the two have announced for the autumn.

Relationship pair: the Central Bank and the Finance Ministry, recorded as an information flow of strong strength and mutual direction, stable since the last update, with high significance for the centre. Action Required: no action required at the present state, with the principal's private secretary to maintain the monthly briefing the two institutions have established. The stable strong flow is observed in the weekly technical exchanges, the shared macroeconomic assessments, the coordinated communication on the currency, and the joint forecasting the two institutions have conducted through the quarter.

Relationship pair: the Opposition Bloc and the Maritime Trade Union, recorded as an alliance of weak strength and mutual direction, weakening since the last update, with medium significance for the centre. Action Required: the centre to track the union's contacts with the smaller blocs the opposition has been courting, and the labour minister to maintain the engagement with the union's leadership the centre has cultivated. The weakening is observed in the union's abstention from the opposition's rally, the union leader's public criticism of the opposition's trade policy, and the absence of the joint platform the two had previously maintained.

Relationship pair: the President's Office and the Constitutional Court, recorded as a dependency of moderate strength and A-to-B direction (the Office to the Court), stable since the last update, with high significance for the centre. Action Required: the centre to prepare the principal's response to the court's forthcoming ruling on the regional-security-coordinator case, and the attorney-general to brief the principal on the court's likely direction. The stable moderate dependency is observed in the court's reliance on the office's submissions on the constitutional questions the office's referrals raise, the absence of the court's independent research capacity, and the office's discretion in the referrals it makes.

Landscape overall assessment: the new hubs, the new brokers, the clusters formed, the clusters fractured, and the overall rating recorded below. New Hubs Identified: the Regional Governors' Council, which has moved from the coordinative body the centre had previously observed to the

centre of gravity the regional challenge to the interior ministry has created, with the council's chair now the public face of the regional tier's assertion and the council's secretariat the operational hub the challenge runs through. New Brokers Identified: the Senior Academics' Network's convenor, who has emerged as the intermediary between the academic network, the civil liberties union, and the smaller parliamentary blocs the judicial-reform campaign has engaged, with the convenor's role observed in the three actors' coordinated statements and the convenor's private communications with the blocs' leaders. Clusters Formed: the judicial-reform cluster, comprising the Senior Academics' Network, the Civil Liberties Union, the smaller parliamentary blocs, and the bar association, bound by the opposition to the government's judicial-reform bill, with the cluster's significance for the centre high because the cluster's coordinated campaign has the capacity to defeat the bill in the parliament's upper house. Clusters Fractured: the rural-export cluster, previously comprising the National Farmers' Federation, the Coastal Exporters' Association, and the Rural Cooperatives' Union, with the fracture observed in the federation's and the association's separate abstentions on the trade committee votes and the cooperatives' union's continued alignment with the government; the fracture's significance for the centre is medium, because the cluster's dissolution removes the centre's intermediating actor on the rural-export policy. Overall Landscape Assessment: shifting — the landscape is in motion, with two pairs weakening, one pair strengthening, one pair new, three pairs stable, the regional governors' council's emergence as a hub, the academic convenor's emergence as a broker, and the judicial-reform cluster's formation. The shifts together place the landscape in the shifting state, and the centre's actions in the next quarter must address the weakening pairs, the new hub, the new broker, and the new cluster before the shifting state becomes the turbulent.

Instrument 8 — The Sensitive Meeting Preparation Packet: Working Template

The complete set of documents the staff assembles before a sensitive meeting between the principal and a powerful actor: the stakeholder profile, the objective sheet, the briefing, and the follow-up plan.

8.1 Purpose

The sensitive meeting preparation packet is the structured set of four documents the staff assembles before a meeting between the principal and a powerful actor on a matter the centre judges sensitive. The four documents are the stakeholder profile, the objective sheet, the briefing, and the follow-up plan, and each serves a distinct purpose: the profile establishes who the principal is meeting, the objective sheet establishes what the principal is in the room to achieve, the briefing establishes the substance and the staff's recommendation, and the follow-up plan establishes what happens after the meeting. The packet is the preparation that ensures the principal enters the meeting with the actor's interests, fears, and constraints in mind, with a clear primary and secondary objective, with the staff's assessment and recommendation on the options, and with the follow-up architecture already in place. The packet is the staff's most important product for the individual meeting, and the assembly is the work the staff performs in the days before the meeting under the responsibility of the designated official.

The packet exists because the sensitive meeting is the meeting the principal cannot afford to enter without preparation. The principal who enters the sensitive meeting with the packet has the actor's likely opening and bottom line in mind, has the staff's recommended option and the case for it, and has the walk-away point set in advance. The principal who enters without the packet has improvised, and the improvisation in a sensitive meeting is the condition under which the principal concedes without intending to, fails to press the advantage the meeting offered, or commits to a follow-up the staff cannot deliver. The packet is the protection against the improvisation, and the assembly is the discipline by which the protection is produced. The sensitive meeting that is prepared is the meeting whose outcome the principal has shaped; the sensitive meeting that is not prepared is the meeting whose outcome the actor has shaped.

8.2 The Stakeholder Profile

The stakeholder profile is the document that establishes who the principal is meeting, and the profile draws on the stakeholder map for the actor's identification, the current position assessment, the relationship history, and the current relationship state, and adds the meeting-specific fields the negotiation requires. The profile is the document the principal reads first, because the profile tells the principal who is in the room and what the actor brings to it. The profile is assembled by the designated official from the centre's working records, the stakeholder map, the relationship

cultivation log, and the briefings the relevant ministries have provided, and the profile that omits a field is the profile the centre has not completed.

The identification fields are the Actor Name, the Position, the Institution, and the Category. The Actor Name is the name as used in the centre's working correspondence. The Position is the office the actor holds. The Institution is the body through which the actor acts, whether the firm, the ministry, the parliamentary group, the confessional body, the regional administration, the branch of the security forces, or the external government. The Category is the actor's category against the five: economic, bureaucratic, social, external, or branch. The four fields orient the principal at the first read, and the profile that fails to identify the institution has left the principal to guess the body whose interests the actor represents.

The assessment fields are the Current Position Assessment, the Relationship History, the Current Relationship State, and the Recent Interactions. The Current Position Assessment is the actor's present position toward the government, drawn from the stakeholder map and stated as supportive, neutral, oppositional, or adversarial. The Relationship History is the brief record of the principal's engagement with the actor over the term, in two or three sentences that capture the engagements, the commitments, and the turning points. The Current Relationship State is the present state of the relationship, stated as sound, strained, deteriorating, or broken. The Recent Interactions are the last two or three contacts the principal or the chief of staff has had with the actor, with the date, the format, and the substance, because the principal who has not been reminded of the last contact enters the meeting without the thread the relationship was left in.

The meeting-specific fields are the Interest, What They Fear, What They Offer, the Known Positions on the Meeting's Subject, the Likely Opening Position, the Likely Bottom Line, the Constraints on the Actor, and the Actor's Principal Advisor(s) on This Subject. The Interest is what the actor wants from the government on the matter the meeting addresses, stated plainly. What They Fear is the outcome the actor is working to avoid, stated plainly, because the actor's fear is the lever the principal holds in the meeting and the principal who does not know the fear has missed the lever. What They Offer is what the actor can bring to the government, whether the investment, the endorsement, the cooperation, the concession, or the restraint. The Known Positions are the positions the actor has stated publicly or privately on the meeting's subject, with the date and the forum, because the principal who meets the actor's stated position for the first time in the meeting has been surprised by a position the staff should have prepared.

The Likely Opening Position is the position the actor is expected to take at the start of the meeting, set by the staff on the evidence of the actor's prior positions and the actor's interest. The Likely Bottom Line is the position below which the actor will not go, set by the staff on the evidence of the actor's constraints and the actor's alternatives. The Constraints on the Actor are the institutional, political, financial, or personal constraints that limit the actor's room to move, whether the board's threshold, the faction's pressure, the budget's limit, the constituency's expectation, or the law's requirement. The Actor's Principal Advisor(s) on This Subject is the official or officials whose counsel the actor will rely on in the meeting and in the aftermath, because the principal who knows the advisor knows the voice the actor will hear after the meeting, and the centre that engages the advisor before the meeting has shaped the voice the actor hears in it.

8.3 The Objective Sheet

The objective sheet is the document that establishes what the principal is in the room to achieve, and the sheet sets the primary objective, the secondary objective, the asks, the concessions in sequence, the red lines, the principal's opening and bottom line, the walk-away point, and the success definition. The sheet is the document the principal reads second, after the profile, because the sheet tells the principal what the principal is in the room to do. The sheet is the staff's product, but the primary objective and the red lines are the principal's, and the staff that drafts the sheet without the principal's direction on these two fields has substituted the staff's judgement for the principal's.

The Meeting Objective (primary) is the single outcome the principal is in the room to secure, stated in one sentence, and the principal who enters the meeting with two primary objectives has none. The Meeting Objective (secondary, if any) is the outcome the principal will pursue if the primary is secured or if the primary proves unattainable, and the secondary objective gives the principal the second purpose the meeting can serve. What the Principal Will Seek is the list of the specific asks the principal will make, each stated as a verb and an object, in the order the principal will make them. What the Principal Will Concede is the list of what the principal is prepared to give, in the sequence the principal will offer them, because the concession offered first is the concession the principal cannot hold in reserve, and the order of the concessions is the principal's bargaining architecture. What the Principal Will Not Concede is the list of the red lines, stated plainly, because the principal who has not set the red lines in advance will set them in the room under the actor's pressure, and the red lines set under pressure are the red lines the principal concedes.

The Principal's Likely Opening is the position the principal will take at the start, set to leave the room to move toward the bottom line. The Principal's Bottom Line is the position below which the principal will not go, set in advance and held in the room. The Walk-Away Point is the condition under which the principal ends the meeting without an agreement, stated in advance so the principal is not making the walk-away decision in the room under the actor's pressure, because the walk-away decision made in the room is the decision the principal does not make. The Success Definition is the statement of what a successful meeting looks like, written before the meeting so the principal and the staff can assess afterward whether the meeting succeeded, because the meeting whose success was not defined in advance is the meeting whose success the principal will claim regardless of the outcome, and the meeting whose success was defined is the meeting the staff can hold the principal and itself to.

8.4 The Briefing

The briefing is the document that establishes the substance of the meeting, and the briefing gives the principal the background, the context, the history, the options, the staff's assessment of each option, the staff's recommendation, the risks the meeting presents, and the mitigation for each risk. The briefing is the document the principal reads third, after the profile and the objective sheet, because the briefing tells the principal what the meeting is about. The briefing is the staff's most substantive contribution to the packet, and the staff that produces the briefing without the

assessment and the recommendation has left the principal to do the staff's work in the room. The briefing's recommendation must be consistent with the objective sheet's primary objective, and the staff that drafts a recommendation at odds with the objective has presented the principal with a packet the principal cannot use in the room.

The Subject is the background and current state of the matter the meeting addresses, written in two or three paragraphs that give the principal the working knowledge the meeting requires. The Context is why this meeting is happening now, with the change, the deadline, the event, or the actor's initiative that has brought the meeting about. The History is the previous engagements the principal and the actor have had on this subject, with the positions each has taken, the commitments each has made, and the matters left unresolved. The three fields together give the principal the temporal picture: where the matter stands, why the meeting is happening, and what has gone before. The principal who enters the meeting without the temporal picture has entered with the present state alone, and the present state alone is the state the actor has framed for the meeting.

The Options are the principal's available courses of action in the meeting, set out as two or three distinct options, each stated as a course of action with the form it would take. The Assessment is the staff's assessment of each option, with the case for and the case against, the actor's likely response, and the consequence for the government and the coalition. The Recommendation is the staff's recommendation of the option the principal should pursue, stated plainly and with the reason, because the staff that offers the options without the recommendation has left the principal to do the staff's work in the room. The Risks are the things that could go wrong in the meeting, set out as four or five specific risks, whether the actor's rejection, the actor's counter-demand, the actor's leak, the principal's misreading, or the staff's gap. The Mitigation is the response the principal will make to each risk, written in advance so the principal is not improvising the response in the room, and the risk that has no mitigation is the risk the principal has accepted in advance.

8.5 The Follow-Up Plan

The follow-up plan is the document that establishes what happens after the meeting, and the plan sets the documentation, the communication, the implementation, and the relationship maintenance. The plan is written before the meeting, because the meeting whose follow-up is planned in advance is the meeting whose outcomes are captured and acted on, and the meeting whose follow-up is left to be planned afterward is the meeting whose outcomes evaporate. The plan is the document the principal reads fourth, after the briefing, because the plan tells the principal how the meeting's outcomes will be held.

The Documentation assigns who records what: the official note to the designated official, the commitments record to the principal's private secretary, and the principal's personal record to the principal and the chief of staff. The Communication assigns who is told what, and when: the cabinet, the senior officials, the coalition partners, the regional or local authorities, and the public, each with the message and the timing the plan sets. The communication that is not planned in advance is the communication that emerges as rumour, and the rumour that follows the sensitive meeting is the rumour that displaces the meeting's outcome in the public's reading of it. The Implementation assigns who does what, by when: each commitment the principal has made in the

meeting is assigned to an owner with a date, and each commitment the actor has made is tracked by the official who will confirm its delivery, because the commitment that is not assigned is the commitment that drifts, and the commitment that drifts is the commitment that becomes the next meeting's grievance.

The Relationship Maintenance sets the next contact the principal or the chief of staff will have with the actor, the purpose of the contact, and the timing, because the sensitive meeting is not the end of the engagement but a moment in it, and the relationship that is not maintained after the meeting is the relationship that loses the meeting's gains. The next contact is scheduled at the close of the meeting, the purpose is set in the plan, and the timing is the timing the relationship's state requires: the contact that confirms the strength when the meeting has strengthened the relationship, the contact that repairs the strain when the meeting has strained it, and the contact that contains the damage when the meeting has damaged it. The follow-up plan closes with the designated official's note of the next contact, and the contact the plan has set is the contact the designated official ensures occurs.

8.6 Instructions for Assembly

The packet is assembled by the designated official, who is the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the chief of staff, or the official whose brief the meeting falls in. The designated official is responsible for the assembly, the integrity of the four documents, the delivery to the principal, and the post-meeting debrief. The assembly is the work of the staff in the days before the meeting, and the staff that assembles the packet in the hours before the meeting has produced the packet the meeting's sensitivity does not allow. The designated official does not delegate the assembly to a subordinate, because the assembly is the work of the official whose position places the centre's working knowledge of the meeting in the official's hands.

The timeline sets when preparation begins, when the packet is delivered, and when the principal reviews. Preparation begins when the meeting is confirmed, typically seven to ten days before for a major meeting and three to five days for a standard sensitive meeting. The stakeholder profile is drafted first, the objective sheet second, the briefing third, the follow-up plan fourth, and the four documents are reconciled to ensure the actor's bottom line in the profile is consistent with the principal's bottom line in the objective sheet and the recommendation in the briefing. The packet is delivered to the principal two full days before the meeting, in time for the principal's first review and for the staff to revise on the principal's questions. The principal reviews the packet the day before the meeting, marks the questions, and meets the designated official to resolve them, and the principal who has not reviewed the packet the day before has entered the meeting less prepared than the staff has prepared the principal to be.

The post-meeting debrief is the template the designated official completes within the day of the meeting, and the debrief records what happened, what was agreed, and what the follow-up requires. The record of what happened captures the principal's and the actor's opening positions, the course of the discussion, the turning points, and the close. The record of what was agreed captures each commitment made and received, with the form and the timing of the delivery, and the commitments that were left ambiguous are recorded as ambiguous so the follow-up can clarify

them. The record of what the follow-up requires activates the follow-up plan, with each commitment assigned to an owner with a date, the communications released, and the next contact scheduled. The debrief is the document the centre retains as the record of the meeting, and the centre that does not complete the debrief within the day has allowed the meeting's substance to drain into the staff's and the principal's separate memories.

The confidentiality handling is the discipline by which the packet's sensitivity is protected. The packet is maintained as the centre's most sensitive pre-meeting document, with the access restricted to the principal, the designated official, and the officials the principal directs. The packet is not shared with the actor's institution, the ministers outside the centre, the staff outside the designated circle, or the press, and the copies are numbered and accounted for. The breach that exposes the packet before the meeting destroys the principal's position in the meeting, because the actor who has read the principal's bottom line and the principal's walk-away point has read the principal's hand. The breach that exposes the packet after the meeting destroys the principal's relationship with the actor, because the actor who has read the staff's candid assessment of the actor's fears and constraints has read the centre's private reading of the actor. The designated official maintains the access list, the copies are destroyed at the close of the matter, and the discipline is maintained as strictly as the sensitivity requires.

8.7 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed preparation packet for a fictional meeting between the prime minister of the Republic of Maravia and the chief executive officer of Northbridge Global Industries, a multinational manufacturer considering a 1.8 billion euro greenfield investment in Maravia's eastern region. The meeting has been requested by the investor's office, scheduled for the following Thursday at 10:00, and the assembly has been completed by the cabinet secretary over the preceding week. The example shows the four documents filled in with realistic content, and the staff that uses the example as a template fills in the names, the institutions, and the substance of its own centre's meeting.

The stakeholder profile. Actor Name: Mr. Hendrik Larsen. Position: Chief Executive Officer. Institution: Northbridge Global Industries, headquartered in Rotterdam. Category: external and economic. Current Position Assessment: supportive, drawn from the stakeholder map; Northbridge has been a long-standing commercial presence in Maravia, with two existing plants employing 4,200 workers. Relationship History: sound, with the principal's two meetings with the previous CEO in the prior term and the government's 2022 investment incentives framework as the working basis. Current Relationship State: sound. Recent Interactions: the CEO's letter of six weeks ago proposing the greenfield investment, and the principal's reply inviting the CEO to discuss the terms. Interest: the government's agreement to a ten-year tax stabilisation clause, a customs arrangement for imported components, and the government's support for the workforce training programme. What They Fear: a future government reversing the terms after the investment is sunk. What They Offer: the 1.8 billion euro investment, 1,800 direct jobs, and an estimated 5,400 indirect jobs in the eastern region. Known Positions on the Meeting's Subject: the tax stabilisation and the customs arrangement, as stated in the CEO's letter. Likely Opening Position: the request for the full

package as presented. Likely Bottom Line: the tax stabilisation clause, with the customs arrangement and the training programme as the negotiable items. Constraints on the Actor: the board's investment committee, which has set the rate-of-return threshold the investment must clear, and the competing site the committee has shortlisted in the neighbouring country. Actor's Principal Advisor(s) on This Subject: Ms. Anouk de Vries, the Chief Financial Officer, who will accompany the CEO to the meeting.

The objective sheet. Meeting Objective (primary): to secure Northbridge's commitment to locate the investment in Maravia, on terms the government can sustain. Meeting Objective (secondary): to establish the personal relationship with the CEO that will support the investment's delivery over the construction period and the first years of operation. What the Principal Will Seek: the investor's public commitment to the Maravia site within the quarter; the investor's agreement to the local-content threshold of 35 per cent; the investor's agreement to the workforce training partnership with the regional technical institute. What the Principal Will Concede, in sequence: the ten-year tax stabilisation clause, offered first as the condition the investor has set; the customs arrangement for imported components, offered second as the concession the principal can make within the trade policy; the government's co-funding of the workforce training programme, offered third as the concession the principal has held in reserve. What the Principal Will Not Concede: the local-content threshold, the environmental compliance regime, and the labour standards, because each is the protection the coalition's regional party has flagged as non-negotiable. The Principal's Likely Opening: the welcome of the investment and the government's broad support, with the specific terms to be discussed. The Principal's Bottom Line: the tax stabilisation clause, the customs arrangement, and the training co-funding, with the local-content threshold held. The Walk-Away Point: the investor's insistence on a local-content threshold below 30 per cent, because the threshold below 30 per cent is the trigger the regional party has set for its withdrawal of support. The Success Definition: the CEO's commitment to the Maravia site by the end of the quarter, on terms that hold the local-content threshold and the labour standards, with the personal relationship established and the follow-up architecture in place.

The briefing. The Subject: Northbridge's proposed greenfield investment in the eastern region, the largest single foreign investment Maravia has attracted in a decade, against the background of Northbridge's six-year commercial presence in the country, the eastern region's unemployment rate of 11 per cent, and the government's stated priority of regional industrial development. The Context: the CEO's board meeting in eight weeks, at which the board's investment committee will make the final site decision, and the principal's meeting is the principal's opportunity to secure the commitment before the board's decision; the competitor site in the neighbouring country is active, and the site's government has offered a comparable package. The History: the principal's two meetings with the previous CEO in the prior term, the government's 2022 investment incentives framework, and the regional party's consistent support for the foreign-investment programme, with the local-content threshold as the one reservation the regional party has articulated. The Options: Option A is the full package as the investor has requested, with the tax stabilisation, the customs arrangement, and the training co-funding, on the investor's terms; Option B is the package with the local-content threshold held at 35 per cent and the labour standards held at the statutory level; Option C is the deferral of the decision pending the regional party's consultation. The Assessment:

Option A secures the investment but at the cost of the coalition's regional party, which has flagged the local-content threshold as the red line; Option B secures the investment and holds the coalition, with the risk that the investor rejects the threshold and chooses the competitor site; Option C loses the investment to the competitor site, because the board's timeline does not allow the deferral. The Recommendation: Option B, with the principal pressing the investor on the local-content threshold and offering the training co-funding as the concession that compensates for the threshold. The Risks: the investor's rejection of the threshold and choice of the competitor site; the investor's counter-demand on the environmental compliance regime; the leak of the meeting's terms to the press; the regional party's misreading of the principal's position as a concession on the threshold. The Mitigation: the principal's emphasis on the training co-funding as the compensation for the threshold; the principal's restatement of the statutory environmental regime as the non-negotiable; the designated official's control of the documentation and the numbering of the copies; the principal's call to the regional party leader within four hours of the meeting's close, with the principal's account of the threshold's retention.

The follow-up plan. The Documentation: the official note to the cabinet secretary; the commitments record to the principal's private secretary; the principal's personal record to the principal and the chief of staff. The Communication: the principal's note to the cabinet within 24 hours, setting the meeting's outcome and the implementation's requirements; the principal's call to the regional party leader within four hours, with the principal's account of the threshold's retention and the training co-funding's offer; the cabinet secretary's brief to the finance minister within 48 hours, with the tax stabilisation clause's drafting instruction; the joint statement with Northbridge within the week, if the commitment is secured, framing the investment and the terms. The Implementation: the tax stabilisation clause assigned to the finance minister for drafting within two weeks; the customs arrangement assigned to the trade minister within four weeks; the training co-funding assigned to the education ministry within six weeks; the local-content threshold assigned to the industry ministry's monitoring function for the life of the investment; the actor's commitments tracked by the cabinet secretary, with the CEO's confirmation of the board's decision expected within eight weeks. The Relationship Maintenance: the principal's next contact with the CEO as the principal's call in two weeks to confirm the board's reaction; the chief of staff's monthly contact with the CFO; the principal's invitation to the CEO for the second meeting in the third quarter, when the implementation's progress will be reviewed.

Instrument 9 — The Negotiation Preparation Workbook: Working Template

The structured workbook for preparing a negotiation: the objectives, the zone of possible agreement, the concession map, the fallback, and the communication plan.

9.1 Purpose

The negotiation preparation workbook is the structured record by which the centre prepares for a negotiation with an actor whose agreement the centre requires and whose position is not the centre's to command. The workbook captures the objectives, the zone of possible agreement, the concession map, the fallback and walk-away point, and the communication plan, and the capture in the single document forces the principal to confront the negotiation's structure before the negotiation begins. The purpose of the workbook is to prevent the principal from entering the negotiation with the sense of the position in place of the analysis of the position, because the sense is the source of the concession the principal did not intend to make and the agreement the principal did not intend to reach. The workbook is prepared for every negotiation the centre judges material, and the negotiation judged immaterial is the negotiation the centre enters without the workbook at the centre's risk.

The workbook replaces the informal preparation the principal conducts in the principal's head or in the brief the principal reads on the way to the meeting, and replaces it with the record the principal has signed. The informal preparation is the source of the surprise the negotiation produces, because the principal who has not written the walk-away point is the principal who does not know when to leave the table, and the principal who has not written the concession map is the principal who concedes the first item the actor contests without the corresponding return. The principal who has prepared the workbook has the analysis to hand, and the principal who has signed the workbook has committed to the analysis the workbook records. The discipline is the discipline of the preparation, and the preparation is the work the workbook enforces.

9.2 The Objectives Section

The objectives section is the first section of the workbook and the section that records what each side wants from the negotiation, in the form that distinguishes the positions the sides state from the interests the positions serve. The Centre's Objectives are recorded as primary, secondary, and tertiary, and the ranking is the principal's own assessment of what the centre must achieve, what the centre prefers to achieve, and what the centre will accept if the higher objectives are secured. The primary objective is the objective on which the principal will not concede without the corresponding gain, and the tertiary objective is the objective the principal is prepared to trade for the primary or the secondary. The ranking is the discipline by which the principal allocates the centre's negotiating capital, and the principal who enters the negotiation without the ranking has conceded the ranking to the actor who has done the work.

The Actor's Objectives are recorded as primary, secondary, and tertiary, and the assessment is the centre's best reading of the actor's position based on the intelligence the centre has gathered, the prior engagements the centre has had with the actor, and the actor's constituency pressures the centre has identified. The assessment is the centre's estimate and not the actor's statement, because the actor's stated position is the opening bid and not the actor's objective, and the centre that records the actor's stated position in place of the assessed objective has confused the bid with the objective. The assessment is revised at each stage of the negotiation as the actor's position is revealed, and the revision is recorded in the workbook with the date and the indicator that prompted it. The actor's primary objective is the objective the actor will not concede without the corresponding gain, and the centre's identification of the objective is the centre's protection against the demand the actor frames as the minor.

The Interests Behind the Positions record the centre's interests, the actor's interests, the overlapping interests, and the conflicting interests, because the positions are the surface and the interests are the substance the negotiation must address. The centre's interests are the underlying needs the centre's objectives serve — the fiscal interest, the political interest, the institutional interest, the legitimacy interest — and the actor's interests are the underlying needs the actor's objectives serve. The overlapping interests are the interests the centre and the actor share, and the overlapping interests are the ground on which the agreement is built, because the agreement that serves the overlapping interests is the agreement both sides can defend to their constituencies. The conflicting interests are the interests the centre and the actor do not share, and the conflicting interests are the ground on which the agreement is contested, and the principal who has identified the conflicting interests has identified the matters the concession map must address.

9.3 The Zone of Possible Agreement

The zone of possible agreement section records the range within which the centre and the actor can settle, and the range is the intersection of the centre's acceptable outcomes and the actor's acceptable outcomes. The Centre's Best Case is the outcome the centre would prefer, stated as the specific terms the centre would accept without modification, and the best case is the outcome the centre opens with if the centre opens first or the outcome the centre works toward if the actor opens first. The Centre's Worst Acceptable Outcome is the outcome below which the centre walks away, stated as the specific terms the centre will not accept, and the worst acceptable outcome is the walk-away point the principal has decided before the negotiation begins. The two together define the centre's settlement range, and the centre that has not defined the range has entered the negotiation without the boundary the walk-away requires.

The Actor's Best Case is the outcome the actor would prefer, assessed on the same intelligence the actor's objectives are assessed on, and the assessment is the centre's reading of the opening the actor is likely to make. The Actor's Worst Acceptable Outcome is the outcome below which the actor walks away, assessed on the centre's reading of the actor's constituency pressures, the actor's alternatives, and the actor's prior conduct in negotiations of comparable weight. The two together define the actor's settlement range, and the centre's assessment of the range is the centre's reading of the ground the negotiation will cover. The assessment is uncertain, and the uncertainty is the

condition the negotiation operates in, and the principal who treats the assessment as the fact has misread the negotiation the workbook prepares.

The Zone of Possible Agreement is the intersection of the centre's settlement range and the actor's settlement range, and the zone is the range within which a settlement both sides can accept is possible. The zone may be wide, in which case the negotiation is the negotiation of the position within the zone, or the zone may be narrow, in which case the negotiation is the negotiation of the few terms the zone permits. The zone may be empty, in which case the negotiation cannot produce an agreement and the principal's task is to widen the zone through the concession, the linkage, or the reframing before the negotiation reaches the impasse. The Most Likely Settlement Point is the centre's assessment of the point within the zone where the settlement will in fact be reached, and the assessment is the centre's reading of the relative weight the two sides bring to the table, the time each side has, and the cost each side bears from the negotiation's continuation.

9.4 The Concession Map

The concession map is the section that records the concessions the centre is prepared to make, the returns the centre will seek in exchange, and the sequence in which the concessions will be made. Concession Item 1 records what the centre offers, what the centre gets in return, and the sequence — the stage of the negotiation at which the concession is made — and the concession item is the unit by which the principal manages the negotiation's progress. Concession Item 2 and Concession Item 3 are recorded on the same structure, and the three items together are the principal's working stock of concessions, because the negotiation that requires more than three concessions has moved from the negotiation the workbook prepared to the negotiation the workbook did not anticipate. Each concession is recorded with the cost the concession imposes on the centre, the value the concession carries for the actor, and the linkage the concession has to the centre's primary, secondary, or tertiary objectives.

The Concessions the Centre Will Not Make are recorded as the explicit list of the concessions the principal has ruled out, and the list is the principal's protection against the drift that produces the concession the principal did not intend to make. The concessions the centre will not make include the concessions that breach the primary objective, the concessions that breach the centre's fiscal or institutional red lines, and the concessions that establish the precedent the centre cannot defend in the next negotiation with the next actor. The list is reviewed at each stage of the negotiation, because the concession the principal has ruled out at the preparation stage is the concession the principal is tempted to make at the impasse, and the list is the discipline that holds the principal to the preparation's judgment. The Concessions the Actor Is Likely to Offer are recorded as the centre's assessment of the concessions the actor can make, and the assessment is the basis on which the principal plans the returns the centre will seek.

The Sequencing Logic records why the concessions are ordered as they are, and the logic is the principal's reasoning about the order in which the concessions maximize the centre's position. The sequencing is the discipline that distinguishes the prepared negotiation from the unprepared, because the principal who concedes the items in the order the actor demands has conceded the sequencing to the actor, and the actor who controls the sequencing controls the negotiation's

momentum. The standard sequencing logic is the logic of the low-cost, high-value concession first — the concession that costs the centre little and signals the centre's seriousness — followed by the medium-cost, medium-value concession that advances the negotiation, followed by the high-cost, high-value concession held for the negotiation's end. The principal who departs from the planned sequencing records the departure in the workbook with the reason, and the recording is the discipline by which the principal's judgment at the table is reconciled with the principal's judgment at the preparation.

9.5 The Fallback and Walk-Away

The fallback and walk-away section is the section that records what the centre does if the negotiation does not produce an agreement, and the section is the discipline that prevents the principal from the agreement the principal accepted because the principal could not bear the no-agreement outcome. The Fallback Position is the centre's plan for the action the centre takes if the negotiation fails, stated as the specific alternative the centre will pursue — the executive measure, the legislative route, the alternative actor, the deferred decision — and the fallback is the centre's protection against the negotiation that has reached the impasse. The fallback is the position the principal holds in mind as the negotiation's alternative, and the strength of the fallback is the centre's leverage in the negotiation, because the actor who knows the centre's fallback is strong knows the centre can walk away. The principal who has not identified the fallback has entered the negotiation without the leverage the fallback provides.

The Walk-Away Point is the outcome below which the principal leaves the table, stated as the specific terms the principal will not accept, and the walk-away point is the line the principal has decided before the negotiation begins. The walk-away point is the discipline that holds the principal to the preparation's judgment, because the principal who has not written the walk-away point is the principal who accepts the outcome just below the worst acceptable outcome in the hope that the next concession will close the gap. The walk-away is the act the principal takes when the actor has refused to move beyond the walk-away point, and the act is the act of leaving the table with the courtesy that preserves the relationship and the firmness that preserves the centre's position. The principal who does not leave the table at the walk-away point has shown the actor that the walk-away point is not the walk-away point, and the actor who has seen the principal's bluff has the leverage the rest of the negotiation.

The Consequences of No Agreement are recorded for the centre, for the actor, and for the relationship, because the principal who has assessed the consequences has assessed the cost the no-agreement imposes on each side and the leverage the cost provides. The consequences for the centre are the policy cost, the political cost, and the institutional cost, and the assessment is the principal's honest reading of the price the centre pays. The consequences for the actor are the centre's assessment of the price the actor pays, and the assessment is the centre's reading of the actor's constituency pressures, the actor's alternatives, and the actor's capacity to absorb the no-agreement. The consequences for the relationship are the centre's assessment of the damage the no-agreement imposes on the future engagement, and the assessment is the basis on which the No-Agreement Communication Plan is built, because the no-agreement the centre communicates with

the courtesy that preserves the relationship is the no-agreement the centre can reverse in the next negotiation.

9.6 The Communication Plan

The communication plan is the section that records who speaks in the negotiation, what the agreed narrative is, what the disclosure plan is, and what the post-negotiation communication will be. Who Speaks records the principal, the staff, and the line ministry, and the allocation of the speaking roles is the discipline by which the centre controls the negotiation's voice. The principal speaks on the matters the principal must speak on — the primary objective, the walk-away point, the political commitment — and the staff and the line ministry speak on the technical matters the principal does not need to own. The principal who speaks on every matter has crowded out the staff and the line ministry whose expertise the negotiation requires, and the principal who speaks on no matter has ceded the negotiation's voice to the staff. The agreed allocation is the allocation the principal has decided before the negotiation begins, and the allocation is recorded in the workbook so the staff and the line ministry know the role each will play.

The Agreed Narrative is the shared frame the centre's negotiating team will use, stated as the two or three sentences that capture the centre's case, the centre's offer, and the centre's reason. The narrative is the frame that holds the centre's positions together, because the principal who has not agreed the narrative with the staff and the line ministry has delivered the positions the actor can pick apart, and the team that has agreed the narrative has delivered the positions the actor must address as the whole. The narrative is the frame the team returns to when the negotiation has moved to the detail, and the return is the discipline that prevents the detail from displacing the centre's case. The Disclosure Plan records what is revealed, what is withheld, and what is signaled, and the plan is the centre's decision about the information the negotiation will trade in. What is revealed is the information the actor needs to accept the centre's case; what is withheld is the information that would weaken the centre's position; what is signaled is the information the centre wants the actor to infer without the centre's confirmation.

The Post-Negotiation Communication records what is said publicly and what is said privately to the key actors, and the plan is the centre's decision about the communication the agreement or the no-agreement requires. The public communication is the statement that frames the outcome for the constituency the centre answers to, and the framing is the framing the centre has prepared, because the centre that frames the outcome at the negotiation's end has framed the outcome, and the centre that allows the actor to frame the outcome has ceded the framing to the actor. The private communication is the communication to the key actors — the coalition partners, the parliamentary figures, the regional leaders, the institutional heads — whose support the outcome requires and whose engagement the outcome's implementation will demand. The private communication precedes the public communication, because the key actor who learns the outcome from the public statement is the key actor the centre has slighted, and the slight is the cost the centre pays in the relationship the implementation requires.

9.7 Instructions for Use

The workbook is prepared by the official the principal designates — the chief of staff, the principal private secretary, the cabinet secretary, or the official whose brief the negotiation falls in — and the designated official is responsible for the workbook's completion, the workbook's presentation to the principal, and the workbook's revision as the negotiation advances. The designated official does not delegate the preparation to a subordinate, because the preparation is the work of the official whose position places the centre's working knowledge of the negotiation in the official's hands. The official convenes the preparation team — the line ministry's officials, the legal adviser, the intelligence official, the communication official — and the team's work is the work the designated official synthesises into the workbook. The workbook is the centre's record, and the centre's record is the record the principal signs.

The preparation timeline is the timeline the workbook is prepared against, and the timeline sets the preparation at the minimum of two weeks before the negotiation's first round. The first week is the week of the assessment: the objectives, the zone of possible agreement, the actor's position, the fallback, and the concession map. The second week is the week of the principal's review, the principal's revision, and the rehearsal of the communication plan with the staff and the line ministry who will speak. The timeline is compressed when the negotiation is the negotiation the centre has not had the notice to prepare for, and the compressed timeline is the timeline the centre accepts at the cost of the preparation's depth, and the cost is the cost the centre bears in the negotiation's surprises.

The principal's review is the meeting at which the principal reviews the workbook, revises the judgments the workbook records, and signs the workbook as the centre's position. The review is the meeting at which the principal confronts the walk-away point, the fallback, and the concessions the centre will not make, because the principal who has not confronted these matters at the review is the principal who confronts them at the table without the time the reflection requires. The principal's revisions are recorded in the workbook, and the revisions are the principal's judgment on the preparation the team has produced. The signed workbook is the workbook the principal takes into the negotiation, and the unsigned workbook is the workbook the principal has not owned.

The post-negotiation documentation is the documentation the designated official produces at the negotiation's close, and the documentation comprises the agreement record, the commitment tracking, and the relationship assessment. The agreement record is the record of what was agreed, stated in the terms the principal and the actor have both accepted, and the record is the record the centre holds as the negotiation's outcome. The commitment tracking is the record of the commitments the centre has made and the commitments the actor has made, with the dates and the owners, and the tracking is the discipline by which the centre discharges the commitments the centre has made and collects the commitments the actor has made. The relationship assessment is the centre's assessment of the relationship's state at the negotiation's close, and the assessment is the input to the next negotiation the centre will have with the actor.

The confidentiality handling is the discipline by which the workbook's sensitivity is protected. The workbook is maintained as the centre's sensitive document, with the access restricted to the principal, the designated official, the preparation team, and the officials the principal directs. The workbook is not shared with the actor the workbook assesses, with the officials outside the

preparation team, or with the actors whose relationships the workbook records. The designated official maintains the access list, stores the workbook on the centre's secure system, and destroys the working copies at the negotiation's close, retaining only the signed workbook and the post-negotiation documentation as the centre's record. The breach that exposes the workbook destroys the centre's position in the negotiation and the centre's relationship with the actor, and the discipline that prevents the breach is the discipline the centre maintains as strictly as the negotiation's success requires.

9.8 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed workbook for a fictional negotiation between the centre and the National Confederation of Industry over a regulatory reform package the government has announced and the confederation has contested. The negotiation is set in the seventh month of the government's term, the confederation's opposition has hardened over the summer, and the principal has decided to seek the confederation's agreement before the reform's legislation is tabled in the autumn. The workbook is prepared by the chief of staff, with the line ministry's officials, the legal adviser, the intelligence official, and the communication official, and the workbook is presented to the principal two weeks before the negotiation's first round.

The Objectives Section. The Centre's Objectives: primary — the confederation's public endorsement of the reform package, or at minimum the confederation's abstention from active opposition; secondary — the confederation's agreement to two technical modifications the line ministry has identified, in exchange for the centre's concessions on the implementation timeline; tertiary — the confederation's commitment to participate in the reform's implementation advisory group. The Actor's Objectives, assessed: primary — the withdrawal of the reform's provisions on the environmental compliance cost, which the confederation has framed as the fatal flaw; secondary — the extension of the implementation timeline from eighteen months to thirty-six months; tertiary — the confederation's seat on the regulatory agency's oversight board. **The Interests Behind the Positions:** the centre's interests are the fiscal interest in the reform's savings, the political interest in the reform's announcement before the autumn, and the legitimacy interest the confederation's endorsement carries; the actor's interests are the confederation's commercial interest in the compliance cost, the confederation's institutional interest in the oversight board seat, and the confederation's political interest in the demonstration that the confederation can move the government. The overlapping interests are the reform's predictability and the implementation's workability, and the conflicting interests are the compliance cost and the oversight board's composition.

The Zone of Possible Agreement. The Centre's Best Case: the confederation's endorsement, the two technical modifications, the eighteen-month timeline, and the advisory-group seat without the oversight-board seat. The Centre's Worst Acceptable Outcome: the confederation's neutral silence, the two technical modifications, the timeline extended to twenty-four months, and the advisory-group seat. The Actor's Best Case, assessed: the withdrawal of the compliance-cost provisions, the thirty-six-month timeline, and the oversight-board seat. The Actor's Worst Acceptable Outcome, assessed: the compliance-cost provisions retained, the timeline extended to

thirty months, and the advisory-group seat without the oversight-board seat. The Zone of Possible Agreement: the timeline between twenty-four and thirty months, the advisory-group seat, and the confederation's silence in place of opposition, with the compliance-cost provisions the contested matter that the negotiation must address through the concession or the linkage. The Most Likely Settlement Point: the timeline at twenty-seven months, the advisory-group seat, the confederation's neutral silence, and the centre's concession on the compliance-cost provisions' phasing — the provisions retained in principle and the implementation deferred to the second phase, with the confederation's oversight role formalised through the advisory group.

The Concession Map. Concession Item 1: the centre offers the implementation timeline extended to twenty-four months, the centre gets the confederation's agreement to the two technical modifications, and the sequence is the opening concession the centre makes at the first round to signal the centre's seriousness. Concession Item 2: the centre offers the advisory-group seat with the confederation's chair, the centre gets the confederation's neutral silence on the reform's announcement, and the sequence is the second-round concession the centre makes after the confederation has accepted the technical modifications. Concession Item 3: the centre offers the compliance-cost provisions' phasing — the provisions retained in principle, the implementation deferred to the second phase, the confederation's oversight role in the phasing's design — the centre gets the confederation's public acknowledgment that the reform's framework is acceptable, and the sequence is the final-round concession the centre holds for the negotiation's end. The Concessions the Centre Will Not Make: the withdrawal of the compliance-cost provisions in principle, the thirty-six-month timeline, the oversight-board seat, and any concession that establishes the precedent that the confederation's opposition reverses the government's announced reform. The Concessions the Actor Is Likely to Offer: the confederation's neutral silence in place of opposition, the confederation's acceptance of the two technical modifications, and the confederation's participation in the advisory group. The Sequencing Logic: the timeline first because the timeline is the lowest-cost, highest-value concession for the centre and the actor's secondary objective; the advisory-group seat second because the seat is the concession that addresses the actor's institutional interest without breaching the centre's red line on the oversight board; the compliance-cost phasing last because the phasing is the highest-cost concession and the concession that closes the negotiation, and the concession held to the end is the concession that maximises the centre's return.

The Fallback and Walk-Away. The Fallback Position: the centre tables the reform's legislation without the confederation's endorsement, with the compliance-cost provisions as announced, the eighteen-month timeline retained, and the centre's public communication framing the confederation's opposition as the protection of the compliance-cost the reform is designed to address. The Walk-Away Point: the centre leaves the table if the confederation demands the withdrawal of the compliance-cost provisions in principle, the thirty-six-month timeline, or the oversight-board seat, because the three together reverse the reform the government has announced and establish the precedent the centre cannot defend. The Consequences of No Agreement: for the centre — the political cost of the confederation's opposition through the autumn, the legislative cost of the contested parliamentary vote, the institutional cost of the demonstration that the confederation can block the government's reform; for the actor — the commercial cost of the reform's passage without the confederation's modifications, the institutional cost of the centre's

withdrawal of the advisory-group seat, the political cost of the public framing as the opponent of the reform the public has been told will reduce the cost of living; for the relationship — the damage the no-agreement imposes on the next engagement, mitigated by the courtesy of the walk-away and the centre's private communication that the door remains open. The No-Agreement Communication Plan: the principal calls the confederation's president on the day of the walk-away, the centre's public statement frames the no-agreement as the centre's commitment to the reform the public has been promised, and the centre's private communication to the coalition partners and the parliamentary figures precedes the public statement by twelve hours.

The Communication Plan. Who Speaks: the principal speaks on the primary objective, the walk-away point, and the political commitment; the chief of staff speaks on the concession map's sequencing and the timeline; the line ministry's deputy minister speaks on the technical modifications and the compliance-cost phasing; the communication official speaks on the post-negotiation communication's framing. The Agreed Narrative: the centre's case is that the reform is necessary and the centre is prepared to address the confederation's implementation concerns; the centre's offer is the timeline, the advisory-group seat, and the compliance-cost phasing; the centre's reason is that the reform serves the public's interest in the lower cost of living and the confederation's interest in the workable implementation. The Disclosure Plan: what is revealed is the centre's willingness to extend the timeline and to phase the compliance-cost provisions; what is withheld is the centre's internal assessment that the confederation's opposition has weakened the confederation's standing with the public; what is signaled is the centre's readiness to walk away, signaled through the principal's schedule and the line ministry's preparation of the legislation's tabling. The Post-Negotiation Communication: the public statement, agreed in the event of the settlement, frames the agreement as the centre's reform delivered with the confederation's constructive engagement; the private communication to the coalition partners, the parliamentary figures, and the regional leaders precedes the public statement by twenty-four hours, and the private communication to the confederation's president — the principal's personal call confirming the settlement and acknowledging the confederation's role — precedes the public statement by forty-eight hours.

Instrument 10 — The Crisis Response Playbook: Working Template

The decision tree, pre-assigned roles, and type-specific responses for the first hours of a crisis of confidence. Designed for rehearsal, not for reading in the moment.

10.1 Purpose

The crisis response playbook is the pre-rehearsed set of decisions, roles, and type-specific actions the centre applies in the first hours of a crisis of confidence. The playbook is rehearsed, not read, and the centre that has never run through the playbook is the centre that will fumble the first hours. The first hours of a crisis are the hours in which the actors on whom the government depends form the judgement on whether the centre has the capacity to manage the crisis, and the judgement once formed is hard to displace. The purpose of the playbook is to compress the decisions the centre must make in those hours into the sequence the centre has rehearsed, so the centre's first hour is the execution of the rehearsed response and not the improvisation the crisis provokes.

The playbook comprises the first-hour decision tree, the pre-assigned roles, and the type-specific responses for the fiscal, political, security, and reputational crises. The decision tree sets the order of the calls, the briefings, the deployments, and the public statements, so the centre's first hour has the structure the crisis has destroyed. The pre-assigned roles assign the crisis lead, the communications lead, the operations lead, the intelligence lead, the relationship lead, and the principal's role to the officials who will hold them, so the centre does not negotiate the roles while the crisis propagates. The type-specific responses set the assessment, the communication, the action, and the 24-hour, 72-hour, and recovery plans for each crisis type, so the centre applies the response the type requires and not the response the centre has defaulted to.

10.2 The First-Hour Decision Tree

The first-hour decision tree is the sequence the centre executes from the moment the crisis is identified, and the sequence is the same for every crisis type. The decision tree comprises four nodes: who is called first, who is briefed and in what order, who is deployed and to where, and who speaks publicly and who does not. The four nodes are executed in parallel, and the parallel execution is the discipline the rehearsed playbook enforces, because the centre that executes the nodes in sequence has allowed the first hour to pass before the public statement is made. The decision tree is the structure the centre has rehearsed, and the centre that has rehearsed the tree executes the four nodes within the first hour, and the centre that has not has spent the first hour deciding who to call.

The first node is who is called first, and the call order is the principal, the chief of staff, the security advisor, and the communications lead, in that sequence. The principal is called first because the principal's decision is required at every subsequent node, and the principal who learns

of the crisis from the press or from the staff's statement has been failed by the staff. The chief of staff is called second because the chief of staff convenes the crisis committee and activates the pre-assigned roles, and the chief of staff who is called after the committee has convened has been bypassed. The security advisor is called third because the security advisor assesses the threat the crisis poses to the principal's safety, the government's continuity, and the state's functioning, and the assessment is required before the deployment is ordered. The communications lead is called fourth because the communications lead prepares the public statement, and the statement is required within the first hour.

The second node is who is briefed and in what order, and the briefing order is the crisis committee first, the cabinet second, the parliamentary party third, and the coalition partners fourth. The crisis committee is briefed first because the committee is the body that runs the response, and the committee that is briefed after the cabinet has been briefed has been failed by the chief of staff. The cabinet is briefed second because the cabinet must speak as one in the public communication, and the cabinet member who learns of the crisis from the press has been failed by the centre. The parliamentary party is briefed third because the parliamentary party's support is required for the measures the response will require, and the parliamentary party that learns of the crisis from the press has been failed by the principal's parliamentary aide. The coalition partners are briefed fourth because the coalition's cohesion is the condition of the government's survival, and the partner who learns of the crisis from the press has been failed by the relationship lead.

The third node is who is deployed and to where, and the deployment order is the crisis committee to the crisis room, the operations lead to the operational centre, the intelligence lead to the assessment cell, and the relationship lead to the engagement channel with the key actors. The fourth node is who speaks publicly and who does not, and the rule is the principal or the designated minister speaks, the chief of staff and the leads do not speak, and the rest of the centre does not speak. The decision points the centre confronts in the first hour are five: is this a crisis, what type, what is the immediate threat, what is the principal's role in the first hour, and what is the staff's role. The five decisions are taken in the first meeting of the crisis committee, and the decisions are recorded in the playbook's first-hour log, because the record is the centre's protection against the charge that the centre did not decide.

10.3 The Pre-Assigned Roles

The pre-assigned roles are the officials who hold the crisis response functions, and the assignment is made before the crisis and rehearsed through the quarterly exercise. The six roles are the crisis lead, the communications lead, the operations lead, the intelligence lead, the relationship lead, and the principal, and each role has the responsibilities, the authority, the reporting line, and the deputy. The deputy is the official who holds the role when the holder is absent or implicated, and the pre-assignment is the discipline by which the centre avoids the negotiation of the roles while the crisis propagates. The roles are assigned by the principal on the chief of staff's recommendation, and the assignment is reviewed at the quarterly rehearsal and revised when the holder has changed office.

The crisis lead runs the centre's response, and the role is held by the chief of staff or the cabinet secretary, because the role requires the official with the authority to direct the centre's staff and the access to the principal. The responsibilities are the convening of the crisis committee, the management of the first-hour decision tree, the coordination of the other leads, and the maintenance of the response's coherence. The authority is the authority to direct the centre's staff, to convene the committee, and to require the leads' reports, and the reporting line is to the principal. The deputy is the senior official the chief of staff has designated, because the crisis lead who is absent or implicated has left the centre without the coordination the response requires.

The communications lead manages the public face of the response, and the role is held by the principal's communications director or the government's chief spokesperson. The responsibilities are the preparation of the first-hour statement, the management of the press through the duration, the briefing of the designated ministers, and the maintenance of the message's consistency. The authority is the authority to clear the public statements, to direct the press operation, and to require the ministers' adherence to the message, and the reporting line is to the principal and the crisis lead. The deputy is the deputy communications director, because the communications lead who has been implicated has left the centre without the public face the response requires.

The operations lead manages the operational response, and the role is held by the cabinet secretary or the senior official whose brief covers the crisis type. The responsibilities are the deployment of the operational measures the type-specific response requires, the coordination of the ministries and the agencies, and the maintenance of the operational tempo. The authority is the authority to direct the ministries and the agencies in the operational matters, to require the ministers' operational decisions, and to convene the operational cell, and the reporting line is to the crisis lead. The deputy is the senior official the operations lead has designated, because the operations lead who is absent or implicated has left the centre without the operational capacity the response requires.

The intelligence lead gathers and assesses the information, and the role is held by the principal's intelligence advisor or the head of the intelligence coordination cell. The responsibilities are the assessment of the threat, the gathering of the information the response requires, the assessment of the actors' confidence and disposition, and the briefing of the committee on the developments. The authority is the authority to direct the intelligence agencies in the assessment, to require the agencies' reporting, and to convene the assessment cell, and the reporting line is to the crisis lead. The deputy is the senior intelligence official the lead has designated, because the intelligence lead who is absent or implicated has left the centre without the assessment the response requires.

The relationship lead manages the key relationships during the crisis, and the role is held by the principal's chief of staff or the senior political aide. The responsibilities are the engagement of the coalition partners, the parliamentary party, the senior figures, and the external actors whose confidence the crisis has tested, in the order their leverage requires. The authority is the authority to speak for the principal in the engagements, to commit the principal to the meetings, and to require the relationship leads in the ministries' cooperation, and the reporting line is to the principal. The deputy is the senior aide the lead has designated, because the relationship lead who is absent or implicated has left the centre without the relationships the response requires.

The principal decides, communicates, and leads, and the principal's role is the role the centre's response turns on. The responsibilities are the chairing of the crisis committee, the decision on the posture and the message, the public communication where the principal's voice is required, and the leadership the centre demonstrates. The authority is the authority the office carries, and the principal's decision is the decision the centre executes, and the reporting line is to the principal's own judgement and to the actors the principal must answer to. The deputy is the deputy prime minister or the senior minister the principal has designated, because the principal who is absent or incapacitated has left the centre without the decision the response requires.

10.4 The Fiscal Crisis Response

The fiscal crisis response is the type-specific response the centre applies to the loss of confidence by the revenue base, the investor community, or the external financiers, and the response is run from the first hour and sustained through the recovery. The immediate assessment is the establishment of the fiscal position within the first day: the revenue position, the expenditure position, the financing position, the reserves position, and the trigger that has caused the loss of confidence. The assessment is the work of the finance ministry, the central bank, and the treasury, coordinated by the operations lead, and the assessment is presented to the crisis committee within the first day. The trigger is named plainly, because the assessment that conceals the trigger has misdiagnosed the response the crisis requires, and the trigger is the condition the plan must address.

The immediate communication is the statement the centre makes within the first hour and the engagement the centre conducts with the key financial actors within the first day. The public statement sets the centre's acknowledgement of the position, the centre's commitment to the plan, and the centre's timeline for the plan's publication, and the statement is direct and unqualified. The engagement with the key financial actors is the engagement with the central bank governor, the commercial banks' leaders, the foreign creditors' representatives, and the international institutions' officials, in the order their leverage requires, and the engagement is conducted by the principal, the finance minister, and the central bank governor jointly. The communication that is vague, qualified, or delayed has propagated the loss the communication was meant to arrest.

The immediate action is the fiscal measures the centre takes within the first day and the relationships the centre activates within the same day. The fiscal measures are the measures that close the financing gap the assessment has established, and the measures are the expenditure measures, the revenue measures, and the financing measures, in the combination the gap requires. The relationships the centre activates are the relationships with the central bank, the international institutions, the bilateral creditors, and the key commercial banks, and the activation is the engagement that secures the bridge the plan requires. The action that is announced in place of enacted has confirmed the actors' judgement that the centre cannot act, and the centre that has announced the measures without enacting them has propagated the loss the action was meant to arrest.

The 24-hour plan is the plan the centre publishes within the first day, with the measures, the timeline, and the implementation evidence the actors' confidence requires, and the 72-hour plan is the plan the centre has begun to implement within the first three days, with the first measures

enacted, the first engagements concluded, and the first indicators of the confidence's return recorded. The recovery plan is the plan the centre implements over the months and the years, with the structural measures, the institutional reforms, and the relationship maintenance the durable confidence requires. The fiscal crisis is resolved by the action and the demonstration of the action, and the centre that has treated the crisis as a matter of the announcement in place of the action has prolonged the loss.

10.5 The Political Crisis Response

The political crisis response is the type-specific response the centre applies to the loss of confidence by the public, the coalition, or the political elites, and the response is run from the first hour and sustained through the recovery. The immediate assessment is the establishment of the political position within the first day: the polling position, the coalition's cohesion, the parliamentary position, the elites' confidence, and the trigger that has caused the loss of confidence. The assessment is the work of the principal's political staff, the parliamentary whips, and the intelligence lead's assessment cell, coordinated by the crisis lead. The trigger is named plainly, and the trigger is the event or the accumulation the centre must address, and the assessment that conceals the trigger has misdiagnosed the response the crisis requires.

The immediate communication is the statement the centre makes within the first hour and the engagement the centre conducts with the coalition within the first day. The public statement sets the centre's acknowledgement of the position, the centre's commitment to the action, and the centre's timeline for the action's demonstration, and the statement is direct and unqualified. The engagement with the coalition is the engagement with the coalition partners, the parliamentary party, the faction leaders, and the senior figures, in the order their leverage requires, and the engagement is conducted by the principal and the relationship lead jointly. The communication that is vague, qualified, or delayed has propagated the loss the communication was meant to arrest, because the political crisis is the type in which the cascade propagates fastest through the channels of political observation.

The immediate action is the coalition measures and the political measures the centre takes within the first day. The coalition measures are the concessions, the engagements, and the demonstrations that hold the coalition, and the political measures are the personnel decisions, the policy decisions, and the parliamentary decisions that arrest the cascade. The action that is announced in place of enacted has confirmed the actors' judgement that the centre cannot act, and the centre that has announced the leadership in place of demonstrating it has prolonged the loss. The measures are taken in the order the assessment has established, and the order is the order the leverage requires.

The 24-hour plan is the plan the centre has executed within the first day, with the coalition engagements concluded, the public statement made, and the parliamentary position secured, and the 72-hour plan is the plan the centre has executed within the first three days, with the coalition held, the cascade arrested, and the principal's leadership demonstrated. The recovery plan is the plan the centre implements over the weeks and the months, with the coalition rebuilt, the public confidence restored, and the centre's leadership reaffirmed through the action and the conduct the

actors observe. The political crisis is resolved by the leadership the principal has demonstrated and the coalition the centre has held, and the centre that has treated the crisis as a matter of the communication in place of the leadership has prolonged the loss.

10.6 The Security and Reputational Crisis Responses

The security crisis response is the type-specific response the centre applies to the loss of confidence in the government's capacity to maintain order or defend the state, and the response is run from the first hour and sustained through the recovery. The immediate assessment is the establishment of the threat, the forces available, the loyalty of the forces, and the channels through which the cascade is propagating, and the assessment distinguishes the regional disturbance from the national rising. The immediate deployment is the deployment of the police, the gendarmerie, and the military in the order the threat requires, and the deployment is the action by which the government's capacity is demonstrated. The immediate communication is the statement that sets the centre's acknowledgement of the threat and the centre's commitment to the deployment, and the statement is direct and unqualified, because the security crisis is the type in which the centre's capacity is most directly tested.

The 24-hour and 72-hour plans for the security crisis are the plans the centre executes within the first day and the first three days, with the deployment ordered, the forces deployed, the public communication made, and the order restored or the defence maintained. The recovery plan is the plan the centre implements over the months and the years, with the causes addressed, the forces' capacity rebuilt, and the public confidence restored through the demonstration of the capacity the centre has shown. The security crisis is resolved by the capacity the deployment has shown and the order the forces have maintained, and the centre that has treated the crisis as a matter of the communication in place of the deployment has prolonged the loss.

The reputational crisis response is the type-specific response the centre applies to the loss of confidence in the government's integrity or competence through scandal, failure, or exposure, and the response is run from the first hour and sustained through the recovery. The immediate assessment is the establishment of the conduct at issue, the actors implicated, the actors whose confidence has been lost, and the channels through which the loss is propagating, and the assessment distinguishes the conduct the centre can defend from the conduct the centre must address. The immediate disclosure management is the engagement of the press, the parliament, and the public in the order the disclosure requires, and the immediate accountability is the resignation, the dismissal, or the prosecution of the actors implicated. The accountability is the action by which the centre distinguishes itself from the conduct at issue, and the centre that has deferred the accountability has identified itself with the conduct.

The 24-hour and 72-hour plans for the reputational crisis are the plans the centre executes within the first day and the first three days, with the conduct assessed, the disclosure managed, the accountability announced and delivered, and the reform announced. The recovery plan is the plan the centre implements over the months and the years, with the reform implemented, the personnel changed, and the structures strengthened, because the reputational crisis is resolved by the accountability shown and the reform demonstrated. The centre that has treated the reputational

crisis as a matter of the communication in place of the accountability has prolonged the loss, and the centre that has deferred the reform has confirmed the judgement that the centre cannot change.

10.7 Instructions for Rehearsal

The rehearsal protocol is the discipline by which the playbook is maintained in the form the crisis requires, and the protocol sets the frequency, the format, the assessment, and the update cycle. The frequency is the quarterly minimum, with the rehearsal conducted at the end of each quarter, and the centre that has deferred the rehearsal has allowed the playbook to drift from the conditions the next crisis will impose. The centre that faces a heightened risk environment rehearses monthly, because the rehearsal is the test the playbook's currency requires, and the playbook that has not been rehearsed in the six months before the crisis has drifted past the conditions the crisis has imposed. The rehearsal is convened by the chief of staff, attended by the principal and the pre-assigned leads, and recorded in the rehearsal log the chief of staff maintains.

The rehearsal format is the format the rehearsal's purpose requires, and the three formats are the tabletop exercise, the role-play, and the full simulation. The tabletop exercise is the walk-through of the decision tree and the type-specific responses against a scenario the chief of staff has prepared, and the exercise is the format the quarterly rehearsal most often uses, because the exercise tests the centre's familiarity with the playbook. The role-play is the rehearsal in which the pre-assigned leads assume their roles and execute the playbook against an injected scenario, and the role-play is the format the centre uses twice a year, because the role-play tests the leads' capacity to execute the playbook under the pressure the role imposes. The full simulation is the rehearsal in which the centre executes the playbook against a live scenario with the operational cells activated, and the simulation is the format the centre uses annually, because the simulation tests the centre's capacity to execute the playbook under the conditions the crisis will impose.

The rehearsal assessment is the assessment the chief of staff conducts at the close of the rehearsal, and the assessment records what worked, what failed, and what needs revision. The assessment is recorded in the rehearsal log, and the revisions are entered into the playbook within the month of the rehearsal, because the playbook that is not revised after the rehearsal has captured the rehearsal's lessons in a form the next crisis cannot use. The update cycle is the cycle by which the playbook is revised, and the cycle is the quarterly revision after the quarterly rehearsal, the event-triggered revision after the event that has exposed the playbook's gap, and the annual revision after the annual simulation. The playbook that is not rehearsed is the playbook that will fail, and the centre that has rehearsed the playbook has the discipline the first hour requires.

10.8 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed crisis response for a fictional fiscal crisis, set in the Republic of Maravia in the seventh month of the principal's second term. The trigger is the revenue shortfall the finance ministry has disclosed on the morning of the fourteenth: the first-half revenue is 8 per cent below the budget, the financing gap for the second half is 3.2 per cent of gross domestic product, and the foreign investors' withdrawal from the treasury bill auction has dropped

the coverage from 2.4 to 1.1 in a single session. The chief of staff assesses the event as a fiscal crisis and activates the playbook at 09:15. The first-hour decision tree is executed by 10:15: the principal, the security advisor, and the communications lead are called in sequence; the crisis committee is convened, and the cabinet, the parliamentary party, and the coalition partners are briefed in order; the committee deploys to the crisis room, the operations lead to the operations centre, the intelligence lead to the assessment cell, and the relationship lead to the engagement channel; the principal speaks publicly at 12:00 and the finance minister at 14:00, and the rest of the centre does not speak. The committee takes the five first-hour decisions at 10:00: this is a crisis, the type is fiscal, the immediate threat is the auction's failure, the principal's role is to chair and address the public, and the staff's role is to execute the type-specific response.

The pre-assigned roles are activated. The crisis lead is the chief of staff, with the cabinet secretary as deputy, and the lead convenes the committee, manages the decision tree, and coordinates the leads. The communications lead is the principal's communications director, with the deputy communications director as deputy, and the lead prepares the principal's 12:00 statement, the finance minister's 14:00 statement, and the press operation through the duration. The operations lead is the cabinet secretary, with the finance ministry's director-general as deputy, and the lead deploys to the operations centre and coordinates the fiscal measures' implementation. The intelligence lead is the principal's intelligence advisor, with the intelligence coordination cell's head as deputy, and the lead deploys to the assessment cell and briefs the committee on the investors' disposition, the central bank's reserves, and the markets' reading. The relationship lead is the principal's senior political aide, with the parliamentary aide as deputy, and the lead engages the coalition partners, the parliamentary party, the central bank governor, the commercial banks' leaders, and the international institutions' officials. The principal chairs the committee, decides the posture and the message, and addresses the public at 12:00.

The fiscal crisis response is implemented. The immediate assessment, presented to the committee at 16:00, establishes the revenue position (8 per cent below budget), the financing gap (3.2 per cent of gross domestic product for the second half), the reserves position (6 per cent depleted in the day), and the trigger (the revenue shortfall has exposed the structural deficit the budget has concealed). The immediate communication is the principal's 12:00 statement acknowledging the position, committing to the plan, and setting the timeline for the plan's publication within 24 hours, and the engagement the relationship lead has conducted with the central bank governor, the four largest commercial banks' leaders, and the international institutions' officials by 16:00. The immediate action is the expenditure measures the cabinet has approved by 18:00 (a 4 per cent reduction in non-priority spending, a deferral of the capital programme, and a freeze on hiring and procurement) and the revenue measures approved by 20:00 (an increase in the excise on fuel and alcohol, and a surcharge on the higher incomes), together closing 2.1 per cent of the gap, with the remaining 1.1 per cent to be closed through the financing the central bank and the international institutions have bridged.

The 24-hour plan is executed by 09:00 on the fifteenth: the finance minister has published the plan with the measures, the timeline, and the implementation evidence; the central bank has conducted the treasury bill auction with the bridge the international institution has provided, and the coverage has recovered to 1.9; the principal has addressed the parliamentary party and secured

the party's support; and the coalition partners have committed to the support. The 72-hour plan is executed by 09:00 on the seventeenth: the first measures have been enacted through the emergency decree the cabinet has issued, the reserves have stabilised, the currency has recovered 2 per cent of the depreciation, and the international institution has publicly endorsed the plan. The recovery plan is implemented over the months that follow: the structural deficit is reduced through the medium-term fiscal framework the finance ministry has published, the revenue base is broadened through the tax reform the parliament has enacted, and the relationships with the investors, the creditors, and the international institutions are maintained through the quarterly engagement the relationship lead has instituted. The centre has executed the rehearsed response, and the centre's first hour has been the execution the playbook prescribed.

Instrument 11 — The Transition Preparation File: Working Template

*The continuously maintained file that becomes the transition brief when a transition occurs.
Updated quarterly so that the brief is 80% ready when the moment comes.*

11.1 Purpose

The transition preparation file is the continuously maintained record that becomes the transition brief when a transition occurs, and the file is the means by which the centre avoids the scramble the unprepared transition produces. A transition is the moment the principal changes — by electoral defeat, by resignation, by succession, by motion of confidence, by term limit, by illness — and the moment is the moment at which the centre's continuity is tested. The file is the record of the commitments outstanding, the dependencies in play, the risks active, the relationships that must be transferred, and the decisions that will need to be made in the first days, and the record is the means by which the new holder enters the position with the knowledge the position requires.

The discipline of quarterly maintenance is the discipline that keeps the file current, and the discipline is the protection against the file that is the artefact of the last transition and the artefact's drift into irrelevance. The file that is updated only when a transition occurs is the file that is too late, because the file produced under transition pressure is the file with the gaps the pressure produces. The quarterly cycle is the cycle that catches the commitments made since the last quarter, the dependencies shifted since the last quarter, the risks emerged since the last quarter, and the relationships changed since the last quarter, and the cycle is the cycle that keeps the file the working record the transition requires.

The 80 per cent ready standard is the standard the file is maintained against, and the standard sets the file's state at the moment a transition is signalled. A file at 80 per cent ready is a file that requires the final 20 per cent — the update of the moment-specific facts, the principal's personal additions, the final confirmation of the actors' positions — and the 20 per cent is the work the transition's first hours can absorb. A file at less than 80 per cent ready is a file that requires creation in the transition's first hours, and the creation is the work the transition's first hours cannot absorb. The standard is the standard by which the centre's preparation is measured, and the centre that maintains the file at the standard is the centre that meets the transition with the brief already in hand.

11.2 The Template

The template is the five sections the file comprises, and the five sections are the sections that cover the territory the transition brief must cover. The sections are the Government Commitments, the Government Dependencies, the Government Risks, the Key Relationships, and the Decisions for the First Days, and the five together are the comprehensive record of the position the new holder inherits. Each section is maintained as the section's own record, with the section's own

update cycle within the quarterly maintenance, and each section's content is the content the section's name describes. The five sections are the five sections every transition brief requires, and the centre that maintains the five sections is the centre that has the brief the transition's first hours demand.

The Government Commitments section records each outstanding commitment the government has made, the actor to whom the commitment is made, the status of the commitment, and the consequence of fulfillment or non-fulfillment. The commitments are the public commitments, the private commitments, the coalition commitments, the international commitments, and the legislative commitments, and each commitment is recorded with the date the commitment was made, the actor to whom the commitment was made, the terms of the commitment, the current status, and the consequence the fulfillment or the non-fulfillment produces. The consequence is the centre's assessment of what the fulfillment or the non-fulfillment does to the actor's relationship with the government, and the assessment is the assessment that orients the new holder's decision on each commitment. The commitments section is the section the new holder reads first, because the commitments are the obligations the new holder inherits and the obligations the new holder's first decisions will address.

The Government Dependencies section records each of the five dependencies — the financial dependency, the human dependency, the informational dependency, the institutional dependency, and the political dependency — and for each dependency the state, the key actors, and the relationship state. The state is the dependency's current trajectory, stated as strengthening, stable, or weakening. The key actors are the actors on whom the dependency depends, named specifically, with each actor's current posture toward the government. The relationship state is the centre's assessment of the relationship's current health, stated as strong, adequate, or strained, and the assessment is the assessment the new holder must work with from the first day. The dependencies section is the section that gives the new holder the map of the terrain the government operates in, and the map is the map the new holder's first engagements will navigate.

The Government Risks section records the top risks the government faces, and for each risk the probability, the consequence, and the response in place. The risks are the risks across the five dependency categories and the risks across the political, security, economic, and reputational domains, and the top risks are the risks the centre has assessed as the most material. The probability is the centre's assessment of the likelihood the risk materialises in the next twelve months, stated as high, moderate, or low. The consequence is the centre's assessment of the impact the risk produces if it materialises, stated as severe, significant, or manageable. The response in place is the centre's current mitigation, with the official responsible and the measures standing, and the response is the response the new holder inherits and the response the new holder's first review will assess.

The Key Relationships section records the relationships the new holder must establish personally, and for each relationship the actor involved, the recommended approach, and the history. The relationships are the relationships the principal holds personally and cannot be transferred through staff — the relationship with the predecessor where the predecessor remains active, the relationships with the coalition leaders, the relationships with the senior figures in the parliamentary party, the relationships with the key external actors, the relationships with the heads of the institutions the government depends on, and the relationships with the principal's

counterparts in the key jurisdictions. The recommended approach is the centre's assessment of how the new holder should engage the actor in the first weeks. The history is the record of the relationship's prior state, the issues that have arisen, and the agreements and the disagreements, and the history is the orientation the new holder's personal engagement requires.

The Decisions for the First Days section records the decisions the new holder will need to make in the first thirty days, and for each decision the context, the options, and the staff's assessment. The decisions are the decisions the transition imposes — the decisions on the personnel (the chief of staff, the principal private secretary, the cabinet secretary, the senior advisors), the decisions on the policy positions the transition's first weeks require, the decisions on the coalition, the decisions on the legislative agenda, the decisions on the international engagements already scheduled, and the decisions on the crises that are active at the moment of transition. The context is the situation the decision addresses. The options are the options the staff has developed. The staff's assessment is the assessment the staff offers, with the recommended option and the reasoning, and the assessment is the orientation the decision requires. The decisions section is the section that gives the new holder the work the first thirty days will hold, and the work is the work the new holder can begin from the first day.

11.3 Instructions for Maintenance

The file is maintained by the official the principal designates — the chief of staff, the principal private secretary, the cabinet secretary, or the official whose brief covers the centre's coordination — and the designated official is the official whose name appears on the file as the file's custodian. The custodian is responsible for the file's accuracy, the file's currency, and the file's confidentiality, and the custodian's responsibility is the responsibility that cannot be delegated below the level the principal has designated. The custodian maintains the file with the support of the officials whose briefs the file's sections draw on — the finance official for the financial dependency and the fiscal risks, the security official for the security risks, the political official for the political dependency and the coalition, the foreign affairs official for the international relationships — and the officials' contributions are the contributions the custodian assembles into the consolidated file. The custodian is the official the principal holds accountable for the file's state at the moment a transition is signalled, and the accountability is the accountability the designation carries.

The quarterly update cycle is the cycle by which the file is maintained at the 80 per cent ready standard, and the cycle sets the update at the end of each quarter, with the update completed within the two weeks the quarter's close allows. The update catches the commitments made since the last quarter, the dependencies shifted since the last quarter, the risks emerged since the last quarter, the relationships changed since the last quarter, and the decisions the next quarter will impose. The update is conducted by the custodian with the officials whose briefs the file's sections draw on, and the update is the update the principal reviews at the quarter's close. The cycle is the cycle that keeps the file the working record the transition requires, and the centre that breaks the cycle is the centre that has let the file drift below the standard.

The principal's review is the review the principal conducts at the close of each quarter, and the review is the review at which the principal reads the file, revises the judgements the file records,

and signs the file as the centre's current position. The review is the review at which the principal confronts the centre's position as the position the transition would expose, and the review's value is the value the quarterly confrontation produces. The principal's revisions are the principal's additions, the principal's corrections, and the principal's judgements on the matters the file records, and the revisions are entered into the file within the week the review closes. The review is the review the file's integrity depends on, because the file without the principal's revisions is the file the staff has written and the file the principal has not owned.

The update triggered by significant events is the update the custodian conducts outside the quarterly cycle, and the update is the update the significant event requires. The significant events are the events that change the centre's position materially — the coalition crisis, the fiscal shock, the security incident, the personnel departure, the international development, the motion of confidence, the electoral result, the principal's illness — and the events are the events the custodian recognises as the events the file's currency requires. The event-triggered update is the update conducted within the seventy-two hours the event's materiality allows, and the update is the update the principal reviews at the event's close. The event-triggered update is the update that keeps the file current between the quarterly cycles, and the update is the update the transition's readiness depends on when the transition comes between cycles.

The confidentiality handling is the discipline by which the file's sensitivity is protected, and the discipline is the discipline the file's status as the most sensitive document in the centre requires. The file is maintained as the centre's most sensitive document, with the access restricted to the principal, the custodian, the officials whose contributions the file's sections draw on, and the principal's designated successor where the principal has designated a successor. The file is stored on the centre's most restricted system, with the access logged, the copies controlled, and the physical print maintained in the principal's safe. The file's existence is not acknowledged outside the restricted circle, and the file's contents are not disclosed except on the principal's express direction, and the direction is the direction the transition's requirements produce.

11.4 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed transition preparation file for the Republic of Maravia in the eighth month of the principal's second term, with the term ending in four months and the principal's re-election contestable. The Government Commitments section records twelve outstanding commitments. The fiscal consolidation commitment, made to the international institution eighteen months ago, terms the deficit reduction to 3 per cent of gross domestic product by year-end, status on track with the deficit at 3.4 per cent, consequence of fulfillment the institution's continued programme support, consequence of non-fulfillment the programme's suspension and the rating agencies' downgrade. The public-sector wage commitment, made to the public-sector union six months ago, terms the 8 per cent wage increase over two years, status partially fulfilled with the first 4 per cent paid and the second 4 per cent deferred, consequence of fulfillment the union's continued restraint, consequence of non-fulfillment the strike the union has threatened. The coalition commitment, made to the Maritime Confederation's leader at the coalition's formation, terms the infrastructure spending allocation to the maritime provinces, status

behind schedule with 62 per cent of the allocation disbursed, consequence of fulfillment the confederation's continued participation, consequence of non-fulfillment the confederation's departure and the coalition's loss of its majority. The remaining nine commitments — the legislative commitment on the regulatory reform, the international commitment on the border agreement, the private commitment to the senior figures in the parliamentary party, and the others — are recorded with the same structure, and the twelve together are the commitments the new holder inherits and the commitments the new holder's first decisions will address.

The Government Dependencies section records the five dependencies. The financial dependency: state weakening, the revenue base eroded by the first half's slowdown, the key actors the revenue authority, the central bank, the three largest commercial banks, the international institution, and the bilateral creditors, the relationship state strained with the commercial banks and adequate with the international institution. The human dependency: state stable, the senior officials in place with two vacancies the centre has not closed, the key actors the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the finance secretary, the defence secretary, and the four line ministers whose briefs the government's programme depends on, the relationship state strong with the cabinet secretary and adequate with the others. The informational dependency: state stable, the centre's access to the intelligence and the policy information maintained, the key actors the intelligence coordinator, the policy units in the line ministries, and the external assessment services, the relationship state adequate. The institutional dependency: state weakening, the constitutional court's two adverse rulings on the reform programme and the upper house's obstruction of the three legislative measures the programme requires, the key actors the constitutional court, the upper house's majority leader, and the subnational governments, the relationship state strained with the court and strained with the upper house. The political dependency: state weakening, the principal's approval at 41 per cent, down from 48 per cent at the term's start, the key actors the coalition partners, the parliamentary party, the senior figures whose endorsements the principal's position depends on, and the constituency networks whose mobilisation the electoral position requires, the relationship state strained with the Maritime Confederation and adequate with the others.

The Government Risks section records the top eight risks. The coalition collapse: probability high, consequence severe, response in place the principal's weekly engagement with the Maritime Confederation's leader and the contingency plan for minority government the custodian has prepared. The fiscal shock: probability moderate, consequence severe, response in place the expenditure measures the finance ministry has prepared and the financing the central bank has lined up. The constitutional court's third adverse ruling: probability high, consequence significant, response in place the legislative revision the attorney-general's office has drafted and the political management the chief of staff has prepared. The border security incident: probability moderate, consequence significant, response in place the deployment the defence ministry has maintained and the diplomatic engagement the foreign ministry has conducted. The principal's health: probability low, consequence severe, response in place the deputy's preparedness and the succession protocol the custodian has rehearsed. The international institution's programme suspension: probability moderate, consequence significant, response in place the fiscal measures that close the gap the suspension would produce. The public-sector strike: probability moderate, consequence significant, response in place the negotiation the labour ministry has conducted and the essential-services

contingency plan. The reputational damage from the procurement investigation: probability moderate, consequence significant, response in place the cooperation the attorney-general's office has offered and the communications management the principal's communications director has prepared. The eight risks together are the risks the new holder inherits and the risks the new holder's first review will assess.

The Key Relationships section records the eleven relationships the new holder must establish personally. The predecessor, who remains active as the senior figure in the parliamentary party: recommended approach the early meeting the predecessor's counsel requires, history the predecessor's continued endorsement of the principal's programme and the predecessor's reservation about the fiscal consolidation's pace. The Maritime Confederation's leader: recommended approach the early meeting the coalition's repair requires, history the coalition's formation, the two crises the coalition has weathered, and the current strain the infrastructure spending's delay has produced. The senior figures in the parliamentary party: recommended approach the individual meetings the figures' endorsements require, history the figures' varying support for the principal's programme and the two figures whose reservations the principal has not closed. The central bank's governor: recommended approach the early meeting the fiscal-monetary coordination requires, history the governor's support for the consolidation and the governor's concern about the deficit's pace. The international institution's resident representative: recommended approach the early meeting the programme's continuation requires, history the representative's support for the programme and the representative's concern about the coalition's stability. The constitutional court's chief justice: recommended approach the early meeting the government's respect for the court requires, history the court's two adverse rulings and the government's compliance. The upper house's majority leader: recommended approach the early meeting the legislative programme's passage requires, history the majority leader's obstruction of the three measures and the centre's attempt to negotiate the passage. The defence chief: recommended approach the early briefing the security situation requires, history the defence chief's management of the border incident and the defence chief's request for the additional resources the principal has not approved. The neighbouring jurisdiction's foreign minister: recommended approach the early call the border agreement's implementation requires, history the agreement's negotiation and the current implementation's pace. The business association's head: recommended approach the early meeting the fiscal position's stabilisation requires, history the association's criticism of the fiscal stance and the association's offer of the support the consolidation's communication requires. The principal's counterpart in the key regional jurisdiction: recommended approach the early call the regional engagement requires, history the counterpart's support for the principal's programme and the counterpart's invitation to the regional summit the principal has not accepted.

The Decisions for the First Days section records the seven decisions the new holder will need to make in the first thirty days. The chief of staff's retention or replacement: context the chief of staff's central role in the centre's coordination and the chief of staff's association with the principal's predecessor, options the retention with the chief of staff's continued service, the retention with the deputy's elevation, or the external appointment, staff's assessment the retention with the deputy's elevation as the option that balances the continuity and the renewal. The fiscal consolidation's pace:

context the international institution's programme and the coalition's strain, options the continuation at the current pace, the acceleration, or the deceleration, staff's assessment the continuation as the option that holds the programme and the coalition. The coalition's repair: context the Maritime Confederation's strain and the infrastructure spending's delay, options the spending's acceleration, the spending's reconfiguration, or the coalition's renegotiation, staff's assessment the acceleration as the option that holds the coalition without the renegotiation's cost. The court's adverse ruling's response: context the third ruling the centre expects and the legislative revision the attorney-general's office has drafted, options the revision's introduction, the revision's deferral, or the constitutional amendment, staff's assessment the revision's introduction as the option that addresses the ruling without the amendment's risk. The border incident's posture: context the security incident's continuation and the diplomatic engagement's progress, options the escalation with the additional deployment, the de-escalation with the diplomatic engagement's intensification, or the maintenance of the current posture, staff's assessment the maintenance as the option that holds the position without the escalation's risk. The public-sector wage commitment's fulfillment: context the union's strike threat and the fiscal position's constraint, options the second 4 per cent's payment, the second 4 per cent's deferral with the negotiation, or the second 4 per cent's reduction, staff's assessment the deferral with the negotiation as the option that holds the fiscal position and the union's restraint. The procurement investigation's management: context the investigation's continuation and the reputational damage's risk, options the cooperation's continuation, the principal's public statement, or the personnel's suspension, staff's assessment the cooperation's continuation with the public statement as the option that holds the centre's position and the investigation's integrity. The seven decisions together are the decisions the new holder's first thirty days will address, and the staff's assessments are the orientation the decisions require.

Instrument 12 — The Scenario Exercise Workbook: Working Template

The pre-rehearsed political scenarios: the trigger, the first-hour response, the first-day response, the first-week response, the actors to engage, and the communication plan. The workbook is not a forecast; it is a rehearsal.

12.1 Purpose

The scenario exercise workbook is the pre-rehearsed set of scenarios the centre expects to face, with the trigger, the response arc across the first hour, the first day, and the first week, the actors the centre must engage, the communication the centre will deliver, and the recovery the centre will execute, set out for each scenario in the structure the centre has rehearsed. The workbook is the centre's preparation for the contingencies the centre cannot prevent, and the centre that has rehearsed the scenarios the centre expects to face is the centre that responds with the discipline the rehearsal has built, and the centre that has not is the centre that responds with the panic the unrehearsed crisis provokes. The workbook is rehearsed; the centre that consults the workbook in the crisis is the centre that has not rehearsed. The rehearsal is the work, and the workbook is the rehearsal's record.

The distinction from the crisis response playbook is the distinction of the arc. The playbook covers the first hours of a crisis, and the playbook's decisions, roles, and type-specific responses are the decisions, roles, and responses the centre executes in the hours before the centre has the assessment the crisis requires. The workbook covers the full arc of a scenario, from the trigger through the first hour, the first day, the first week, and the recovery, and the workbook's responses are the responses the centre executes after the assessment is in and the centre is managing the scenario's progression. The playbook is the centre's first-hour discipline; the workbook is the centre's discipline across the arc. The two instruments are complementary, and the centre that maintains the playbook without the workbook has rehearsed the first hour without rehearsing the arc the first hour opens, and the centre that maintains the workbook without the playbook has rehearsed the arc without rehearsing the first hour the arc depends on.

12.2 The Scenario Template

The scenario template is the structure every scenario in the workbook follows, and the structure comprises the identification fields, the time-arc response fields, the engagement fields, and the maintenance fields. The structure is the same for every scenario, and the uniformity is the discipline that allows the centre to compare scenarios, to rehearse scenarios in sequence, and to update scenarios without rebuilding the workbook. The template's fields are the fields the centre has determined the rehearsal requires, and the field that is completed without the centre's working knowledge is the field the centre discovers is empty at the rehearsal. The scenario that omits a field is the scenario the centre has not completed.

The identification fields are the Scenario Name, the Scenario Type, and the Trigger. The Scenario Name is the short, memorable name the centre uses to refer to the scenario in the rehearsal and the working correspondence, and the name is the name the centre recognises at the mention, not the name the centre has to look up. The Scenario Type is the type against the six the workbook recognises: economic, political, security, reputational, personnel, and external, and the type sets the response arc the scenario follows. The Trigger is the event that activates the scenario, stated as the specific occurrence the centre will recognise, and the trigger that is stated as a category rather than an event is the trigger the centre will not recognise when the event arrives. The trigger is the field that the centre updates most frequently, because the trigger the centre has rehearsed is the trigger the centre has anticipated, and the trigger the centre has not is the trigger that arrives as the surprise.

The First-Hour Response field sets who is called, who is briefed, who is deployed, and who speaks in the hour after the trigger. The field draws on the crisis response playbook for the call order, the briefing order, the deployment order, and the speaking rule, and the field records the centre's execution of the playbook's first-hour discipline for the scenario the trigger has activated. The field is the field that links the workbook to the playbook, and the centre that has not aligned the field with the playbook has rehearsed a first-hour response the playbook does not support. The first-hour field is the field the centre executes from memory, because the centre does not consult the workbook in the first hour, and the rehearsal is the work that puts the first-hour response into the centre's working practice.

The First-Day Response field sets the assessment the centre produces, the decision points the centre confronts, the actions the centre takes, and the communications the centre delivers across the first day. The assessment is the centre's working judgement of the scenario's nature, severity, trajectory, and implications, and the assessment is the assessment the centre produces in the meeting the chief of staff convenes in the first day's morning. The decision points are the decisions the centre must take in the first day, stated as the questions the centre must answer, and the decisions the centre defers beyond the first day are the decisions the centre has taken in the scenario's first phase. The actions are the actions the centre executes in the first day, in the order the centre executes them. The communications are the statements the centre makes across the first day, in the order the centre makes them, and the communications the centre has rehearsed are the communications the centre delivers with the discipline the rehearsal has built.

The First-Week Response field sets the stabilisation the centre achieves, the relationship management the centre conducts, and the follow-through the centre executes across the first week. The stabilisation is the centre's work to bring the scenario to the state in which the scenario is contained, the actors the centre depends on are reassured, and the government's functioning is restored to the state the scenario disrupted. The relationship management is the centre's engagement with the actors the scenario has affected — the coalition partners, the parliamentary figures, the regional leaders, the foreign governments, the media, the public — and the engagement is the engagement the centre conducts in the order the actors' salience requires. The follow-through is the centre's execution of the commitments the first-day decisions have imposed, and the follow-through the centre has rehearsed is the follow-through the centre delivers without the improvisation the unrehearsed week imposes.

The Actors to Engage field sets who the centre must contact, in what order, and for what purpose, and the field is the field the centre executes across the first hour, the first day, and the first week. The actors are listed in the order the centre contacts them, and the order is the order the actors' salience to the scenario requires, not the order the centre's habit prefers. The purpose for each actor is the purpose the contact serves, and the purpose is stated as the specific outcome the contact seeks, not the generic briefing the contact's convenience allows. The Communication Plan field sets what the centre says publicly, what the centre says privately to the key actors, and what the centre withholds, and the field distinguishes the three communications the discipline of the scenario requires. The public communication is the centre's statement to the press and the public; the private communication is the centre's message to the actors the centre must engage personally; the withheld communication is the information the centre holds until the timing the scenario's management requires.

The Recovery Plan field sets how the centre returns to the normal operations the scenario disrupted, and the field comprises the conditions the centre must meet for the recovery to begin, the sequence the centre executes to return to normal, and the markers the centre uses to judge the recovery's completion. The recovery is the centre's work to restore the relationships, the credibility, and the operating tempo the scenario has cost the centre, and the work extends across the weeks and months the scenario's aftermath requires. The Scenario Owner field sets who in the centre is responsible for maintaining the scenario, and the owner is the official whose brief the scenario falls in, with the authority to update the scenario and the responsibility to convene the scenario's rehearsal. The owner is the centre's point of accountability for the scenario, and the scenario that has no owner is the scenario the centre has not maintained.

12.3 The Scenario Selection Guide

The selection of the scenarios the workbook rehearses is the selection the centre makes against three criteria: the most likely, the most consequential, and the most challenging. The most likely are the scenarios the centre's working judgement assesses as the scenarios the centre is most likely to face in the period the workbook covers, and the likelihood is the likelihood the centre draws from the power audit, the current risk landscape, and the centre's reading of the actors the government depends on. The most consequential are the scenarios that, if they occur, will impose the highest cost on the government's position, the government's programme, or the government's survival, and the consequence is the consequence the centre assesses regardless of the likelihood. The most challenging are the scenarios that test the centre's capacity — the capacity to coordinate, to communicate, to decide under pressure — and the challenge is the challenge the centre rehearses to build the capacity the scenario demands. The three criteria overlap, and the scenario that meets all three is the scenario the centre rehearses first.

The minimum set the workbook maintains is at least one scenario from each of the six types: economic, political, security, reputational, personnel, and external. The minimum set is the floor, and the centre that maintains only the minimum set has rehearsed the centre's capacity across the types without rehearsing the centre's capacity across the scenarios the centre is most likely to face. The minimum set is maintained because the scenario types differ in the response arc they require,

and the centre that has rehearsed only the political scenario has not rehearsed the security scenario's deployment or the personnel scenario's confidentiality. The minimum set is the set the centre maintains even when the centre's working judgement assesses one type as unlikely, because the unlikely type is the type that arrives as the surprise, and the surprise the centre has rehearsed is the surprise the centre manages with the discipline the rehearsal has built.

The selection review is the review the centre conducts annually to revise the workbook's scenario set, and the review is the review the centre bases on the power audit and the current risk landscape. The power audit is the centre's working record of the actors the government depends on, the dependencies' direction, and the dependencies' strength, and the audit's revisions identify the scenarios the centre must add to the workbook and the scenarios the centre may retire. The current risk landscape is the centre's reading of the risks the government faces in the period the review covers, and the reading is the reading the centre draws from the intelligence assessment, the economic forecast, the political assessment, and the security assessment. The review is conducted by the chief of staff, with the officials whose briefs the scenarios fall in, and the review's product is the workbook's revised scenario set, with the scenarios added, retired, or updated as the review has determined.

12.4 Instructions for Rehearsal

The rehearsal of each scenario is the work the workbook exists for, and the rehearsal is conducted in three modes that escalate in the realism they impose: the tabletop exercise, the role-play, and the full simulation. The three modes are the escalation the centre applies across the rehearsal cycle, with the tabletop as the mode the centre runs most frequently, the role-play as the mode the centre runs before the principal's review, and the full simulation as the mode the centre runs annually for the scenarios the centre has assessed as the highest-priority. The rehearsal that the centre has not conducted is the rehearsal the centre has not built the discipline for, and the centre that maintains the workbook without the rehearsal holds the document without the capacity the document exists to build.

The tabletop exercise is the rehearsal in which the staff walks through the scenario's response arc in the conference room, with the scenario owner presenting the trigger and the staff walking through the first-hour, the first-day, and the first-week responses in sequence. The tabletop tests the workbook's completeness, the staff's familiarity with the scenario, and the coherence of the response arc the workbook records. The tabletop is conducted in two to three hours, with the chief of staff in the chair and the officials whose briefs the scenario touches in attendance. The tabletop is the mode the centre runs for every scenario in the workbook at least once a year, and the tabletop is the mode the centre runs when the scenario is added to the workbook or when the scenario's update is significant.

The role-play is the rehearsal in which the principals participate, with the principal, the chief of staff, the designated ministers, and the officials whose briefs the scenario touches taking the roles the scenario assigns them. The role-play tests the principals' decisions, communication, and coordination under the conditions the scenario imposes, and the role-play is the mode that surfaces the frictions the tabletop cannot surface. The role-play is conducted in a half-day, with the scenario

owner presenting the trigger, the principals responding in real time, and the staff recording the principals' decisions, statements, and the gaps the role-play exposes. The role-play is the mode the centre runs before the principal's review of the workbook, and the role-play is the mode the centre runs when the scenario is the scenario the centre has assessed as the highest-priority.

The full simulation is the rehearsal in which the centre activates as if the scenario were real, with the crisis committee convened, the crisis room activated, the communications deployed, and the response arc executed across the simulated first hour, first day, and first week. The full simulation tests the centre's capacity to execute the rehearsed response under the conditions the scenario would impose, and the full simulation is the mode that exposes the gaps the tabletop and the role-play cannot expose. The full simulation is conducted across a day or more, with the principal's participation, the staff's full activation, and the external actors' participation where the simulation's realism requires. The full simulation is the mode the centre runs annually for the highest-priority scenarios, and the full simulation is the mode the centre runs when the centre has undergone the significant change in personnel, structure, or capacity the simulation's reassessment requires.

The rehearsal assessment is the assessment the centre produces at the rehearsal's close, and the assessment records what worked, what failed, and what needs revision. What worked is the response the rehearsal executed as the workbook records; what failed is the response the rehearsal did not execute as the workbook records; what needs revision is the response the rehearsal executed but the execution revealed as the response the centre must revise. The revision is the revision the scenario owner records in the workbook, and the revision's record is the centre's protection against the charge that the centre did not revise. The update cycle is the cycle the centre applies to the workbook across the year, with the tabletop's revisions recorded within the week of the tabletop, the role-play's revisions recorded within the month of the role-play, and the full simulation's revisions recorded within the quarter of the simulation. The workbook that the centre has not updated is the workbook the centre has not maintained, and the centre that maintains the workbook without the update holds the document without the discipline the document exists to build.

12.5 Worked Example

The worked example is a completed scenario for a fictional government, set in the fourth year of the government's term, with the government sustained by a three-party coalition in which the smallest partner holds the balance the government's majority depends on. The scenario is the withdrawal of the coalition partner: the partner's leader has privately decided to withdraw, the partner's parliamentary group has been informed, and the partner's leader has requested the meeting with the principal at which the withdrawal will be announced. The scenario is set in the week before the government's budget is to be tabled, and the partner's withdrawal collapses the government's majority and imposes the choice between the resignation, the reconstitution, and the continuation as a minority government. The scenario is prepared by the chief of staff, with the parliamentary aide, the attorney-general's office, the communication official, and the intelligence official whose brief the coalition's cohesion falls in.

The Trigger. The partner's leader calls the principal on the morning of the scenario's activation and requests the meeting for that afternoon, with the request framed as the urgent personal matter the partner's leader does not specify. The intelligence official, who has tracked the partner's parliamentary group's disposition, briefs the chief of staff within the hour that the partner's leader has informed the group of the decision to withdraw. **The First-Hour Response.** The principal is called first, the chief of staff second, the attorney-general third, the communication official fourth, and the intelligence official fifth. The crisis committee is convened in the crisis room, the parliamentary aide is deployed to the parliamentary party's leadership, the attorney-general is deployed to the constitutional assessment, and the communication official is deployed to the holding statement the centre will issue if the press learns of the meeting. The principal speaks; the chief of staff and the leads do not speak; the rest of the centre does not speak.

The First-Day Response. The assessment the centre produces in the morning meeting is the assessment that the partner's withdrawal is the decision the partner's leader has taken, that the withdrawal is the decision and not the negotiating position the centre has faced in the previous coalition crises, and that the centre's choice is the choice among the resignation, the reconstitution, and the minority continuation. The decision points are five: does the principal accept the partner's leader's withdrawal at the afternoon meeting, does the centre seek the reconsideration, does the centre approach the opposition figures for the supply-and-confidence arrangement the minority continuation requires, does the centre prepare the cabinet for the resignation, and does the centre prepare the public communication. The actions are the principal's meeting with the partner's leader, the chief of staff's meeting with the partner's chief of staff, the attorney-general's preparation of the constitutional options, the parliamentary aide's sounding of the parliamentary party, and the communication official's preparation of the three statements the three decisions require. The communications are the private communication to the coalition's remaining partner, the private communication to the parliamentary party's leadership, the private communication to the regional leaders whose support the centre requires, and the holding statement the centre holds in reserve.

The First-Week Response. The stabilisation the centre achieves across the first week is the stabilisation of the government's functioning, the parliamentary majority's arrangement, and the public's confidence, and the stabilisation is the work the centre executes against the decision the principal has taken at the first day's close. The relationship management the centre conducts is the principal's engagement with the coalition's remaining partner, the principal's engagement with the opposition figures whose support the minority continuation requires, the chief of staff's engagement with the parliamentary party's leadership, and the principal's engagement with the regional leaders whose support the centre requires. The follow-through the centre executes is the execution of the commitments the first-day decisions have imposed — the parliamentary arrangement, the cabinet's reconfiguration if the reconstitution is the decision, the budget's revision if the minority continuation is the decision, and the public communication's continuity across the week. **The Actors to Engage,** in order: the partner's leader, the coalition's remaining partner's leader, the parliamentary party's leadership, the opposition figures, the regional leaders, the foreign governments whose relations the government's stability affects, the press, and the public.

The Communication Plan. The public communication is the principal's address to the nation on the evening of the first day, framing the decision the principal has taken as the decision the

government's stability and the public's interest require, and the principal's subsequent statements across the week as the decisions' implementation is communicated. The private communication to the key actors is the principal's personal calls to the coalition's remaining partner's leader, the opposition figures whose support the minority continuation requires, the regional leaders, and the foreign governments whose relations the government's stability affects, with the calls made before the public address and the content tailored to the actor's interest and the centre's ask. The withheld communication is the intelligence assessment of the partner's leader's motives, the centre's internal assessment of the minority continuation's viability, and the centre's contingency planning for the resignation, and the withheld is the information the centre holds until the timing the scenario's management requires.

The Recovery Plan. The recovery the centre executes is the centre's return to the normal operations the scenario has disrupted, and the recovery comprises the parliamentary arrangement's stabilisation, the cabinet's reconfiguration, the budget's passage, and the relationships' restoration across the months the scenario's aftermath requires. The conditions the centre must meet for the recovery to begin are the parliamentary majority's arrangement, the public's confidence's stabilisation, and the coalition's remaining partner's commitment to the arrangement the centre has negotiated. The markers the centre uses to judge the recovery's completion are the budget's passage, the parliamentary party's cohesion, the coalition's remaining partner's sustained support, and the public's confidence as the polling the centre commissions records. The Scenario Owner. The chief of staff is the scenario's owner, with the authority to update the scenario, the responsibility to convene the scenario's rehearsal, and the accountability the centre holds the chief of staff to for the scenario's maintenance.

Instrument 13 — The Principal's Judgment Journal: Working Template

The personal record the principal maintains of significant judgments made and their outcomes. The journal is the principal's own development instrument — the record from which judgment is built.

13.1 Purpose

The judgment journal is the principal's personal record of significant judgments and the outcomes those judgments produced, and the journal is the instrument by which judgment is built through disciplined reflection. The principal who does not keep the journal is the principal who repeats the mistakes the journal would have surfaced, and the principal who keeps the journal inconsistently is the principal who builds the judgment the consistency requires only in the periods the journal is kept. The journal is personal to the principal, held by the principal, written by the principal, and read by the principal, and the journal is not shared with the staff, the cabinet, the coalition partners, the successors, or the archives. The discipline the journal imposes is the discipline the principal's development requires, because judgment is built from the review of judgments made, and the review the journal enables is the review the unaided memory cannot sustain.

The journal's purpose is the conversion of experience into judgment, and the conversion occurs through the principal's reflection on the decisions the principal has made and the outcomes those decisions have produced. The decision is recorded within 48 hours, while the context is fresh, and the outcome is assessed 30 to 90 days later, when the consequences are visible, and the pattern is reviewed quarterly, when the recurrence is discernible. The reflection the journal requires is the reflection the principal's discretionary time must protect, because the principal who has not protected the time has not made the reflection, and the principal who has not made the reflection has accumulated experience without converting it into judgment. The journal is the principal's own development instrument, and the development the journal produces is the development no other instrument produces, because the development requires the principal's own reflection on the principal's own decisions.

13.2 The Template

The template is the set of fields the principal completes for each entry, and the fields are the fields the reflection requires, in the order the reflection requires them. The Date field records the date of the decision, not the date of the entry, because the entry may be made within the 48-hour window the protocol prescribes and the decision date is the date the reflection anchors. The Decision field records what was decided in one sentence, and the sentence is the sentence the principal would write to the principal's own future self, because the future self will read the entry without the context the present self holds. The Context field records the situation, the pressures,

and the time constraint, and the field records the situation as the principal perceived it at the time, not as the principal reconstructs it with the benefit of the outcome.

The Options Considered field records each option the principal weighed and the assessment the principal made of each, and the field records the options the principal actually weighed, not the options the principal would weigh in retrospect. The Option Chosen field records the option the principal selected, in the language the principal used at the time, and the field is the field the reflection tests against the options the principal rejected. The Reasoning field records why the principal chose the option the principal chose and not the others, and the reasoning is the reasoning the principal actually applied, including the reasoning the principal now considers mistaken. The Key Factors field records the factors that weighed most heavily in the decision, and the factors are the factors the principal can name, because the factors the principal cannot name are the factors the principal cannot review.

The Outcome field records the assessment the principal makes 30 to 90 days later, and the field records whether the decision produced the intended result, the unintended consequences the decision produced, and the result the principal now assesses. The Lesson field records what the principal learned from the decision, and the lesson is the lesson the principal can state in one or two sentences, because the lesson that cannot be stated briefly has not been distilled. The Pattern field records whether the decision fits a pattern in the principal's judgment, and the pattern is the recurring strength or weakness the entry reveals, and the field is the field the quarterly review completes. The template is the structure the reflection requires, and the principal who has deviated from the template has produced an entry the reflection cannot use, because the entry lacks the field the pattern requires.

13.3 The Reflection Protocol

The reflection protocol is the discipline by which the journal is maintained, and the protocol sets the entry timing, the outcome assessment timing, the pattern review timing, and the annual review timing. The entry is made within 48 hours of the decision, while the context is fresh, because the entry made a week later has lost the texture the reflection requires, and the entry made a month later has reconstructed the context the principal now wishes had been the context. The principal who has deferred the entry beyond 48 hours has forfeited the entry's value, and the principal who has deferred the entry regularly has forfeited the journal's purpose. The entry is made in the principal's own hand or in the principal's own file, and the entry is made by the principal alone, because the entry made by the staff is the staff's record, not the principal's reflection.

The outcome assessment is made 30 to 90 days after the decision, when the consequences are visible, and the assessment records the result the decision produced and the result the principal now assesses. The 30-day minimum is the minimum the consequences require to become visible, and the 90-day maximum is the maximum the principal's memory of the context can sustain, because the assessment made beyond 90 days has lost the context the entry holds. The outcome assessment is made in the entry's Outcome and Lesson fields, and the assessment is made by the principal alone, in the principal's own time. The assessment that is not made has left the journal with the

decision and without the result, and the journal with the decision and without the result has not produced the reflection the journal's purpose requires.

The pattern review is conducted quarterly, and the review is the principal's review of all entries made in the quarter, with the Pattern field completed for each entry and the recurring strengths and weaknesses identified across the entries. The quarterly review is the review the principal conducts in the principal's own time, with the journal alone, and the review is not delegated and not shared. The review identifies the patterns the entries have revealed, the patterns the principal must lean on, and the patterns the principal must correct, and the patterns the review has identified are recorded in a separate pattern note the principal maintains. The pattern note is the principal's own assessment of the principal's own judgment, and the note is the instrument by which the principal's development is tracked across the entries.

The annual review is conducted at the end of the year, and the review is the principal's review of the year's entries, the patterns the quarterly reviews have identified, and the development the journal has produced. The annual review assesses the principal's judgment development over the year, identifies the strengths the principal has built, the weaknesses the principal has not yet corrected, and the development the principal will pursue in the year ahead. The annual review is the review by which the journal's purpose is tested, because the journal that has not produced development has not justified the discipline the journal requires, and the principal who has conducted the annual review has the assessment the principal's development requires. The annual review is recorded in the pattern note, and the note is the principal's own assessment of the principal's own development, read by the principal alone.

13.4 The Confidentiality Protocol

The confidentiality protocol is the discipline by which the journal's privacy is maintained, and the protocol sets the journal's ownership, the journal's access, and the journal's disposition. The journal is personal to the principal, and the journal is held by the principal in the principal's own possession, in the principal's own file, on the principal's own device, and not in the centre's systems, the centre's archives, or the centre's premises. The journal is not shared with the staff, the cabinet, the coalition partners, the successors, or the archives, because the journal shared is the journal the principal can no longer write honestly, and the journal the principal cannot write honestly has lost the reflection the journal's purpose requires. The journal's privacy is the privacy the reflection requires, and the privacy is the privacy the protocol protects through the journal's life.

The journal is not retained after the principal's departure, and the disposition protocol requires the principal to destroy the journal or to take the journal on departure, with no copy retained in the centre's systems or the centre's archives. The journal retained in the centre's archives is the journal the successor can read, and the journal the successor can read is the journal the principal has written for the successor, not the journal the principal has written for the principal's own reflection. The journal that has been retained has compromised the reflection the journal's purpose requires, because the principal who has known the journal will be read by the successor has written the journal the successor's reading requires, not the journal the reflection requires. The disposition

protocol is the protocol by which the journal's privacy is maintained through the principal's departure, and the protocol is the protocol the principal executes on the day of the departure.

The journal is not a record of government, and the journal is not the record the archives hold, the record the audit examines, or the record the inquiry reviews. The journal is the principal's own development instrument, and the journal's status is the status the protocol establishes, and the status is the status the principal maintains throughout the journal's life. The decisions recorded in the journal are the decisions the centre has made, and the decisions the centre has made are recorded in the centre's records, and the journal's record of the decisions is the principal's reflection on the decisions, not the centre's record of the decisions. The protocol is the protocol by which the journal is distinguished from the centre's records, and the distinction is the distinction the principal maintains, and the distinction is the distinction the journal's reflection requires.

13.5 Worked Example

Three completed journal entries are set out below, with all fields filled in. The entries are drawn from a fictional principal's journal in the Republic of Maravia, in the third year of the principal's term, and the entries illustrate the entry made within 48 hours, the outcome assessment made 30 to 90 days later, and the pattern noted in the quarterly review. The first entry records a successful decision to concede on a fiscal matter to preserve a coalition relationship. The second entry records a successful decision to hold firm on a personnel appointment against political pressure. The third entry records an unsuccessful decision to delay a reform announcement, with the delay exploited by the opposition.

First entry. Date: 14 March. The Decision: conceded on the supplemental appropriation's regional allocation formula, accepting the finance committee chair's formula in exchange for the chair's support on the broader fiscal framework. The Context: the coalition held 51 per cent of the seats, the regional party held 6 per cent, the supplemental appropriation was required within 30 days to avoid a shutdown, and the finance committee chair had threatened to block the framework vote without the formula change. The Options Considered: hold firm on the original formula, force the chair's hand, and risk the framework vote — assessment, high risk, the chair's bloc was sufficient to defeat the framework; concede on the formula and secure the chair's support for the framework — assessment, the formula's fiscal cost was 0.3 per cent of the supplemental, the framework's value was the medium-term fiscal path; refer the formula to a working group and delay the framework — assessment, the delay exceeded the 30-day window. The Option Chosen: concede on the formula and secure the chair's support. The Reasoning: the framework's medium-term value exceeded the formula's fiscal cost, the chair's support on the framework was the lever the principal required, and the concession on the formula was the concession the chair had publicly demanded. The Key Factors: the coalition's narrow majority, the framework's medium-term value, the chair's leverage, the 30-day window. The Outcome (assessed 60 days later, on 13 May): successful — the framework passed with the chair's support, the supplemental was enacted within the window, the chair's relationship with the principal strengthened through the engagement, and the formula's fiscal cost was absorbed within the fiscal path. The Lesson: the concession on the secondary to secure the primary is the trade the coalition's narrow majority requires, and the

concession made publicly and delivered promptly is the concession that builds the relationship. The Pattern: the recurring strength of the principal's coalition management — the willingness to concede on the secondary to secure the primary.

Second entry. Date: 22 April. The Decision: held firm on the appointment of the director-general of the intelligence service, against the senior coalition partner's demand for the partner's own nominee. The Context: the senior coalition partner had demanded the nominee as the price of the partner's continued support for the principal's reform programme, the vacancy had persisted for four months, the intelligence service's interim leadership was weakening the service's capacity, and the principal's nominee was the senior professional the service's continuity required. The Options Considered: appoint the principal's nominee, accept the partner's withdrawal of support for the reform programme — assessment, high risk, the reform programme required the partner's votes; appoint the partner's nominee, secure the partner's support for the reform programme — assessment, the partner's nominee was a political appointee, the appointment would compromise the service's professionalism, and the precedent would invite future demands; delay the appointment further, refer the nominee to a consultation — assessment, the service's capacity was already weakening, the delay would deepen the weakening. The Option Chosen: appoint the principal's nominee and accept the partner's withdrawal. The Reasoning: the intelligence service's professionalism was the asset the principal could not compromise, the precedent the concession would set was the precedent the principal would face on every subsequent appointment, and the reform programme's defeat was the loss the principal could absorb, while the service's politicisation was the loss the principal could not. The Key Factors: the service's professionalism, the precedent the concession would set, the reform programme's replaceability, the partner's leverage. The Outcome (assessed 75 days later, on 6 July): successful — the principal's nominee was appointed, the partner withdrew support for the reform programme and the programme was defeated in the vote, but the service's capacity was restored within six months, the principal's standing with the professional civil service was strengthened, and the partner's later demand for a different appointment was withdrawn when the principal's firmness was recalled. The Lesson: the asset that cannot be replaced is the asset the principal holds firm on, and the loss the principal can absorb is the loss the principal absorbs to hold the asset. The Pattern: the recurring strength of the principal's personnel judgment — the willingness to absorb the political loss to protect the professional asset.

Third entry. Date: 18 June. The Decision: delayed the announcement of the principal's reform of the regional development framework, deferring the announcement from 20 June to 15 July, to allow the finance ministry's fiscal assessment to be incorporated. The Context: the reform was the principal's flagship measure, the announcement had been scheduled for 20 June, the finance ministry had flagged a fiscal assessment the ministry would complete by 10 July, and the opposition had been quiet on the reform through the spring. The Options Considered: announce on 20 June with the fiscal assessment outstanding — assessment, the announcement without the assessment would expose the reform to the charge that the fiscal basis was unsound; delay the announcement to 15 July, incorporate the assessment — assessment, the delay would allow the assessment to be incorporated, but the delay would give the opposition six weeks to organise; announce the framework on 20 June and the fiscal basis on 15 July — assessment, the two-stage announcement would invite the charge that the framework had been announced without the basis.

The Option Chosen: delay the announcement to 15 July. The Reasoning: the fiscal basis was the basis the reform's credibility required, the announcement without the basis would expose the reform to the charge the principal could not answer, and the opposition's quiet was the quiet the principal had read as the absence of the capacity to organise. The Key Factors: the fiscal basis, the reform's credibility, the opposition's quiet, the finance ministry's timeline. The Outcome (assessed 45 days later, on 2 August): unsuccessful — the delay was exploited by the opposition, which organised the regional chambers' opposition to the reform through the six weeks, the reform was substantially amended in the regional consultation, the principal's standing on the reform was weakened, and the fiscal assessment the delay was meant to incorporate added little to the reform's credibility. The Lesson: the delay the principal has imposed to perfect the announcement is the delay the opposition has exploited to organise the opposition, and the opposition the principal has read as quiet is the opposition the principal has misread. The Pattern: the recurring weakness of the principal's reform judgment — the willingness to delay the announcement to perfect the basis, with the delay exploited by the opposition, and the misreading of the opposition's quiet as the absence of the capacity to organise.

Instrument 14 — The Trust Assessment: Working Template

The periodic personal assessment by the principal of the trust state with each key actor. The assessment is not shared with staff; it is the principal's private discipline.

14.1 Purpose

The trust assessment is the principal's periodic personal assessment of where trust stands with each key actor, whether the trust is building or eroding, and what the principal needs to do to maintain or rebuild it. Trust is the foundation on which the principal's working relationships with the key actors rest: the actors on whom the government depends for revenue, for political support, for institutional cooperation, and for information. The trust state with each actor is not static, and the principal who does not track the state discovers, too late, that a key relationship has lost the trust on which the centre's effectiveness depended. The assessment is the principal's private discipline, the periodic review that prevents the late discovery.

The assessment is not a staff product, and the assessment is not shared with staff. The trust state is the principal's own judgement, formed from the principal's own engagement with the actor, the principal's own observation of the actor's behaviour, and the principal's own knowledge of what the actor has done and what the actor has failed to do. The principal records the assessment in the principal's private records, and the assessment forms the basis on which the principal decides the personal engagement each key actor requires. The discipline is the principal's because the trust is the principal's to maintain or to rebuild.

14.2 The Template

The template is the structured record of the assessment, with the fields the assessment requires for each actor: Actor Name; Trust Level; The Basis; The Trend; The Erosion Indicators; The Action; The Timeline; The Assessment Date; The Next Assessment Date. Each field records a specific judgement, and the assessment is complete only when every field is filled. The order of the fields is the order of the assessment's logic: the actor is named, the level is judged, the basis is stated, the trend is assessed, the indicators are recorded where the trend is eroding, the action is set, the timeline is fixed, and the dates anchor the cycle.

The Actor Name field records the actor the assessment concerns, named specifically as the official, the leader, the head of the institution, the head of the family, or the principal interlocutor, and not by category or by office alone. The naming is specific because trust is held by the person and not by the office, and the assessment that names the office and not the person is the assessment that has missed the relationship the principal needs to maintain. The Trust Level field records the principal's judgement of the trust state with the actor: high, medium, or low, against the trust level rubric.

The Basis field records the evidence that supports the judgement: the specific acts that have built the trust, the specific patterns of behaviour that have sustained it, and the specific failures that

have eroded it. The Basis field is the field that disciplines the judgement, because the principal who cannot state the basis in specific acts and patterns is the principal whose judgement has drifted from evidence into impression. The Trend field records whether the trust is building, stable, or eroding, against the trend assessment rubric. The Trend is the field that orients the action: a high-trust relationship that is eroding is the relationship that needs the immediate engagement, and a low-trust relationship that is building is the relationship the principal can build on.

The Erosion Indicators field is completed when the Trend is eroding, and records the observable signs of the erosion: the specific behaviours, the specific failures, the specific shifts in tone or in access that indicate the trust is weakening. The Action field records what the principal needs to do to maintain or rebuild the trust: the personal engagement, the specific commitment, the specific act of repair. The Timeline field records when the action must be taken, stated as a specific date and not as a general intention. The principal who records the action without the timeline is the principal who has recorded an intention and not a commitment, and the intention is the step at which the discipline fails.

The Assessment Date field records the date the assessment was made, and the Next Assessment Date field records the date the next assessment is due, set against the tiered frequency the relationship's importance requires. The completed template is the record the principal reviews at each cycle, the record against which the next assessment is compared, and the record that shows the trajectory of the trust over time. The template is updated at each assessment, the previous assessments retained, and the trajectory of the trust read across the sequence. The template that is not retained across cycles is the template that has lost the longitudinal judgement the discipline requires.

14.3 The Trust Level Rubric

The trust level rubric sets the criteria by which the principal judges the trust state with each actor as high, medium, or low. The criteria are observable and evidentiary, drawn from the actor's behaviour toward the centre over time, and the judgement is the principal's, formed from the principal's own engagement and observation. The rubric translates the principal's accumulated knowledge of the actor into a level the assessment records, and the level orients the action the relationship requires.

High trust is recorded when the actor has consistently relied on the centre's commitments over an extended period, has shared sensitive information with the centre, and has supported the centre in difficult moments. The reliance on commitments is the actor's pattern of accepting the centre's word, acting on the centre's assurances, and the absence of the verification demands that mark a transactional relationship. The sharing of sensitive information is the actor's pattern of disclosing to the centre what the actor has not disclosed to others, and the support in difficult moments is the actor's pattern of standing with the centre when standing with the centre has cost the actor something. The high-trust relationship is the relationship that has been built over time and that the principal can draw on in the moments the centre needs the actor's support.

Medium trust is recorded when the actor cooperates with the centre but verifies the centre's commitments, and the relationship is functional but not resilient. The cooperation is the actor's

willingness to work with the centre on the matters the relationship requires, and the verification is the actor's pattern of checking the centre's word, asking for the specifics, and reserving judgement until the centre has delivered. The medium-trust relationship holds in normal conditions and may not hold in the conditions the centre most needs the actor's support. The principal who records medium trust is the principal who knows the relationship needs work before the difficult moment arrives, and the work is the principal's personal engagement with the actor on the matters the verification pattern concerns.

Low trust is recorded when the actor has been surprised or disappointed by the centre, and the cooperation is transactional and fragile. The surprise or disappointment is the actor's experience of the centre's failure to meet a commitment, the centre's reversal of a position, or the centre's exclusion of the actor from a decision the actor expected to be part of. The transactional cooperation is the actor's pattern of working with the centre only on the matters where the actor's interests align, and the fragility is the relationship's vulnerability to the next disagreement. The low-trust relationship is the relationship the principal must decide whether to invest in rebuilding or to manage at a distance, and the decision is the principal's because the investment is the principal's time and the principal's political capital.

14.4 The Trend Assessment Rubric

The trend assessment rubric sets the criteria by which the principal judges whether the trust with each actor is building, stable, or eroding. The trend is the judgement that orients the principal's immediate action, because the level records the state and the trend records the direction. The trend is assessed against the recent acts and failures that have shaped the relationship since the last assessment, and the assessment is the principal's, formed from the principal's own observation of the actor's recent behaviour.

Building is recorded when recent acts have strengthened the trust. The indicators include the actor's increased willingness to share sensitive information, the actor's reliance on the centre's commitments without verification, the actor's active support for the centre in moments the support was not required, and the actor's outreach to the principal in matters beyond the immediate business of the relationship. The building trend is the trend the principal can build on, and the action the building trend requires is the action that consolidates the gain: the specific act of recognition, the specific commitment that reciprocates the actor's trust. The principal who records a building trend and takes no action is the principal who has let the gain pass without consolidation, and the gain that is not consolidated is the gain that fades.

Stable is recorded when the trust is maintained through consistent behaviour, neither strengthened nor weakened since the last assessment. The indicators include the actor's continued cooperation at the level previously recorded, the absence of surprises or disappointments in the period, and the absence of the early indicators of erosion. The stable trend is the trend that requires maintenance, and the maintenance is the principal's continued personal engagement with the actor at the cadence the relationship has established. The stable trend is not the trend that requires no action; the stable trend is the trend that requires the action of continued presence, and the

relationship that is stable and unattended is the relationship that drifts toward erosion without the principal noticing.

Eroding is recorded when recent acts or failures have weakened the trust. The early indicators of erosion include the actor's increased verification of the centre's commitments, the actor's reduced willingness to share sensitive information, the actor's increased formality in communications that were previously informal, and the actor's reduced availability for the principal's requests. The late indicators of erosion include the actor's public or private expression of disappointment with the centre, the actor's refusal of a request the actor would previously have granted, the actor's cultivation of alternative relationships that compete with the centre, and the actor's open criticism of the centre's position. The eroding trend is the trend that requires the principal's immediate engagement, and the engagement is the action that, taken at the early indicators, can arrest the erosion before the late indicators set the relationship on a course the principal cannot reverse.

14.5 Instructions for Use

The assessment is conducted personally by the principal, not by staff. The trust assessment is the principal's own judgement, formed from the principal's own engagement with the actor, and the staff member who conducts the assessment on the principal's behalf has produced a staff product, not the principal's discipline. The principal schedules the assessment as a personal appointment, works through each actor in turn, and records the assessment in the principal's private records. The staff's role is limited to the support the principal requests: the calendar reminder, the file of the previous assessments, and the file of the recent interactions the principal wishes to review.

The frequency of the assessment is tiered by the relationship's importance to the centre. Tier 1 relationships — the relationships on which the government's principal dependencies rest — are assessed monthly. Tier 2 relationships — the relationships that are important to the centre's effectiveness but not on the critical path of the principal dependencies — are assessed quarterly. Tier 3 relationships — the relationships the centre maintains for the long term and that are not under immediate strain — are assessed semi-annually. The tiering is the discipline that calibrates the principal's attention to the relationship's importance, and the principal who assesses every relationship at the same frequency is the principal who has either under-attended the Tier 1 relationships or over-attended the Tier 3.

The confidentiality of the assessment is absolute. The assessment is personal to the principal, kept in the principal's private records, and not shared with staff, not shared with the actor assessed, not shared with the principal's political allies, and not shared with the principal's family. The trust assessment that is shared is the trust assessment that has become a staff product or a political instrument, and the trust assessment that has become a staff product or a political instrument is no longer the principal's private discipline. The actor who learns that the principal has recorded a trust judgement is the actor whose trust the assessment has itself eroded, and the erosion is the cost the breach of confidentiality imposes on the relationship the discipline was meant to protect.

The action the assessment triggers is the principal's personal engagement with the actor. The assessment that records no action is the assessment that has been conducted as a record and not as a discipline, and the discipline holds only when the assessment produces the action. The action is set

against the timeline the assessment records, and the principal who does not take the action by the timeline is the principal whose discipline has failed at the step that matters. The assessment is reviewed at the next cycle, and the action taken is recorded against the assessment that triggered it, closing the loop on which the discipline's learning rests.

14.6 Worked Example

The worked example is three completed trust assessments, drawn from a fictional government in its second year. The three assessments illustrate the combinations the discipline most often produces: a high-trust, stable relationship that needs maintenance; a medium-trust, eroding relationship that needs rebuilding; and a low-trust, eroding relationship that needs a decision about whether to invest in rebuilding or to manage the relationship differently. The assessments are the principal's private record, set out here as illustration. All three assessments share the Assessment Date of 14 March, and the Next Assessment Date is set at one month for the Tier 1 relationships and at one month for the eroding Tier 2 relationship, because the eroding trend has compressed the cycle.

Assessment 1. Actor Name: the Finance Minister. Trust Level: high. The Basis: the Finance Minister has consistently relied on the centre's commitments on the budget across the eighteen months of the government's tenure, has shared the ministry's internal revenue projections before the formal submission on three occasions, and has supported the centre in the cabinet's difficult moments, including the vote on the fiscal consolidation measure in November. The Trend: stable. The Erosion Indicators: not applicable. The Action: the principal's personal engagement with the Finance Minister at the monthly cadence already established, the principal's specific act of recognition for the consolidation vote, and the principal's specific commitment to consult the Finance Minister before the next budget round opens. The Timeline: the recognition within the week, the consultation commitment within the month. The Assessment Date: 14 March. The Next Assessment Date: 14 April.

Assessment 2. Actor Name: the Defence Minister. Trust Level: medium. The Basis: the Defence Minister cooperates with the centre on the budget and on the procurement programme, but verifies the centre's commitments through the ministry's own channels, and the relationship has been functional but not resilient through the year. The Trend: eroding. The Erosion Indicators: the Defence Minister has increased the verification of the centre's commitments on the procurement timeline, has reduced the sharing of sensitive information on the ministry's force-readiness assessment, and has shifted the communications with the principal from informal telephone calls to formal letters. The Action: the principal's personal meeting with the Defence Minister, the principal's specific act of disclosure on the procurement timeline, and the principal's specific commitment to involve the Defence Minister in the next security review. The Timeline: the meeting within the week, the disclosure at the meeting, the involvement commitment within the month. The Assessment Date: 14 March. The Next Assessment Date: 14 April.

Assessment 3. Actor Name: the leader of the Regional Party, a coalition member. Trust Level: low. The Basis: the Regional Party's leader was surprised by the centre's decision to delay the regional infrastructure programme, a decision the leader expected to be consulted on, and the

cooperation since has been transactional, limited to the votes the coalition agreement requires. The Trend: eroding. The Erosion Indicators: the leader has privately expressed disappointment to two officials whose reporting reached the principal, has refused the principal's request for a joint public appearance, and has begun cultivating the opposition leader's party through two intermediaries. The Action: the principal's decision point — whether to invest in the rebuilding through a personal meeting, a specific commitment on the infrastructure programme, and the leader's inclusion in the next coalition review, or to manage the relationship at a distance through the whip's office and the coalition secretariat. The Timeline: the decision within the week, the action that follows the decision within the month. The Assessment Date: 14 March. The Next Assessment Date: 14 April.

Instrument 15 — The Decision Record: Working Template

The standardized record of every significant decision the principal makes: the decision, the basis, the options, the reasoning, and the authorization. The record that survives the principal's departure.

15.1 Purpose

The decision record is the standardised entry the centre makes for every significant decision the principal takes, and the entry captures the decision, the basis, the options, the reasoning, and the authorisation in the single form the centre can hold. The record has three purposes. The first is the institutional memory that survives the principal's departure: the principal who takes the decision carries the decision's context in memory, and the centre that inherits the principal's departure does not, and the record is the bridge from the principal's memory to the centre's working knowledge. The second is the accountability that comes from documenting the basis for decisions: the decision whose basis is recorded is the decision the centre can be held to, and the decision whose basis is not recorded is the decision the centre cannot defend in the review, the inquiry, or the transition. The third is the learning that comes from reviewing the pattern of decisions over time, and the pattern reveals the principal's dispositions, the centre's biases, and the decisions the centre takes well and the decisions the centre takes poorly.

The record is not for the principal; it is for the centre. The principal who takes the decision does not need the record to remember the decision, and the principal who consults the record is the principal who has already lost the decision's context. The record is for the chief of staff who must brief the next meeting, the officials who must implement the decision, the council that must defend the decision, and the principal's successor who must inherit the decision. The centre that maintains the record has the working knowledge the principal's departure cannot erase; the centre that does not maintain the record inherits the decision without the basis and must either reverse the decision without understanding it or continue the decision without owning it.

15.2 The Template

The template comprises the fields that together constitute the record of a significant decision, and each field is completed, with the entry that omits a field the entry the centre has not completed. The template is maintained as the single record for each decision, with each decision recorded in its own entry, the entries numbered in the order the decisions are taken, and the file accumulating across the term. The fields are grouped in three parts: the front matter identifies the decision, the substance records the decision's basis, and the process records the decision's authorisation, implementation, review, and classification.

The front matter fields. The Decision Reference Number is the sequential identifier, in the format DR-YYYY-NNN, that locates the record in the file. The Date is the date the decision was taken, not the date the record was written. The Decision is what was decided, stated precisely and

in the terms the centre will be held to. The Decision Maker is the principal, or the official to whom the principal has delegated the decision, with the delegation's reference. The Context is the situation that required the decision, stated in the terms the principal understood at the time, not the terms the retrospective imposes.

The substance fields. The Options Considered records each option the principal weighed, with the assessment of each: what the option would deliver, what the option would cost, what the option would risk, and what the option would commit the centre to. The Option Chosen is the option the principal selected, stated precisely and without the ambiguity the announcement's phrasing sometimes introduces. The Reasoning is the case for the chosen option and the case against each of the rejected options, stated in the order of weight, with the principal's judgement of why the chosen option prevails. The Key Factors are the factors that weighed most heavily, ranked, with the principal's judgement of the weight each factor carried and the factor the principal judges decisive. The Consultation records who was consulted, what each consulted party advised, and the principal's response to the advice, with the principal's reason where the advice was modified or rejected.

The process fields. The Authorization records who authorised the decision, by what authority, and in what form the authorisation was given — the principal's signature, the council's minute, the legal instrument, the public statement. The Implementation records who implements the decision, by when, with what resources, and through what instrument; the owner is the official the principal has charged, the date is the date by which the implementation is complete, the resources are the staff, the budget, and the authority the implementation requires, and the instrument is the legal instrument, the directive, or the public act by which the implementation is effected. The Review Date is the date by which the decision's outcomes will be assessed, set at the point the implementation's effects can be read, with the indicators against which the outcomes will be assessed and the official responsible for the assessment. The Classification records the record's security classification, set against the centre's classification regime, with the access the classification permits and the date the classification will be reviewed.

15.3 The Decision Significance Threshold

The decision significance threshold is the test by which the centre determines which decisions require a record. Not every decision the principal takes requires a record; the decisions that require a record are the decisions that meet one or more of the threshold's criteria, and the criteria are the markers of significance the centre has agreed with itself. The threshold is the discipline that prevents the file from swelling with the routine decisions the centre does not need to record, and the threshold is the discipline that prevents the file from losing the significant decisions the centre does need to record. The threshold is the test the chief of staff applies before the record is begun, and the test is applied at the point the decision is taken, not at the point the record is reviewed.

The criteria are five. A decision meets the threshold if it commits the government to a course of action — the policy direction adopted, the negotiation position taken, the public commitment made, the strategic choice embraced. A decision meets the threshold if it affects a key relationship — the coalition member the government relies on, the major external actor the government

engages, the institutional counterparty the government works through, the public constituency the government serves. A decision meets the threshold if it allocates significant resources — the budget transfer above the threshold the centre has set, the appointment to the position the centre judges significant, the procurement the centre judges material. A decision meets the threshold if it sets a precedent — the decision the centre will be held to in the next case, the decision that establishes the practice the centre will follow, the decision that defines the principle the centre will apply. A decision meets the threshold if it carries significant risk — the risk the principal accepts, the risk the centre bears, the risk the public will hold the government to, the risk the centre cannot reverse without the cost the centre cannot afford.

The threshold is not bureaucratic; it is judgmental. The criteria function as the standards the chief of staff applies in the judgement of which decisions require the record, and the production of the record follows the judgement the criteria support. The decision that meets one criterion weakly and another criterion strongly is a decision that requires the record; the decision that meets no criterion is a decision the centre does not record. The chief of staff who defers the judgement to the principal has transferred the judgement to the principal whose judgement of the decision's significance is least reliable, because the principal who takes the decision is the principal whose sense of the decision's weight is shaped by the taking. The chief of staff is responsible for identifying which decisions meet the threshold, attends the principal's meetings, observes the principal's decisions in the course of the day, and flags the decisions that meet the threshold for the record. The principal does not self-flag, and the chief of staff's flag is the trigger the designated official acts on.

15.4 Instructions for Maintenance

The records are maintained by the official the principal designates — the cabinet secretary, the principal private secretary, the chief of staff, or the official whose position places the centre's records in the official's hands. The designated official is responsible for the preparation of each record, for the filing of the records in the centre's record system, for the integrity of the file, and for the access the file permits. The official does not delegate the maintenance to a subordinate, because the maintenance is the work the centre holds the official accountable for, and the delegation is the abdication the gap arrives in. The official prepares the record within the week of the chief of staff's flag, presents the record to the principal for the principal's confirmation, and files the confirmed record in the system the same day.

The filing system is the single authoritative file the centre maintains for the decision records. The records are filed under the reference number, indexed by the decision's subject, the decision maker, the date, and the classification, with the cross-references the subject requires. The system is the single file; no parallel files are maintained in the principal's office, the chief of staff's office, or the officials' offices. The single file is the discipline by which the centre knows where the record is, and the parallel file is the condition under which the centre loses the record in the transition, the inquiry, or the review.

The review protocol is the monthly review the chief of staff conducts to ensure the file's completeness. The review covers the decisions the chief of staff has flagged in the month, the

records the designated official has prepared, and the decisions the chief of staff judges may have been missed. The review's test is whether every decision that met the threshold in the month has a record, and the chief of staff's judgement of the missed decisions is the judgement the review is conducted to elicit. The chief of staff reports the review's findings to the principal, with the records the chief of staff judges incomplete, the decisions the chief of staff judges the record missed, and the chief of staff's proposal for the records' revision or the missing records' preparation.

The access protocol and the retention protocol govern the file's sensitivity and the file's life beyond the term. The records are the centre's most sensitive documents, with the access restricted to the principal, the chief of staff, the designated official, and the officials the principal directs; the records are not shared with the ministers outside the centre, the parliamentary party, the coalition partners, or the external actors whose relationships the records reference. The designated official maintains the access list, reviews the access log at the quarterly interval, and reports the access to the principal at the monthly review. The records are retained for the term of the government and for the period the centre's retention regime requires after the term, with the records archived to the national archive at the point the retention regime prescribes and destroyed at the point the retention regime permits.

The transition protocol governs the records' transfer to the incoming principal. The records are part of the transition preparation file, and the transition preparation is the work the centre conducts in the months before the principal's departure — the planned departure at the term's end, the unplanned departure the crisis imposes, the electoral departure the public decides. The records in the transition file are the records the incoming principal reads to understand the decisions the centre has taken, the basis on which the centre has taken them, and the commitments the centre has made. The records the centre does not maintain are the records the incoming principal lacks, and the incoming principal who lacks the records inherits the decisions without the basis and must govern in the shadow of the centre the records would have illuminated.

15.5 Worked Example

The worked example is two completed decision records. The first is a decision to appoint a specific person to a key position over alternative candidates, illustrating the appointment decision the centre takes at the point a significant office falls vacant. The second is a decision to adjust the government's position on a policy matter in response to a coalition partner's pressure, illustrating the policy adjustment decision the centre takes when the coalition's cohesion and the government's programme come into tension. The two records illustrate the template in the two decision types the centre encounters most frequently, and the two records show the field-by-field completion the discipline requires.

Record 1 — the appointment. Decision Reference Number: DR-2025-007. Date: 14 March 2025. The Decision: to appoint Dr Helena Vasquez as Governor of the Central Bank for a term of six years, with effect from 1 May 2025. The Decision Maker: the principal, on the advice of the finance minister and the chief of staff. The Context: the incumbent governor's term expires on 30 April 2025; the financial markets have signalled concern at the uncertainty of the succession; the coalition's fiscal programme requires a governor the markets credit. The Options Considered: Dr

Vasquez (the deputy governor, with the technical standing and the markets' confidence, against the cost of the precedent of promoting the deputy and the institutional risk of the incumbent's opposition); Mr Cardoso (the former finance secretary, with the political experience and the coalition's preference, against the cost of the markets' concern and the conflict with the incumbent's succession plan); Dr Khan (the academic economist, with the policy reputation and the independence, against the cost of the lack of operational experience and the coalition's objection). The Option Chosen: Dr Vasquez.

Record 1 — continued. The Reasoning: Dr Vasquez was chosen because the markets' confidence is the factor that outweighs the others in the present financial position, and the deputy's promotion is the precedent the markets expect and the centre can defend. Mr Cardoso was rejected because the markets' concern would have cost the centre the fiscal programme's credibility, and the coalition's preference does not outweigh the credibility cost. Dr Khan was rejected because the operational inexperience would have imposed the learning curve the centre cannot afford in the present financial position, and the independence the centre values is the independence Dr Vasquez also provides. The Key Factors: the markets' confidence (decisive); the fiscal programme's credibility (decisive); the coalition's preference (considered, not decisive); the incumbent's opposition (considered, not decisive). The Consultation: the finance minister (advised Dr Vasquez); the chief of staff (advised Dr Vasquez); the coalition's leader (advised Mr Cardoso); the incumbent governor (advised an external candidate not on the centre's list). The Authorization: the principal, on the advice of the council, with the council's minute of 14 March 2025 and the formal instrument of appointment signed the same day. The Implementation: the chief of staff, by 1 May 2025, with the resources of the principal's office and the finance ministry, through the formal instrument and the public announcement. The Review Date: 1 November 2025, six months into the term, at the point the markets' response and the fiscal programme's implementation can be read. The Classification: Restricted.

Record 2 — the policy adjustment. Decision Reference Number: DR-2025-014. Date: 22 July 2025. The Decision: to adjust the government's position on the labour reform bill from the position announced in the budget (the reform's provisions to take effect on 1 January 2026) to the adjusted position (the reform's provisions to take effect on 1 July 2026, with the phased implementation the labour confederation has proposed), in response to the Labour Party's pressure as the coalition's second-largest member. The Decision Maker: the principal, on the advice of the chief of staff and the labour minister. The Context: the Labour Party has signalled that the reform's January 2026 implementation will cost the party its industrial constituency; the party's leader has communicated the coalition's strain to the chief of staff; the labour confederation has threatened the national strike the centre judges costly; the government's majority depends on the Labour Party's votes. The Options Considered: hold the position (with the cost of the Labour Party's defection on the bill and the confederation's strike); adjust the position to the phased implementation (with the cost of the precedent the concession establishes and the fiscal cost of the delayed savings); withdraw the reform (with the cost of the centre's credibility on the fiscal programme and the credit the markets have extended on the reform's passage). The Option Chosen: adjust the position to the phased implementation.

Record 2 — continued. The Reasoning: the phased implementation was chosen because the Labour Party's defection would have cost the bill its majority and the confederation's strike would have cost the centre the public's confidence, and the phased implementation is the adjustment that holds the coalition and prevents the strike while preserving the reform's substance. The position held against was rejected because the costs of holding exceeded the costs of adjusting, and the centre that holds the position at the cost of the coalition has won the position and lost the government. The withdrawal was rejected because the centre's credibility on the fiscal programme is the asset the centre cannot spend on the reform's withdrawal, and the markets' response to the withdrawal would have been the response the centre cannot afford. The Key Factors: the coalition's cohesion (decisive); the public's confidence (decisive); the centre's credibility on the fiscal programme (decisive against the withdrawal); the fiscal cost of the delayed savings (considered, not decisive); the precedent the concession establishes (considered, not decisive). The Consultation: the chief of staff (advised the adjustment); the labour minister (advised the adjustment); the finance minister (advised against, on the fiscal cost); the Labour Party's leader (advised the adjustment and communicated the party's position); the labour confederation's president (advised the adjustment and offered the confederation's endorsement in return). The Authorization: the principal, with the council's minute of 22 July 2025 and the public statement the principal made the same day. The Implementation: the labour minister, by 1 September 2025, with the resources of the labour ministry and the principal's office, through the bill's amendment and the public communication. The Review Date: 1 August 2026, one month after the phased implementation begins, at the point the implementation's effects on the labour market, the confederation's engagement, and the coalition's cohesion can be read. The Classification: Restricted.

Supporting Document A — The Staff Officer's Guide to the Toolkit

The guide for the staff officer who maintains the toolkit's instruments: what each instrument is, who maintains it, when it is updated, and how the instruments work together.

A.1 The Toolkit's Architecture

The toolkit comprises fifteen instruments in four tiers: daily, periodic, event, and personal. The daily instruments are the stakeholder map, the dependency dashboard, the weekly centre briefing, and the relationship cultivation log. The periodic instruments are the coalition health tracker, the trust assessment, the power audit, and the network map update. The event instruments are the sensitive meeting preparation packet, the negotiation preparation workbook, the crisis response playbook, the transition preparation file, and the scenario exercise workbook. The personal instruments are the principal's judgement journal and the decision record.

Information flows upward through the tiers. The daily instruments capture the granular changes the centre works with each day, and the periodic instruments aggregate the daily material into the monthly and quarterly assessments. The event instruments draw on the daily and the periodic material to prepare the centre for the events the centre must handle, and the personal instruments receive from every tier the material the principal's judgement and the centre's decision record require, in turn shaping the next day's daily entries.

A.2 The Daily Routine

The daily routine occupies the morning and the early afternoon. The day opens with the stakeholder map maintenance, where the entries shifted in the prior twenty-four hours are updated against the morning meeting's inputs and the previous day's contacts. The dependency dashboard update follows, with the staff officer refreshing the indicators, flagging the changed dependencies, and preparing the dashboard for the chief of staff's review. The chief of staff's directions on the flags shape the staff officer's work for the remainder of the morning.

The afternoon is the weekly briefing production and the relationship cultivation log updates. The weekly briefing is produced across the week: Monday and Tuesday for gathering, Wednesday and Thursday for drafting, Friday for finalisation and delivery. The relationship cultivation log is updated at the close of each day, recording the contacts, the substance, the commitments, and the follow-ups, with the time allocation split fifty percent on the daily instruments, thirty on the briefing, and twenty on the log.

A.3 The Weekly Routine

The weekly routine is the cadence the chief of staff sets for the staff officer's review of the daily instruments. The weekly briefing delivery is the Friday morning meeting at which the chief of

staff presents the briefing to the principal, and the staff officer attends to record the principal's directions. The dashboard review with the chief of staff is the Monday afternoon meeting at which the staff officer walks the chief of staff through the dashboard's current state and the flags the dashboard raises.

The stakeholder map review is the Wednesday meeting at which the staff officer and the chief of staff review the map's entries against the prior week's changes and agree the actions the update implies. The relationship log review is the Thursday meeting at which the two identify the relationships that require the chief of staff's or the principal's personal attention. The escalation protocol is the procedure by which the staff officer takes a flag to the chief of staff, the chief of staff takes the flag to the principal, and the principal directs the action.

A.4 The Monthly and Quarterly Routines

The monthly routine is the coalition health tracker review and the trust assessment support. The coalition health tracker review is the first-week-of-the-month meeting at which the staff officer walks the chief of staff through the tracker's current state and the actions the update implies. The trust assessment support is the staff officer's preparation of the materials the principal requires for the trust assessment the principal conducts with the senior staff. The monthly routine is the lighter of the two periodic routines.

The quarterly routine is the heavier lift. The power audit preparation begins in the second month of the quarter, with the staff officer gathering the indicators and the chief of staff drafting the interim assessment. The network map update, the coalition health tracker formal review, the transition file update, and the scenario rehearsal are the quarterly exercises the staff officer prepares and the principal and the senior staff conduct. The staff officer who keeps the quarterly routine keeps the periodic and event instruments ready for the quarterly strategic review.

A.5 The Annual Routine

The annual routine is the power audit, the toolkit review, and the scenario selection review. The power audit is the full assessment the principal conducts once a year, with the centre's senior staff, of the government's power position: the resources, the dependencies, the coalitions, the networks, and the threats. The staff officer supports the audit with the year's accumulation of dashboard, tracker, and map material, and the audit's output is the power position statement the principal issues. The staff officer's preparation begins in the month before the audit.

The toolkit review is the chief of staff's assessment of whether the instruments are working: whether the daily instruments capture the changes needed, whether the periodic instruments aggregate at the right interval, whether the event instruments are ready, and whether the personal instruments receive the material required. The review's output is the adjustment list: the instruments that need revision, the fields that need addition or removal, the cadences that need shift. The scenario selection review is the annual selection of the four scenarios the quarterly rehearsals will work through.

A.6 Chapter Summary

The staff officer's work is the maintenance of the toolkit's flow through the four tiers and the four routines. The architecture is the four-tier flow: the daily instruments feed the periodic instruments, the periodic instruments feed the event instruments, and all feed the personal instruments. The routines are the cadences by which the staff officer maintains the flow: the daily, the weekly, the monthly and quarterly, and the annual. The staff officer who keeps the routines keeps the toolkit, and the staff officer who breaks the routines breaks the toolkit.

Supporting Document B — The Onboarding Guide for New Centre Staff

The guide for a new staff officer joining the centre: what to read, what to learn, what to do in the first 30 days.

B.1 The First Week

The first week is the reading week. The new staff officer reads the Governing Manual's foundational chapters, the chapters that define the centre, the principal, the chief of staff, the dependencies the government bears, and the coalitions the government works through. The new officer reads the toolkit's instruments, beginning with the stakeholder map and the dependency dashboard, then the weekly briefing and the relationship cultivation log, then the periodic and event instruments, and finally the personal instruments. The reading is the foundation the new officer's later work stands on.

The new officer learns the stakeholder map's current state and the dependency dashboard's current state, with the chief of staff or the designated instrument owner walking the new officer through the entries and the flags. The new officer meets the chief of staff, the instrument owners, and the principal if the principal judges the meeting appropriate. The chief of staff sets the role, the responsibilities, and the first assignments; the instrument owners agree the shadowing schedule; the principal's meeting, where it occurs, introduces the new officer to the authority the centre serves.

B.2 The First Month

The first month is the shadowing month. The new officer shadows the instrument owners through their daily routines: the stakeholder map maintenance, the dependency dashboard update, the weekly briefing production, the relationship cultivation log updates. The shadowing is the observation by which the new officer learns the maintenance protocols, and the new officer asks the questions the protocol's steps raise and reviews the notes with the instrument owner at the end of each day. The shadowing is not passive, and the officer who shadows passively reaches the month's end without the working knowledge the next stage requires.

The new officer learns the maintenance protocols: the cadence, the inputs, the fields, the judgements, and the escalation each instrument requires. The new officer begins taking ownership of one instrument, with the instrument the chief of staff assigns and the instrument owner's supervision, and the ownership is the gradual transfer of the maintenance responsibility over the month's final two weeks. The assessment at the month's end is the chief of staff's judgement of whether the new officer is ready for independent maintenance: whether the cadence is met and whether the entries meet the standard.

B.3 The First Quarter

The first quarter is the independent maintenance quarter. The new officer maintains the assigned instrument independently, with the instrument owner's review shifting from the daily supervision to the weekly check. The independent maintenance is the work by which the new officer consolidates the protocol's discipline, encounters the judgements the protocol's steps require the new officer to make, and develops the working knowledge of the instrument the centre requires. The new officer who maintains the instrument independently for the quarter is the new officer who has learned the instrument.

The new officer participates in the quarterly review, attending as the observer of the centre's strategic assessment and the contributor of the assigned instrument's material. The new officer participates in the scenario rehearsal, taking the role the chief of staff assigns in the scenario the principal has selected. The assessment at the quarter's end is the chief of staff's judgement, with the principal's input, of whether the new officer is ready for full centre duties: whether the instrument is maintained at the standard and whether the officer carries the centre's confidence.

B.4 Chapter Summary

The onboarding proceeds through the first week, the first month, and the first quarter. The first week is the reading week: the new officer reads the foundational chapters and the instruments, learns the current state of the daily instruments, and meets the chief of staff, the instrument owners, and the principal. The first month is the shadowing month, where the new officer shadows the instrument owners and begins taking ownership of one instrument. The first quarter is the independent maintenance quarter, with the assessment at the quarter's end of readiness for full centre duties.

Supporting Document C — The Monthly Review Protocol

The structured monthly review the chief of staff conducts with the centre's staff: the state of each instrument, the issues identified, the actions required.

C.1 The Protocol's Purpose

The monthly review is the discipline that keeps the instruments current and the staff accountable. The review is the chief of staff's assessment of the centre's operational readiness, conducted at the monthly interval with the centre's staff, and the purpose is the assurance that the instruments the centre maintains are the instruments the centre can rely on when the principal calls on them. The instruments that fall behind in the month are the instruments that fail the principal in the event, and the review catches the failure before the principal encounters it.

The review stands apart from the status meeting in three respects. The status meeting reports what has been done; the review assesses whether what has been done is sufficient. The status meeting takes the instruments at the staff's word; the review tests the instruments against the chief of staff's own judgement of what the instruments should show. The status meeting is the meeting the staff can conduct alone; the review is the meeting the chief of staff conducts because the staff cannot.

C.2 The Review Agenda

The review's agenda is structured in six items, with the time allocation set to keep the review within the ninety minutes the chief of staff allots. The dependency dashboard review is the first item, with fifteen minutes devoted to the dashboard's current state, the flags, and the dependencies the chief of staff must take to the principal. The stakeholder map spot-check is the second item, with fifteen minutes devoted to the chief of staff's selection of five entries reviewed in detail, testing the staff's maintenance against the chief of staff's own knowledge of the actors, and the spot-check's selections are not announced in advance.

The coalition health tracker review is the third item, with twenty minutes devoted to the tracker's current state and the actions the update implies. The relationship cultivation log review is the fourth item, with fifteen minutes devoted to the log's entries for the relationships the chief of staff judges most consequential. The emerging risks item is the fifth, with fifteen minutes for the risks the staff and the chief of staff identify for the coming month. The staffing and workload item is the sixth, with ten minutes for the staff's capacity and the adjustments the chief of staff judges necessary.

C.3 The Review Output

The review's output is three lists. The action list is the list of the actions the review identifies as required: the instruments that need update, the entries that need revision, the relationships that

need cultivation, the dependencies that need escalation. Each action is recorded with the owner, the deadline, and the standard the action must meet, and the chief of staff tracks the action list to completion in the month between the reviews. The action that the review records and the chief of staff does not track is the action that the next review finds undone.

The escalation list is the list of the matters requiring the principal's attention: the dependencies, the relationships, the risks, and the decisions the principal must take personally. The escalation list is the list the chief of staff takes to the principal in the meeting the chief of staff holds in the days following the review. The adjustment list is the list of the instruments needing revision, and the urgent adjustments are the adjustments the chief of staff makes before the annual toolkit review.

C.4 Chapter Summary

The monthly review is the chief of staff's assessment of the centre's operational readiness, conducted through a structured agenda and producing three lists. The agenda is the six items the chief of staff works through in the ninety minutes: the dashboard review, the map spot-check, the coalition tracker review, the relationship log review, the emerging risks, and the staffing and workload. The output is the action list, the escalation list, and the adjustment list. The review that does not produce the three lists is the review that has not been conducted.

Supporting Document D — The Quarterly Strategic Review Protocol

The structured quarterly review the principal conducts with the centre's senior staff: the power position, the coalition health, the network landscape, the risk landscape, and the strategic adjustments required.

D.1 The Protocol's Purpose

The quarterly review is the principal's strategic discipline. The review is the assessment the principal conducts once a quarter, with the centre's senior staff, of the government's power position, the coalition health, the network landscape, the risk landscape, and the strategic adjustments the assessment implies. The purpose is the assurance that the strategic direction the principal has set remains the direction the government's position supports. The principal who does not conduct the review governs on assumptions the present quarter's position no longer supports.

The principal owns the review. The chief of staff prepares the review, gathers the material, briefs the principal in advance, and supports the principal through the review's conduct. The principal leads the review, makes the strategic assessments, and takes the strategic decisions the review's assessments imply. The chief of staff who treats the review as the chief of staff's review has taken the principal's strategic discipline from the principal, and the principal who treats the review as the chief of staff's review has surrendered the strategic discipline the principal alone can exercise.

D.2 The Review Agenda

The review's agenda is structured in six items, with the time allocation set to keep the review within the half-day the principal allots. The power audit interim review is the first item, with forty-five minutes devoted to the audit's interim assessment, the shifts in the power position since the prior review, and the implications for the strategic direction. The coalition health tracker formal review is the second item, with forty-five minutes devoted to the tracker's full review, the members whose health has shifted, and the actions the coalition's health implies, and the two items establish the strategic frame for the remaining four.

The network map update review is the third item, with thirty minutes for the network landscape's shifts and the implications for the centre's reach. The transition file update review is the fourth item, with thirty minutes for the file's currency and the principal's directions on the file's contents. The scenario rehearsal assessment is the fifth item, with thirty minutes for the scenario rehearsed in the quarter and the implications for the centre's preparedness. The toolkit review is the sixth item, with thirty minutes for the chief of staff's report on the instruments' working and the principal's directions on the adjustments.

D.3 The Review Output

The review's output is four sets of decisions. The strategic adjustment decisions are the decisions the principal takes on the strategic direction, the policy priorities, the coalition management, and the engagement strategy, with each decision recorded in the decision record. The strategic adjustments are the adjustments the government's power position requires, and the principal who does not make the adjustments the position requires governs against the position and loses the position's support. The strategic adjustment decisions are the review's heaviest output, taken in the review's final hour on the basis of the agenda's preceding five items.

The instrument revision decisions are the decisions the principal takes on the toolkit's instruments: the revisions, the cadences, and the protocols the centre will adjust. The staffing and resource decisions are the decisions on the centre's staff and resources: the staff the centre needs, the staff the centre must release, the resources the centre must allocate, and the resources the centre must shift. The escalation to the principal's personal attention is the list of the matters requiring the principal's direct engagement: the relationships, the negotiations, the crises, and the decisions the principal must take personally.

D.4 Chapter Summary

The quarterly strategic review is the principal's strategic discipline, conducted through a structured agenda and producing four sets of decisions. The agenda is the six items the principal works through in the half-day: the power audit interim review, the coalition health tracker formal review, the network map update review, the transition file update review, the scenario rehearsal assessment, and the toolkit review. The output is the strategic adjustment decisions, the instrument revision decisions, the staffing and resource decisions, and the escalation to the principal's personal attention.