

EUROPEAID/129783/C/SER/multi - Lot 1: Studies and Technical assistance in all sectors

Request For Services No 2012/289343

Assistance in the implementation of consultations and research linked to the preparation of the Communication on civil society in development and to the set up of the Policy Forum for Development with CSO and LAs

Tome II

Annexes to the report on the key results of the on-line consultation on the issues paper

"CSOs in Development Cooperation"

Drafted by
Beatriz Sanz Corella
An Van Goey



This project is funded by
The European Union



A project implemented by
Business and Strategies Europe

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

The suggestions and views put forward in this document have been used to feed the drafting of the forthcoming Communication. They also provide input for other programming and operational guidance documents. However, they do not prejudge the form or content of the Communication or any future proposal of the European Commission.

Annex 1 – List of contributors

Listed below are only those respondents who agreed to have their identity published.

1	YPC	Armenia
3	LUCOFIVA	Cameroon
4	BHRRL	Kyrgyzstan
7	Mission CLARITE	Cameroon
8	GBRSP	Pakistan
12	Center for Strategic Studies	Ukraine
15	Human Inborn Freedom	Cambodia
21	ADINJA	Nicaragua
22	Social initiative for Development	Kenya
26	Wa Municipal TPA - SMC Coalition	Ghana
27	TIPA	Mauritius
33	Tarayana Foundation	Bhutan
37	Association des Amis de la Nature	Burundi
38	European University Institute	Italy
42	ASBRAD	Brazil
43	Plan International	Vietnam
46	Observatoire Burundais des Prisons	Burundi
54	Interact Worldwide	UK
55	CEDES	Mexico
56	AFRICAphonie	Cameroon
59	Union Sindical Obrera - SOTERMUNN	Spain
62	ACOANA	Venezuela
64	CAJEF	Senegal
70	CONGCOOP	Guatemala
71	Agrupacion Ciudadana de Turismo y Recreacion de Pelluhue	Chile
73	IPON	Philippines
75	Association Haiti Tchaka Danse HTD	Haiti
77	Trocaire	Ireland
79	CIDSE	Belgium
81	ACTED	Kyrgyzstan
82	HELVETA Swiss Intercooperation	Bhutan
84	Peace Training and Research Organisation	Afghanistan
87	ONG Lalana	Madagascar
93	KEPA	Finland
96	IDDC	Belgium
97	CARI	France
101	PROFAMILIA	Nicaragua
102	ASHONPLAFA	Honduras
105	FUNDAP	Guatemala
106	Hub Impulsor Social AC	Mexico
112	JURIX	Russia
113	(European) Solidarity	Israel
114	Development and Environment	Ukraine
115	AC Colombia	Colombia
120	Center of Strategic Research and Development	Georgia
121	Hivos	Netherlands
124	Resource Center for Elderly	Kyrgyzstan
126	GRDR	France
128	YADD	Cameroon

129	Finnish NGO Platform to the EU	Finland
130	WACSI	Ghana
132	Arab Women Organisation of Jordan	Jordan
133	AFJT	Chad
134	VSO International	UK
135	GCFV	Haiti
139	Project Keshet Jewish Women's HR Organisation	Russia
145	People's Empowerment Foundation	Thailand
146	Copenhagen Initiative for Central America and Mexico	Belgium
150	ASSOAL	Cameroon
152	Brainforest	Gabon
153	WWF European Policy Office	Belgium
156	Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat	Ethiopia
161	Intervita Onlus	Italy
162	Save the Children	Belgium
163	CONCORD	Belgium
165	LIPASCECU	Philippines
168	People for Peace and Defense of Rights	Uganda
170	BENFAM	Brazil
173	Associazione ONG Italiane National Platform	Italy
174	GREGED	Morocco
177	AVSI	Lebanon
186	ABEMO Women Vision	Cameroon
188	ARISO	Mozambique
190	World Solidarity	Belgium
195	Clean Clothes Campaign	Netherlands
196	AVSI Polska	Poland
197	AVSI Foundation	Italy
199	Fenomena Asociacion	Serbia
200	AVSI	Ecuador
203	AJECEI	Ivory Coast
205	Club des Amis	Ivory Coast
207	East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project	Uganda
209	People's Development Foundation	Romania
210	SlowFood	Italy
216	Euclid Network	UK
217	Centre for European Transformation	Belarus
218	EPLO	Belgium
220	PODEC	Colombia
223	Cooperatives Europe	Belgium
228	Reseau Mad'Aids	Madagascar
231	Asia Pacific Research Network	Philippines
233	FIFATA	Madagascar
235	Oxfam International	Netherlands
237	Institut Panos Paris	France
238	OGRADIE	Ivory Coast
242	Association Green Alternative	Georgia
243	VRUTTI	India
244	IPPF	Belgium
245	IBON International	Philippines
247	Transparency International	Germany
249	I'ADIS	Burundi
250	Hanns Seider Stiftung	Germany

251	Heinrich Boll Stiftung	Germany
253	AVSI	Brazil
255	Sociedade Aberta	Mozambique
256	Welthungerhilfe	Germany
264	WECF	Netherlands
268	Convention de la Société Civile Ivoirienne	Ivory Coast
269	Transparencia Mexicana	Mexico
271	Fundacion Matrix	Spain
272	ACV CSC	Belgium
274	ECNL	Hungary
275	OIS Afrique	Ivory Coast
276	Kingston Restoration Company Limited	Jamaica
279	DWW	Czech Republic
281	Mujer y Ciudadania	Venezuela
284	Fundacion FODESA	Guatemala
286	YUCOM	Serbia
288	Fundacion ESPERANZA	Colombia
289	INECIP	Argentina
293	Transparency Institute	Trinidad and Tobago
294	Provincia Activa	Chile
297	OSC	Burundi
298	PNGO	OPT
302	Equipo de formacion informacion y publicaciones	Venezuela
306	Action for Global Health	EU
307	Eurasia Partnership Foundation	Georgia
308	Equidad de Genero	Mexico
313	Coordination SUD	France
319	Obras Educativas Padre Giussani	Brazil
320	International Labor Organization (ILO)	Belgium
321	ENOP	Belgium
322	Red Cross	Belgium

Annex 2 - Other ideas expressed by respondents

QUESTION 1: How can CSOs apply in their activities the Aid and Development Effectiveness principles of Busan?

- CSOs should align work plans with those of governments at various levels whenever possible, in order to avoid duplication of services and waste of resources (use resources openly). They should work in particularly close cooperation with LAs (x 7).
- CSOs must be dedicated to continually serving people and not their own organisational interests. CSOs that are committed to serving people and protecting rights shall adhere to the Busan Principles and treat them as the backbone of their work (x2).
- CSOs should engage in consultation with clients, embrace openness to networking and cooperation and show a willingness to become critical friends to government and to their own sector. Greater willingness amongst CSOs to cooperate with other CSOs and get past zero-sum, one-man-band models are important.
- Fund-related regulation should not curtail the freedom of CSOs. The main drawback in the 'Aid Effectiveness' approach is that CSOs assume the role of "mini-donors," leading every activity to become fund-centric, and the CSO to 'think, speak and act *for* the people'. Contrastingly, in the 'Development Effectiveness' approach the CSO plays the role of a facilitator, so every activity then becomes 'people-centric' and the CSO 'thinks, speaks and acts *with* the people'.
- In terms of the practical application of the principles on development effectiveness, regular meetings between governments and CSOs are important because the government is the registering body for CSOs in a number of countries. CSOs should aim to involve government as much as possible in their work, combating the unhelpful 'them and us' culture.
- A database on CSO funded/implemented projects, including budgets, should be made available, as transparency and accountability bring trust to the relations between communities, CSOs, local governments and donors. Also, capacity building is needed in areas such as public speaking, and facilitation will enhance the CSOs ability to contribute to development policy and advocacy issues.

QUESTION 2: How do you think that different actors, including the EU, could help to promote an enabling environment for CSO (a) in repressive regimes, (b) in fragile / conflict countries, (c) other countries? Can you suggest good practices?

2.1. About the political role of EU & donors & strategies:

In general (all contexts):

The EU is called on to:

- Encourage a clear division of labour between the various stakeholders whilst ensuring that the multi-stakeholder dialogue on CSO Development Effectiveness and the Enabling Environment is continued and the commitments made in Busan by countries and CSOs are followed up. The EU (including the EC and its MS) should support the initiative of a Building Block on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (x3).

- Promote CSO leadership (x3) as well as broad campaigns raising the profiles of CSOs and their work in partner countries. Actively engage in public outreach activities that explain complex development issues at the grass-roots level, and make better use of social media and ICTs (x2).
- Build the legal framework for CSOs beyond minimum standards to maximize their contribution to development. The enabling environment for CSOs in its broader meaning is usually not the top priority for these governments even though some issues are crucial for socio-economic development, e.g. public participation and CSO sustainability. Support actions can be directed at assessing such needs, bringing them to government's agenda and facilitating their continued involvement. For example, EC shall stay at the forefront of ensuring participatory processes, engaging both governments and CSOs when designing and implementing development cooperation programmes.
- Change the processes for "consultation" and dialogue with CSO, as these are important tools, which also help to determine the landscape of active local CSOs, to gain timely information about the potential threats to CSOs, and to better target specific support. The issues of better planning and timing for invitations, broader dissemination of invitations and information (beyond those with EU funding), enabling access to a broader range of CSOs, languages, appropriate feedback loops, and ensuring the use of the information for decision-making must be resolved immediately. Far too often consultations still are carried out in piecemeal, inconsistent and untimely ways. In difficult contexts, the problems are compounded. Key local spokespersons and analysts may not be in the capital city and cannot be available or travel on short notice. Also, the EU should lead in enhancing the access of locals from a broader geographical range to decision-makers of the EU and other multilateral and bilateral actors.
- Refrain from imposing a model of organisation and functioning of CS, but instead build on existing structures in respect of local societal and cultural factors and dynamics, as well as in respect of CS diversity.
- Define cooperation with governments and CSOs as separate entities and consider GONGOs (or 'surrogate CSOs') differently from rest of CSOs, which are independent. Compensate high-performing CSOs and punish poor-performing CSOs.
- Respect the right of CSO to self-define their representation. CS itself should drive selection of CS representatives and interlocutors in case of dialogue and consultation. Offering sufficient number of seats (adapted to the way CS is organised) and being transparent about the process and its objectives (public announcements through adequate communication means) are pre-conditions for fair and effective representation and for avoiding fostering competition and mistrust in CS. In case of international events, facilitation of visa delivery are a key element of support.
- Do not withdraw from states where economy shows signs of improvement, as economic growth does not necessarily translate to social equity and development.
- Invest in building capacity of the EC delegation staff in understanding the CSO enabling environment, and establish a structured dialogue with CSOs to ensure their participation in developing Delegation's priorities. This must figure clearly in the job descriptions of all Delegation staff, most importantly the Head of Delegation and the civil society focal points. Unfortunately, the reality is quite different today. Colleagues in Delegations are overburdened by paperwork; they are so concerned about doing things right (procedures), that they have little time to think about whether they are doing the right thing. The engagement with civil society in all EU Delegations should also be seen as an integral and essential aspect of EU support to governance, democratisation and human rights.

- Hold hearings in the European Parliament to highlight concerns. The Delegations of the European Parliament have proven to be an effective instrument to improve the context of CSOs work and their visits in partner countries should always include meetings with CSOs. These delegations should play an even more important role (x3).
- Award more space in EU cooperation programmes to LAs.

In repressive and fragile contexts:

- It is critical in times of transition to ensure the decentralized solutions and ample participation of CSOs in accountability, so that there will not be an increase of frustration.
- Additionally, in fragile conditions it is important to engage as early as possible in building up an enabling environment for CSOs in order to ensure a positive impact on the capacity and sustainability of the CSO sector in the longer run. There are several important variables that contribute to the sustainability of the efforts. The following are critical in countries with fragile environments: (i) building capacity of both CS and government on CSO legal issues, (ii) encouraging cross-sectoral partnership and communication, (iii) encouraging policy processes that are inclusive and participatory, (iii) supporting progressive implementation of laws on CS and (iv) providing long-term capacity support to stakeholders on CS enabling environment (e.g., through fellowships, NGO law courses and longer term engagement).
- It is also important to make a clear distinction between local civil society organisations able and willing to contribute to improving good governance, and branches of international organisations which may be much more aligned with (potentially repressive) governments and have a single focus on conservation (thereby often undermining more governance oriented civil society organisations that are willing to stand up for rights). Also, the needs of vulnerable groups and the inclusion of their representative organisations should be duly considered.
- On an operational level, the EU should simplify the rules governing the management of grants. This could enable a much broader range of CSOs, including small, grassroots and community-based organisations, to benefit from EU funding, and thus expand their activities to include policy dialogue and monitoring activities.

2.2. About Civil Society, itself, and Human Rights defenders

- Reaffirm political engagement by CSOs and take part in the policymaking to perform checks and balances (x8). Also, CSOs should engage in open and transparent dialogue, even about potential conflicts and areas of disagreement.
- Improve M&E systems, enhance CS structuring and networking, and improve governance systems to prove reliability and responsibility (x7).
- Use popular (e.g. social media) and traditional (e.g. theatre) communication strategies alongside one another, as well as informal education/theatre.
- Support peace-building, with strategies directed towards democratic development. Particularly, human rights defenders should build on and improve existing coordinating networks aimed at strengthening the protection of defenders and the solidarity among them, particularly those outside

the capital and/or dealing with sensitive topics. These networks could also carry out joint activities on a regular basis, such as the monitoring of places of detention. Protection networks could also be extended to the region, which could provide an additional layer of protection

2.3. About governments (including local governments):

- To governments, the recommendations mainly revolve around dialogue and cooperation, including: the legal framework and CS registration issues, strengthening democracy and participation, lessening government control/regulation, taxation and funding concerns, transparency and realization of national and international commitments, and recognition.

2.4. About funding schemes and modalities (in general):

The EU is called to:

- Coordinate and adapt modalities of support to CS in a permanent way. Each support mechanism needs to be strategically positioned in the social, economic, institutional, cultural, as well as political context of the country in which it is implemented. It should be noted that CSO support programmes can never be “neutral” as regards the context in which they are intervening and, more importantly, in the context of CS (x4).
- Establish more systematic approaches, trainings and incentives on engagement with and in support of CS, and harmonise them in all Delegations so that engagement is not dependent on individual interest and good will. In particular, the EU should consider simplifying procedures, making access to CS-funding easier for grass roots CSOs, and be careful not to favour certain aspects of CS action or certain categories of actors to the detriment of others (x2).
- Provide CSOs with small-scale (and easy to obtain) grants, and make core support available to CSOs (particularly for networks and platforms). An idea would be to use INGOs and local, well-established CSOs to channel funds.
- Support initiatives that allow forms of cooperation, thus reducing conflict and competition among CSOs, and develop a merit-based assessments of potential grantees (x2).
- Assist CSOs to acquire basic equipment and tools for their activities, sending foreign experts to share their expertise and best practices with CSOs (especially newly funded ones), and coach them on receiving funding from abroad, etc.
- Create 'CSO community centres' as places with working space which different CSOs or activist groups can use for their activities on the basis similar to co-working place initiatives.

2.5. Views diverging from the paper views and from other respondents:

- Enhanced cooperation between the State and CS even in repressive regimes should be encouraged by the EU (x2).
- Bilateral aid should be directly channelled to CSOs, as bilateral aid is subject to corruption and misappropriation.

QUESTION 3: What, in your experience, are good indicators to measure progress in the area of “enabling environment” for CSOs

3.1. Other ideas about indicators:

- Range of CS activities (x5)
- Number of beneficiaries (x5)
- Number of youths actively engaged
- Effective CSO delivery of rapid response actions
- Existence of local development plans
- Linkages between national and international agendas
- Government attendance to CSO-organised events
- Number of websites created by CSOs

3.2. General indicators (not SMART)

- Good governance and participatory democracy
- Culture of participation and volunteerism
- Social and economic cohesion (x2)
- Social recognition, credibility and trust towards CSOs from all actors and sectors
- Accountability and openness to the public on the work of civil society
- Qualitative changes for the beneficiaries
- Reduction of police violence at demonstrations and greater acknowledgement and respect of stakeholders’ right to protest
- Political stability
- The standard of living and education

QUESTION 4: How could the media, including social media, contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs

- In addition to traditional print, TV and radio broadcasts, online social media further speeds up the transmission of information to broader audiences and across borders. Social media represents greater freedom, as media campaigns and issues raised can be initiated from the grassroots, from the ‘bottom-up’. Besides, social media is controlled and operated by citizens and allows CSOs to become their own spokesperson (x3).
- Social media can also be a useful tool for shining a spotlight on social issues through art and culture, such as locally produced plays, art and drama. The power of art and culture in social and economic transformation processes is currently under-utilized (x2).
- As recent events in the Arab world show, social media has a great mobilization effect, which has resulted in attempts of stricter regulation applied by some governments. The events in the Middle East and North Africa highlight the need to examine the legal protections for associations, assemblies, and dissent in the digital age. Freedom of opinion and expression have been most commonly cited as the primary legal bases to combat government interference with Internet access, but Internet freedom is also integrally linked with the rights of association and assembly. As recent events around the world demonstrate, governments are specifically using Internet restrictions to impede protests (i.e., assemblies, associations, and other online connections).
- While in some countries social media is the main communication means between CS and the broader public, in other contexts use of social media, albeit playing a role of paramount importance, is still limited and needs to be further promoted. In societies where the rate of literacy is low and access to

new communication technologies is limited, radio and television are of particular importance in outreach at the community level. This may also include traditional means of communication such as public town crier and theatre-action. From that point of view, community based rural or urban radio established by CS in developing countries represent a powerful tool to reach and inform the citizens at the grassroots level about their rights, entitlements and obligations, and a means to allow people to people exchange and learning processes (including for the spreading of technical knowledge in the areas of farming, health, children care, sanitation etc.).

- It is also important to beware that the contrary is possible too; that is to say, media can sometimes take sides, reinforcing prejudices, muddling the facts and peddling half-truths. In this regard, it is important to underline that media should not demonize CSOs and should be educated to provide information in "easy to read" format which is adjusted to persons, also with different disabilities. Media should regularly publish the tendencies (local, regional or national polls) on issues that hinge on democratic governance (Provision of quality basic services, responsiveness and accountability).
- The question also reads the other way around: How could the EU enable CSOs to do more to safeguard spaces for independent media, including social media, as free media plays an important role in addressing issues that matter to all citizens, and contributes to transparent and accountable government. In many countries these agents of change, who vigorously condemn the government or human rights abuses, can face persecution. Free media needs to be supported in order to assist CSOs in their work. The EU and other donors can facilitate the process of freedom of expression through: (i) Facilitating projects through funding and capacity building; (ii) Ensuring free access on Internet, and; (iii) Monitoring western companies that provide surveillance and censorship technology to curtain CSOs and critical citizens.
- As regards proposed action, more coordination is needed with clear objectives, covering grassroots media activities - simple and comprehensive. Community radio is of particular importance in places where other media channels are absent (x3). In addition, more funding has to be directed towards the education of communities. There is also a need to generate a social responsibility culture (for themselves as well as for governments), to improve technology to strengthen the links between exile media and citizen journalists, and to put greater pressure on social media companies to not kowtow to governments
- There is also need to invest in the professionalization of media and promote the creation and observation of an appropriate regulatory regime (for instance, laws on libel and on incitement of hatred). The endorsement of ethical codes like those of EU journalists can lead to well-informed, non-biased coverage on CSOs.

Question 5: What are, in your experience, the challenges and opportunities for CSO involvement in policy dialogues, including in terms of institutional mechanisms and operational rules? Can you provide good examples?

All ideas are included in the main report.

Question 6: How can progress related to CSO participation in policy dialogues at country level be measured and monitored?

6.1. Other Indicators:

- Free, prior, informed consent as a pre-requisite for any serious projects with environmental impacts (such as dams, power stations, mines, etc.) or social sector reforms (x3).

- Press coverage of policy dialogues.
- Number of government officials participating in policy dialogue.
- Scope and timeliness of accessible information on the policy initiatives.
- Ability to exist, register, secure funding and participate in public affairs with freedom of expression and information.
- Less threats/pressure by vested interests (rich and politicians).
- National and international budgets for CSOs.
- Number of CSO forums.
- Number of advocacy campaigns.

6.2. Sources of verification:

- Reports by both government and CSO platforms & think tanks (e.g. Proceedings of dialogue signed by mixed committees) (x10)
- Web pages of line ministries (x5)
- CS Monthly/quarterly or annual progress reports and then the follow up action plan and results (x6)
- Baseline studies to assess CS involvement in policy making (x5)
- Government decisions before and after advocacy work (x3).
- Testimonies by the CSOs themselves (including case stories).
- Evaluation or audit reports and then the counter action plan and results (x3)
- Policy briefs developed and disseminated by CSO (x2).
- Mappings of CS activity and capacity.
- Field visits. CSOs may be doing terrific job on the ground but little resources to show the results. In this case it is important to enter in a close dialogue with them.
- Embassy reports.

Question 7: What are the most effective entry points for CSOs in “participatory budgetary processes”?

- Champions need to be identified within the government, at national and local levels (x3).
- CSO could work towards being accepted as a service or resource provider by government, but without losing the focus on the needs of their constituency. In particular, CSOs could aim to pilot good practice with government in order to jointly establish what works. This could be followed by advocacy to ensure that government then commits to replicating successful projects. If CSO pilot projects prove successful, then Governments could help finance scaling up whilst continuously responding to the fast changing realities on the ground (socio-cultural, economical, as well as environmental) (x3).
- Transparent (and reasonably disaggregated) budgets with lessons learned at all levels (of policies, programs and projects) must be published and used for further improvements. This creates shared accountability for development results by policy-makers (parliaments etc.) and executive bodies, as well as for the taxpayers. To this end, ICTs could be used (e.g. E-budget processes allow a maximum of transparency).
- Unfortunately, this is not yet a reality in many countries (x3).

Question 8:

(i) Responding to the Communication on Budget Support, how could the EU promote CSOs role in “domestic accountability” and in oversight functions?

- The issue of trust is fundamental since “agendas can be skewed towards the agenda of those who pay the piper.” The EU can help in setting up consultative forums where governments outline their draft

plans and the CSOs can provide input as part of review processes. The EU should also promote the involvement of CSOs in tracking community budget expenditures. To do so, several tools are proposed, including: (i) A social audit - a well-structured participatory and empowering process, whereby citizens assess the performance of local authorities – and, (ii) A Citizen Report Card (CRC), which is a survey undertaken by the constituencies of public institutions that provides a quantitative view of how users perceive the quality, effectiveness and suitability of public services. The CRCs differ from traditional surveys because they possess inherent mechanisms to disseminate and integrate actions. The tool helps public institutions to engage in open discussions about their performance and thereby improve in response to user demands. In addition, public hearings are open fora where citizens can interact with officials on development plans and initiatives taking place in their constituency. In this way, public hearings provide a venue for the whole community, rather than just a handful of committed interest groups, to engage with local government in a transparent and accountable manner.

- Support networks and their role of circulation of information; including pre budget CSO forums, budget hearings, memoranda preparation and presentation to budget committees and budget office, etc.
- Allow the programming to be demand driven, provide funding and technical support to the level that local media will allow, use examples from other countries in the region, identify and work with champions in government and media
- Include social partners in policy dialogue at national and European level when it comes to planning, implementing and monitoring of several issues, including: social policies, sustainable employment policies and labour rights, social protection/social protection floors, socio-economic growth and role of the private sector.
- Develop partnerships for strengthening 'think tanking.' Think tanks and other policy relevant institutions need EU support, as such backing can greatly enhance the quality and quantity of policy research and policy inputs. This, in turn, can bolster CSOs towards taking proactive stances armed with the power of evocative and elaborative information for successful advocacy.
- Help in establishing full time working offices to function as budget observers and policy analysts, consisting of the representatives of CSOs. These offices should also conduct market analysis and onsite assessments of the government projects to find effectiveness, challenges and improvement options.

Question 9: In your opinion, what criteria should be used to ensure that representative and legitimate CSOs take part in policy dialogue and in budgetary oversight work?

All ideas are included in the main report.

QUESTION 10: In your opinion, what should be the role of European and International CSOs in supporting local CSO participation in policy processes and oversight functions including at country level?

10.1. Other ideas

- Assist in the identification of committed and independent local CSOs.
- Raise the status of local CSOs and the profile of issues by “being in the same room as them” and their stakeholders.

- Support media to work closely with CSOs and assist in the production of key messages as part of capacity strengthening and mentoring.
- Collaborate to advocate for a standardization in the grant application process. More translation in local languages is necessary (not just for applications, but also for consultations like this one).
- In terms of added value or comparative advantage of EU NGOs they offer the following: (i) Proximity and long-term linkages with what is happening at field level (witness role); (ii) Proximity to decision makers in Europe that have a prominent role in international affairs (question of the impact of our policy and advocacy work); (iii) Capacity to analyse and communicate the complex mechanisms of EU decision-making and the policy and regulation aquis, and to identify appropriate targets in the Institutions and; (iv) Capacity to mobilize the public in the EU, to make noise and put pressure on our governments and the international community.

10.2. Diverging views

- While some CSOs share the view that enhanced transfer of skills and expertise (e.g. Quality insurance, monitoring, evaluation and learning, dissemination, new tools and approaches, etc.) is necessary from INGOs to local CSOs, others argue for no enhanced transfer of skills and expertise as ‘the period of time when local NGOs needed ordinary training has passed’ and local CSOs should have more autonomy vis-à-vis International CSOs (x3).
- International CSOs may push their own hidden agendas (x2).

QUESTION 11: What approaches should be developed to improve donor support to Capacity Development of CSOs?

11.1. Other ideas

- Strengthen support to regional and cross-national CSO networks. Such coalitions bring together different local governments, increase political dialogue at regional level, put peer pressure on stakeholders, and transnational issues are better taken up.
- Besides NGOs, also cover professional unions, political parties (the most immature institution), religious groups, and most importantly, youth business associations (as job creators).
- Based on Central and Eastern European (CEE) experience, investing in the sustainability of CSOs through supporting development of local funding mechanisms is essential. This can be achieved through several means including incentives for income generation, nurturing the development of a philanthropic culture, strategic support for institutional development to CSOs, and critically - even though this is mostly neglected - through building up domestic philanthropic foundations that can carry on support of the sector once foreign donors phase out or withdraw (x2).
- Promote the sustainable, social development paradigm by fighting inequality, implementing the Decent Work Agenda, establishing social protection mechanisms (such as social protection floors), foster green jobs, strengthening balanced labour market development, progressive taxation and fiscal programmes and just trade and investment rules, as well as ensuring social, economic and ecological coherence in public and private policies.

- About funding modalities:
 - Suppress the co-funding requirement.
 - Respect the Right of Initiative of CSOs.

- About topics/themes/sectors to be privileged within CD:
 - Support OD in relevant topics such as gender, risk management, sustainable development, etc.
 - Focus on the leadership and strategic management of CSOs (x2).
 - Focus on how to build strong relationships with all sectors (the private sector, the government, the media, the community/LA, and other CSOs.) and on-line activism.
 - Promote intercultural exchanges.
 - Develop the professional capacities of young people (e.g. leadership skills, professional competencies and civic consciousness).
 - Provide scholarships (x4) and support internships.
 - Invest in local staff human resources and in sustainable long-term mechanism to ensure the implementation of systems and common practices.
 - Promote high-quality and corporate volunteerism.
 - Move away from service delivery (as this is part of LAs' core competencies).

11.2. Bad practices

- Cumbersome and bureaucratic funding procedures.
- Funding not linked to donor countries' foreign policy
- Funding for capacity building creating dependency

QUESTION 12: What are the role and added value of international /EU based CSOs in this area?

12.1. Other ideas

- European and International CSOs should support local CSOs to bear the burden of the heavy administrative reporting imposed by the EU, and gradually help national CSOs to take over (x2). They also need to better coordinate their efforts to avoid duplication.
- They need to adopt a bottom up approach to bring on board small CSOs, and build on the comparative advantages and complementarities of each partner.
- They can place volunteers at local CSOs with a support role.

12.1. Diverging or nuanced views

- European CSOs' role is decreasing (x2).
- Being international in nature does not ensure good insight in the issues, country contexts, good practice at home and many other criteria.

QUESTION 13: What are, in your opinion, the main challenges CSOs face in implementing these mechanisms for improving internal governance? How can CSOs monitor progress in the implementation of such mechanisms?

All ideas are included in the main report.

QUESTION 14: Should the EU support CSOs in implementing mechanisms for improving internal governance? If yes how?

Other ideas from those having answered yes:

- CSOs are often limited in resources and do not always have the capacity to improve mechanisms. Providing training will help CSOs gather new insights, skills and experiences (x4).
- The EU can generally support mechanisms of long-term peer review in order to establish well-rooted practices and sustainability. Such mechanisms require follow up and need to be funded in the longer term to also ensure independence and autonomy of CSOs in the future.
- The EU could also support the development of accreditation tools, reward the best practices and promote peer-mechanisms and South-to-South exchanges.
- It is also important to ensure the translation of relevant tools and documents to the local language. Many tools are developed in English, and are therefore only accessible to the minority that is often in the leadership positions, but do not reach constituencies. It is thus important that documents and tools be translated into the local languages so that all members can embrace the processes and use the tools.
- These support mechanisms should be integrated into project funding (as a component).

QUESTION 15: Are there other key elements, in addition to the ones discussed above, to be considered in building a solid and informed EU engagement with local CSOs in a given country?

- Link CSO support to visible CSO involvement into Performance Contracts (“put external pressure”) and gain a better understanding of CSOs’ phases/ stages of development (x4) as they condition CSOs capacity development needs.
- Gain a better understanding of the role of CSOs not only as traditional development organisations but also as social enterprises, delivering vital services on the ground whilst contributing to sustainable economic growth and employment. Social enterprises stand for a delivery of social services, whilst being independent (partially or completely) from public funding. They therefore contribute towards a sustainable development model. Some developing countries have already strongly embraced these concepts (x2).
- Build the capacity of CSOs to engage more with the private sector. In the present global economy private companies are playing an important role and CSR as a concept is getting much more important. The EU should consider ways to facilitate and support strategic dialogue and engagement between the private sector and CSOs.
- Put gender at centre stage of all development issues and better integrate minorities and vulnerable groups (also by developing adequate funding mechanisms) (x3).
- Embark on capacity building exercises with tie-in from universities and institutions. Also, identify champions within research institutions and government, and provide governments with EU support grants when they are willing to support CSOs, with a view to lay a basis for CSO accessing funds from government in future.

- Facilitate local CSO capacity to input to UN reporting mechanisms on Human Rights, including submitting shadow reports to the UN treaty bodies. The EU could work more closely with international organisations to coordinate reporting deadlines, making the process more transparent and easier. Funding could also be made available to conduct country-based training around these issues.
- Revise the requirement to be registered at PADOR.

QUESTION 16: How should country level political dynamics be considered in engaging with CSOs and supporting their governance roles?

16.1. Other ideas

- Respect the impartiality of CSOs and work with non-political CSOs (x3). Beyond their role as service delivery or providers, CSOs have a critical role in defending democratic principles and country ownership.
- As set in the Structured Dialogue's recommendations, national policy dialogues including the CSOs platform and the LAs national association should be encouraged by donors when discussing their programming strategies at country level.
- Be aware that the capital is not the country. There is often more space for sustained and effective cooperation and capacity building outside the capital, especially in semi-federal countries. However, this comes with higher transaction costs and more complicated monitoring requirements, which should be recognised in the type and duration of support that the EU offers to CSO country sectors. Consultation with opposition parties and figures, where they exist, should be encouraged in order to propagate and normalise often under-developed understandings of public debate and its desirability.
- Ensure sufficient flexibility to accommodate changes in plans, delays or redirection of resources (especially in conflict situations) and grant more visibility to EU support.

16.2. Diverging views:

- Political dynamics are important but not decisive. They should only be taken into account when they endanger enabling environments.
- Donors should encourage partner CSOs to follow regulations of governments.

QUESTION 17: In your view, what are the implications and opportunities for CSOs related to the above-mentioned trends?

17.1. About opportunities:

- Institutionalisation of participatory mechanisms such as social dialogue or Economic and Social Committees can play an important role in structuring representation and accountability across societal borders. Yet, when it comes to more fluid forms of civic engagement, CSOs should support these spontaneous movements in pursuing their goals but not aim at integrating them into formalised structures. (2x)
- CSOs positive interventions are deeply linked to their enabling environment's (fiscal, legal, media).

- Confidence of the public system in CSOs' reliability, commitment of CSOs to be accountable, sustainable, transparent, effective and capable are all integral.
- CSOs have the ability to respond quicker and more efficiently than public structures to new challenges.
- Development education is useful to contribute to ending poverty.
- There is a need to better explore opportunities offered by South-to-South cooperation
- There are new sources of funding available.
 - 1) Contributions from Diaspora groups can be channelled and targeted towards specific projects (i.e. by using mobile crowd funding).
 - 2) Philanthropist Awards can encourage this trend of private funding of CSOs (<http://www.partnersalbania.org/index.php?fq=brenda&m=shfaqart&gj=gj2&aid=>
 - 3) Social investment that funds social enterprises and expects a return on investment. (see: <http://www.thesocialinvestmentbusiness.org/our-funds/seif/>). There are a multitude of financial products for the social market being developed at the moment, which can offer new opportunities for CS to become more sustainable.

17.2. About risks:

- If civic actions are made on the basis of emotions or immediate reaction to a situation, they can create more confusion and hatred, possibly from both sides depending which side CSOs support or stand with.
- Diaspora can also have a malign effect by embracing romanticised, conservative notions of the "Old Country" and resisting social and political progress in the home country. In some instances, they can re-import national or regional political conflicts to their home countries. Ireland's Diaspora in the USA, or the role of returning Armenian Diaspora politicians in Caucasus politics post-1991, are testament to that. It must therefore not be assumed that the Diaspora is automatically a benign force for a country's development. It's difficult to argue that the EU should attempt to engage with Diaspora politicians or communities wherever in the world they live but it should be possible, for instance, for the EU Delegation in the UK to host an event for leaders of Britain's Bengali population to promote the EU assistance in Bangladesh, and to get across a few ideas about representative democracy at the same time. There are risks associated with this approach, but there are also risks associated with ignoring Diaspora.
- Local CSOs' relations to external actors or the Diaspora may be controlled by the government and/or elitist groups.
- Private initiatives provide opportunities and threats at the same time. The local level of the "do it yourself" trend, with a few exceptions, is not the biggest driver of change in the CSO ecosystem. The small scale of projects might help at micro level, but usually does not bring about structural change at a medium or larger scale (x4).
- The role of new actors, like China, can be a threat to CSOs

QUESTION 18: How should the EU respond to these trends in your opinion?

- **Integrate these new trends in CFP thematic as well as bilateral cooperation.** Within each call for proposals the EU could also create space for one or two more risky proposals. These proposals need to be highly innovative and could potentially have a large impact. They might not be able to meet all the criteria as they have no track record yet, but the potential might be very interesting. Within the new framework of 2014-2020, it might be a possibility to blend in this new approach.
- **Take into account migrant organisations as CS actors** and to support cooperation between other CS actors and migrant organisations in all aspects of their programmes, including development education. Small grants should be mobilized for helping migrant organisations to build their organisational and management capacities, and to liaise between organisations from different EU MSs countries. This would help diasporas to organise themselves in favour of development action that use remittances more strategically, as the potential of remittances is much bigger (x2).
- **Ensure that EU Technical Assistance is primarily through local or regional procurement,** and builds on existing practices (from the range of existing CSO, including CBO and local or INGOs). This will also meet the recognized recommendations that for fragile contexts, it is extremely crucial to have deep local knowledge and existing long-term partnerships, as well as to be committed to a long term investment, in order to be successful with technical assistance (x2).

QUESTION 19: Additional comments

19.1. On the political and policy level:

- Social dialogue should be promoted as the central strategy to ensure local democratic ownership (x12)
- The principle of “do no harm” is not always respected by donors, and some seem to be disconnected from local dynamics (x7).
- There is a need for a better definition of what a multi-stakeholder process means and implies in practice. Also, there is a need to adopt a differentiated strategy on CSOs, outlining their respective multifaceted roles in development, human rights and democratisation, governance, public awareness, peace and security. The Communication should therefore address how to support pluralistic and active CSOs in Europe and partner countries who are able to meaningfully fulfil all their roles as development actors, including service delivery, watchdog role, awareness raising and/or development education (x10).
- CSOs bring added value to the definition, execution and evaluation of public policies in their national context, whether in partner countries or in Europe (x8). CSOs also contribute to strengthening the functioning of the EU institutions and provide a link between them and EU citizens. What is important is to respect such diversity and to promote synergies and cooperation between CSOs active and engaged at different levels, whether local, regional or global. The Open Forum on CS development effectiveness offers a good example of such an approach.
- Within a Global Civil Society, European CSOs bring specific value added on advocating for just and sustainable global development and policies, supporting CSOs in other regions, supporting the implementation of programmes by mutual sharing of knowledge, experiences and lessons learned, building awareness for citizen’s rights and empowering and fostering the participation of all citizens to

become actors of change in world-wide poverty eradication. Furthermore, European CSOs play a role in rigorous monitoring and evaluation of development activities and projects in order to lead to improved effectiveness and involvement of their local partners. Last but not least, European CSOs also continue to work in humanitarian relief and to uphold humanitarian principles (x3).

- The EU should recognize the centrality of international human rights principles and law to all aid and development relations. Also, as the consultation paper highlights, CSOs are actors in their own right, with a right of initiative (x5). CSOs have a global response to the challenge posed by aid effectiveness through the Istanbul Principles. Civil society is a rich and highly diverse space, where actors may pursue opposing agendas. It is not appropriate to attempt to unify these. Rather, CSOs should be encouraged to do what they do best: to come up with new visions, to challenge the mainstream and propose alternatives, and to reach out to the most excluded. It is important to avoid instrumentalising CSOs in development, and instead protect their operating space and seek ways to work with and alongside them.
- The Decent Work Agenda, contributing to inclusive and sustainable growth, must be included when it comes to concentration of sectors at country level, and adequately resourced within the 'Human Development' sub-theme of the 'Thematic envelope for public goods and challenges' (x3).
- Social partners must be included from the start in policy dialogue to ensure democratic ownership of development policies which goes beyond government's involvement (x3).
- Today there is a need to reconsider past strategies and programmes to make them more efficient and effective.
- Donors **should play a facilitation role** (listening & understanding local dynamics, mobilising resources, etc.) (x7). It is important to underline that today, CSOs in developing countries find the EU too "distant" or "out of reach." As such, the delegations have to become more approachable in order to have an impact. It requires resources for the delegations.
- EU development policy has to be consistent with EU agriculture, trade and investment policies, among others. EU development policy has to ensure that the EU limits its own footprint and is in line and will strengthen EU environmental policies (x5).
- Differentiation between (groups) of countries should be based on relevant indicators such as UN Human Development Index, and not as a tool to support (mutual) economic interests of the EU. The programming process (drafting of Country Strategy Papers) must fully involve the European Parliament, guaranteeing democratic screening and accountability of EU development policies (x2).
 - Support to CSOs should be framed in a human rights based approach to development. All development programmes should ensure that pro-poor and sustainable development prevails over short term and narrow or elite European interests. Sustainable development and the fulfilment of human rights should form the basis for EU policymaking.
 - The Communication should demonstrate the determination of the EU regarding the promotion of the right of initiative and of an enabling environment for CSOs as independent development actors in their own right – in partner countries as well as in Europe.

- The bipolar world of donors and recipients (North and South divide as well as governments and non-state actors divide) should end. Only shared visions and motivations, real cooperation and complementarity can lead to long-lasting development impact
- INGOs can play an additional role in partner countries to ensure awareness of EU policies and where needed provide support to policy research, lobby and advocacy.
- Emphasis should be made to prevent backsliding of existing laws and adoption of new restrictive laws.
- Social and economic inequalities, together with conflict, are issues that should garner greater attention.
- Recognition should be given to membership-based organisations, making use of alternative funding mechanisms developed during the SD, such as the 'partnership/framework agreements' and 'core funding'.
- Private sector must operate in compliance with international labour standards and in support of local development needs.
- Gender equality and women empowerment should be included right beside human rights, democracy and governance.
- Better attention should be paid to persons with disabilities and disabled persons' organisations.
- Local CSOs should not just be used as a source for information and for "mapping" needs and institutions, but also directly engaged in formulating solutions and mechanisms.
- EC headquarters should look more actively at promoting continuity between Brussels and the EU delegations in the field.

19.2. On the operational level and about funding modalities and procedures:

- Funding remains of paramount importance. Support to CSOs needs to be translated in the future financial instruments 2014-2020, beyond the proposed thematic programme "Civil Society Organisations and Local Authorities". CONCORD calls for greater recognition of CSOs as implementing actors in all geographic programmes, and a clear commitment to a 15% earmarking of funds for CS within the geographic programme. The communication should include references to the promotion of an enabling environment for CSOs as independent development actors in their own right. (x3)
- The EU should meet ODA Commitments: the EU has committed itself to the collective target of spending 0.7 % of its GNI on ODA by 2015. In line with this objective, TUs ask the EU to considerably increase its ODA to meet the 0.7% target within the next MFF. (x4)
- An actor-based approach should be undertaken within the 'Envelope for CSOs and LAs', allowing more adaptable and effective partnership modalities with the variety of development actors having different structures, objectives and mandates (x7). Additionally, it is important to support CSOs collaboration rather than promoting competition (e.g. by supporting thematic networks, even if they are not formally registered) (x3).

- Not all CSOs have the same level of understanding and knowledge on EU policies and programmes. Enhanced information is therefore of paramount importance (x4). Also, there is a need to improve communication between Delegations and CSOs (e.g. consultations preparing AAP or Call for Proposals).
- EU regulation regarding the maximum % of EU grant project support (80 or 90 percent of the project) is very unfavourable for CSOs and present a huge burden for all organisations. It is very difficult for CSOs to provide its own resources for co-financing the project, and it is also unrealistic to approach some other donors to ask for 10 or 20% additional contribution in advance of the process of application for EU funding. Applying this condition for state institutions is reasonable, but insisting on the same regulations for CSOs is frustrating.
- Changes are needed in the system for granting European development funding through CSOs. It is necessary to introduce arrangements such as the "framework agreements", operational grants, cascading subsidies, multiannual agreements, emergency funding and implementation of the "toolbox" defined in the Structured Dialogue.
- While welcoming the highlight on advocacy and CSO involvement in policy processes, greater recognition should be given to CSOs as implementing actors in all EC geographic programmes, and a clear commitment to a 15% earmarking of funds for CS within the geographic programmes.
- The EU should support CS Right of Initiative and allow CSO to develop programs and proposals themselves.
- The EU should make project proposal guidelines and related documents available in local languages, and reconsider the policy to work with private consultancies and/or with intermediaries.
- Recognition should be given to membership-based organisations, such as trade unions, making use of alternative funding mechanisms developed during the Structured Dialogue like the 'partnership/framework agreements'. Accordingly, support for capacity building of trade unions as social partners should be granted in the 'Thematic envelope for public goods and challenges', as well as the Decent Work Agenda, and should be prioritized and adequately resourced within the 'Human Development' sub-theme (2x).
- Fund raising for our activities, including institutional strengthening, is very difficult at the moment, and support from EU would be most appreciated.

19.3. Suggested additional bibliography:

- Report from the CIDSE-Caritas Europe Regional Seminar Arusha/Tanzania, 13-16 November 2007
<http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/regional-seminar-arusha-tanzania-13-16-november-2007.html>"><http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/regional-seminar-arusha-tanzania-13-16-november-2007.html>
- CIDSE-Caritas Europe North-South Development Forum 2010.
<http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/cidse-ce-north-south-development-forum-2010.html>"><http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/cidse-ce-north-south-development-forum-2010.html>

- The Church in Africa: A force for advocacy and democratisation
<http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/the-church-in-africa-a-force-for-advocacy-and-democratisation.html>><http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/policy-coherence-for-development/the-church-in-africa-a-force-for-advocacy-and-democratisation.html>
- Democracy in Action: Protecting Civil Society Space: 2012
http://www.trocaire.org/sites/trocaire/files/pdfs/policy/Democracy_in_Action.pdf
- Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness: “The Siem Reap Consensus on the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness”, June 2011. <http://www.cso-effectiveness.org/-toolkits,082-.html>
- Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness: “Putting the Istanbul Principles into Practice – an Implementation Toolkit”, January 2012. <http://www.cso-effectiveness.org/-toolkits,082-.html>
- Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness: “Advocacy Toolkit” January 2012 <http://www.cso-effectiveness.org/-toolkits,082-.html>
- ECNL, Criteria and Procedures for Selection of Civil Society Organizations in Cross-Sector Bodies: Comparative overview and description of the situation in Macedonia, commissioned by the Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (MCIC) and OSCE (awaiting publication)
- ECNL, 2010, Comparative Overview of European Standards and Practices in Regulating Public Participation, commissioned by OSCE and the Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (MCIC)
- ECNL, 2009, Study on Recent Public and Self-Regulatory Initiatives Improving Transparency and Accountability of Non-Profit Organisations in the European Union, commissioned and published by the European Commission. Accessed: http://ec.europa.eu/homeaffairs/doc_centre/terrorism/docs/initiatives_improving_transparency_accountability_npos_avr09.pdf
- ECNL, Assessment Tool on government-CSO cooperation, available upon request
- ICNL, Association and Assembly in the Digital Age, in *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, Volume 13, Issue 4, December 2011. Accessed: http://www.icnl.org/research/journal/vol13iss4/art_1.htm
- ICNL, Enabling Organizational Development: NGO Legal Reform in Post-Conflict Settings, in *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, Volume 9, Issue 4, August 2007. Accessed: http://www.icnl.org/research/journal/vol9iss4/special_1.htm
- ICNL, Global Trends in NGO Law, Volume 2, Issue 3: Enabling Reform: Lessons Learned From Progressive NGO Legal Initiatives. Accessed: <http://www.icnl.org/research/trends/trends2-3.html>
- ICNL, Monitoring/Tracking Tool: Discussion Guide, accessed: http://www.icnl.org/research/resources/assessment/MTT_eng.pdf
- ICNL/World Movement for Democracy, Defending Civil Society Report, 2008. Accessed: <http://www.icnl.org/research/resources/dcs/index.html>
- UN, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Accessed: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>

Annex 3 - Good practices shared by respondents¹

Case-studies on question 1: How can CSOs apply in their activities the Aid and Development Effectiveness principles of Busan?

Philippines, CSOs – Regional Development Council

A coalition of Philippine CSOs meets every first quarter of the year to discuss the Millennium Development Goals for different geographical locations. The information and suggestions resulting from such Regional Development Council meetings is distributed to the member partner organisations.

More info: e.g. <http://www.rdc8.ph/> and <http://www.rdc11.net/> and <http://www.neda-rdc6.ph/>

Cambodia, CSOs – Cooperation Committee for Cambodia

The Governance Hub Program (GHP) and Voluntary Certification System is a 5 years program which aims to bring about positive changes for the CSO sector in Cambodia.

More info: <http://www.ccc-cambodia.org/ccc-program.html>

Global, TUs – Principles & Guidelines on Development effectiveness

The principles and guidelines have been elaborated on a consultative basis by TU organisation representatives both in the North and the South. The International TU Confederation (ITUC) coordinated this process, with the support of its regional structures, affiliated organisations, Solidarity Support Organisations, and Global Union Federations. They are designed to serve as a common reference for development cooperation initiatives, strengthening working methodologies and ultimately contributing to enhancing the impact of TU cooperation programmes. Secondly, the “TUDEP - TU Development effectiveness Profile” is a learning tool to support TU development actors in putting the Principles in practice, as well as facilitating the M&E of their implementation.

More info: <http://www.ituc-csi.org/tu-development-effectiveness-profile.html>

Uganda, CSO – Participatory Poverty Resource Monitoring Tool

Through the use of the "Participatory Poverty Resource Monitoring Tool" (PPRMT) process which involves the target community in identifying the problems, developing the solutions, implementing the agreed action points, monitoring and evaluating the interventions and moving to the next stages together, LICODA has been applying development effectiveness principles.

More info: <http://www.civilsocietyforum.org/lira-community-development-association-licoda>

Global, CSOs - International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)

The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) aims to make information about aid spending easier to find, use and compare. This stretches from taxpayers in donor countries, to those in developing countries

¹ Only good practices shared by respondents that wish to see their contributions published are included.

who benefit from aid. Improving transparency also helps governments in developing countries manage aid more effectively. IATI was launched in September 2008 in [Accra](#), Ghana. It is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that has brought together: donor countries, developing country governments, non-governmental organisations, and experts in aid information. These participants agree on a common, open, international standard for publishing more and better information about aid. This [standard](#) was agreed in February 2011. **More info:** <http://www.aidtransparency.net/>

Regional, Foundations - Eurasia Foundation Network

Since 2004, Eurasia Foundation has evolved from a U.S.-based foundation with multiple field offices into the Eurasia Foundation Network – a constellation of affiliated, locally registered foundations in Russia, Central Asia, the South Caucasus, Ukraine and Moldova that work in partnership with Eurasia Foundation in the U.S. Among other programs, it has a Capacity Mapping Initiative for the members of the Network. **More info:** <http://www.eurasia.org/>

Regional, CSOs - Pan-Africa CSO Forum

This is an example of South-South co-operation: some GCAP coalition partners in Africa have led to the production of a statement on aid effectiveness and development leading up to the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan. The four organisations are: 1. FENMET, 2. Reality of Aid, 3. Uganda National NGO Forum and 4. West African Civil Society Organization Institute.

More info: <http://www.whiteband.org/en/pan-african-cso-statement-aid-effectiveness>

Global, CSO - World Vision (WV) 's work based on One World Trust Global Accountability Report

World Vision's commitment to 'accountability' has been an integral part of its mission, vision and values since its foundation in 1951. Accountability was reaffirmed as one of four 'partnership' principles in 2007, and in 2008, WV created the Global Accountability Department to lead a comprehensive review of internal and external accountability standards. WV's Accountability Community of Practice includes staff working in a wide range of countries and functions, including many representatives who were locally hired. Internally, WV has built on the Global Accountability Report prepared by the One World Trust in 2006, developing a strategic framework for accountability (including the focus on reinforcing personal and professional ethics, authentic participation and partnerships, with special attention to accountability to the children and communities that are served, continuous learning, transparency and global engagement). In 2011, World Vision International approved an Open Information Policy and established a Disclosure Committee to support the transition to greater transparency. WV's membership in the International NGO Charter of Accountability Company has provided additional internal impetus. The annual Accountability Report required by the Charter Company is reviewed by an independent panel of experts and the report and the panel assessment are published on the World Vision and Charter Company websites. **More info:**

<http://wvi.org/wvi/wviweb.nsf/maindocs/1D2B36806EAD6CD08825738A0074CFD8?opendocument>

International organisation – UNAIDS Guidance on partnerships with Civil Society

In the context of Busan, UNAIDS implemented in 2011 a study on CSOs working with a focus on AIDS (AIDS CSOs) and their engagement in national development processes, including national assessment in six countries – Burkina Faso, Jamaica, Morocco, Nepal, Peru and Zambia. **More info:**

http://www.unaids.org/en/media/unaids/contentassets/documents/unaidspublication/2012/JC2236_guidance_partnership_civilsociety_en.pdf

Case-studies on question 2: How do you think that different actors, including the EU, could help to promote an enabling environment for CSO (a) in repressive regimes, (b) in fragile / conflict countries, (c) other countries? Can you suggest good practices?

Global, CSOs - Inclusive partnerships and Democratic Ownership

A document was produced by Alliance2015 in preparation for the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness of Busan in 2011. It is the final outcome of a research and monitoring project on Democratic Ownership conducted in Cambodia, Ghana, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Tanzania. The objective of the briefs is to assess the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action and the contribution this has made to increasing civil society engagement in and ownership of development processes. The five country briefs can be found online. **More info:** see www.alliance2015.org and http://www.concern.net/sites/www.concern.net/files/images/all_cross_country_final.pdf

Kazakhstan, various – Regional councils working on domestic violence

In Kazakhstan, the action entitled “Organization of the activity of regional interdepartmental councils on counteraction to domestic violence” was implemented under financial support of the EU by means of a documentation package. The regional councils appear to be an effective structure for cooperation between the public and civil sectors in order to solve the problem of domestic violence. This informal structure doesn’t require financial expenses and is based on interpersonal connections, which allows resolving problematic issues by means of meetings and phone calls. Social partnership has allowed enhancing the influence of the NGOs-participants of the project on regional policy formulation concerning positive change for women. Various programmes on protection of women against violence are now included into state social tenders as lots.

More info: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/documents/case-studies/kazakhstan_human_domestic_violence_en.pdf

Bangladesh, CSO – Democracy Watch & Consultation and Policy Dialogue

Democracy Watch observes elections since 1996. In a repressive regime, bureaucracy is regimented to deliver the regime’s agendas rather than peoples'. The EU can have dialogue with the regime for bringing in democracy and democratic culture of tolerance and thereby help the CSOs continue with their development work without being involved in conflict. The respondent/organisation suggests to work via a consortium of donors, which could act together to put pressure on the country’s repressive regime.

More info: <http://www.dwatch-bd.org/>

More specifically, in Bangladesh, the EU gathers various major Bilateral and Multilateral Donors through a series of Consultations and Policy dialogue. At the same time, a group of Civil Society Organizations with a 10 Member Committee was formed. For example, an alternative Draft Law has been prepared and shared electronically for suggestions. A senior Advisor of the Prime Minister was designated to work with the designated CSO group to further work on the Draft NGO Law. It will be discussed and taken up with the Ministry of Law Affairs for further consultation, and will have another round of discussion with the selected Group of CSO’s and NGO’s before placing in the Parliament.

Global, various – FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements

FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements is a multi-stakeholder process that requires governments to engage in a dialogue with civil society (including local communities and indigenous people) and is triggered by the EU. In many FLEGT countries CSOs have taken up a seat at the table as well as independent monitoring roles, e.g. by giving concrete suggestions for law reform, insisting on access to information not previously accessible etc. In repressive regimes or conflict countries the EU could make their support conditional to the effective inclusion of CSOs in programs and policy development, and monitor this aspect and address it if not respected in order to avoid conflicts.

More info: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/forests/flegt.htm>

Philippines, CSO – managed ODA

The Philippines Development Assistance Program (PDAP) counted with direct access for CSOs of a respectable proportion of the Canadian ODA in the '80s and the creation of a CSO-managed fund for Human Resource Development in the early '90s.

More info:

http://www.realityofaid.org/userfiles/aideffectiveness/presentations/oct10_On%20Models%20of%20Donor%20Support%20and%20Good%20Practices.pdf

Bhutan, CSO Fund Facility

In Bhutan, a joint CSO Fund Facility (funded by four development partners) has been a good mechanism, not only for the CSOs, but also in building trust between the Government, the CSOs and the development partners. The quite rigid Government regulation has thus become more flexible.

More info: <http://www.csofund.org/about/>

Nepal - Basic Operating Guidelines (BOGs)

The BOGs can be considered a statement of principles, as well as a code of conduct. They are intended to offer BOGs signatories, staff and implementing partners protection from any challenges to operational space. They also make donors and implementing partners responsible for working in a way that is transparent, accountable, impartial and inclusive (the four fundamental principles).

More info:

http://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/nepal/eu_nepal/political_relations/operating_guidelines/index_en.htm

European Dialogue on Modernisation with Belarus

<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/226&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

Global – Slow food campaign

The Terra Madre network was launched by Slow Food in 2004. The network, bringing together decision-makers (consumers, educational institutions, chefs and cooks, agricultural research entities, NGOs) from 150 countries, achieves a significant impact through repeated, cumulative, local action, following a guiding global vision. When it received the Operating grant by DG Environment the necessary resources were found to properly structure itself and to increase its internal competencies. **More info:**

<http://www.terramadre.org/> and <http://www.slowfood.com/>

Case-studies on question 3: What, in your experience, are good indicators to measure progress in the area of “enabling environment” for CSOs?

Bosnia and Herzegovina – LOD Methodology

The LOD methodology is a set of procedures, rules, guidelines and templates based on inputs from EU rules and regulations for distribution of funds to CSOs, UNDP internally developed documents and experience of UNDP staff dealing directly with the municipalities and CSOs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is conducted by UNDP, the EU, and the Bosnia and Herzegovina Ministry of Justice in cooperation with local communities. **More info:** <http://www.undp.ba/index.aspx?PID=17&RID=1200>

Global, UN – Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is a new and unique mechanism of the United Nations which started in April 2008 and consists of the review of the human rights practices of all States in the world, once every four years.

More info: <http://www.upr-info.org/>

Georgia – CSO registration and involvement

In Georgia CSO can be registered in 24 hours for a reasonable registration fee without red tape procedure. Laws regulating free access to public information are quite conducive. The amendments to the law on self-governance oblige local self-governance bodies to engage CSOs in decision-making process.

Various EE measurement examples

- USAID NGO Sustainability Index that produces NGO legal environment scores for at least 50 countries.
- CIVICUS’ Civil Society Index: <https://www.civicus.org/what-we-do/cross-cuttingprojects/csi>
- For qualitative data, there is ICNL NGO Law Monitor : www.ngolawmonitor.org ;
- The National integrity system assessments (NIS) conducted by Transparency International: <http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/nis> ;
- The “Voice and Accountability” indicator that the World Bank calculates from other indices: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/pdf/va.pdf>;
- Data being collected by Global Integrity on environments for NGOs working on governance and anti-corruption issues <http://www.globalintegrity.org/report/Argentina/2010/scorecard>

Case-studies on question 4: How could the media, including social media, contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs?

Social dialogue in development.

More info: <http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication/attachment/268453?download=true&ts=12edd101546>

UN Rapporteur on freedom of association.

More info:

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/AssemblyAssociation/Pages/SRFreedomAssemblyAssociationIndex.aspx>

Case-studies on question 5: What are, in your experience, the challenges and opportunities for CSO involvement in policy dialogues, including in terms of institutional mechanisms and operational rules? Can you provide good examples?

Democratic Republic of Congo, CSO - Liaison Committee with UN

APROJA is contributing to the drafting of the law on human rights defenders and the setting up of a Liaison Committee between focal points and the UN Office of Human Rights. Professional journalists can play an important role as facilitators. **More info:** http://www.acpcongo.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3099

Burundi, CSO – Dialogue spaces for young leaders

REJA, in synergy with Association des Scouts du Burundi has set up spaces for dialogue between young leaders within the political parties and young leaders from Civil Society.

More info: http://ccfd-terresolidaire.org/ewb_pages/p/partenaire_2397.php

The Philippines, various – Commission on Women

After the ouster of the dictator, most of those in government were human rights activists who believed in transparency and democratic processes. The Philippine Commission on Women (PCW) actively sought a separate "shadow report" from NGOs (even though the government under Marcos also showed an opposite view to what was real). On institutional mechanisms, women NGOs lobbied for the Magna Carat of Women with the support of PCW and successfully won a rape case under the CEDAW Protocol. Also, under President Arroyo, a Presidential Committee on Human Rights was created to convene all government agencies and CSOs to dialogue on the issues and set an agenda on the implementation of various treaties signed by the Philippine government. **More info:** <http://pcw.gov.ph/>

Bosnia Herzegovina, CSO & LA – From practice to policy

Thanks to the project "Social inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities", supported by UNDP's Reinforcement of Local Democracy II (LOD II) which is funded by the European Union (EU) through the funds of the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) SUMERO cooperated with Sarajevo City as well as many cantonal ministries and the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. The CSO representatives are now also included in making Law on Social Protection and Minimum Social Security, and the Law on the Protection of Families with Children.

More info: <http://www.undp.ba/index.aspx?PID=7&RID=722>

Global, CSOs & LA – Involvement in governance structures

The global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria is a good example of CS involvement, also in the governance structures.

More info: <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/library/resourceslinks/partners/>

Also the multi-stakeholder programmes (programmes concertés pluriacteurs –PCPA) co-funded by French cooperation offer a good example of CS involvement.

More info: <http://www.etudiantsetdeveloppement.org/content/un-programme-concert%C3%A9-pluri-acteurs-ou-pcpa-cest-quoi>

Ghana, CSOs – Multi-Donor Budget support process

The Multi-Donor Budget Support (MDBS) process provides a very good opportunity for CSOs to participate in development dialogue at the highest level. However, there is little or no knowledge within civil society about the MDBS framework (for example about the calendar of events, meeting times and key contact and entry points). So a major challenge is the level of coordination and harmonisation for collective engagement. The Ghana aid effectiveness forum would require support to strengthen that process. The M&E framework of SEND Ghana for example has institutionalised frameworks for government civil society engagement at the local level.

More info: http://www.cooperazioneallosviluppo.esteri.it/pdgcs/documentazione/Report/2011-02-11_AllianceGhana.pdf

The Ghana aid effectiveness forum (with a membership of 14 networks) is also implementing a budget advocacy project organised around the networks for the monitoring of government targets in the 2012 budget in 5 sectors. **More info:** <http://www.aefgh.org/website/>

Kyrgyzstan , CSOs – Anti-mining lobby

CSOs have tried to adapt the best practices on the issues of human rights, transparency and resolution of conflicts through peaceful instruments. M&E of projects of the mining industry provided an opportunity for gradual changes of budget management, focusing on the distribution of profits, as well as on the issues of environmental and industrial safety of companies and governments of all levels. Attention was paid to increasing the capacity of local people, through the development of systematic and continuous monitoring of the activities of mining companies. In addition, a partner network of solidarity was established, with the principles of horizontal partnership and participation. The active position of CSO impeded the attempts of the state to restrict the activities of CSOs and to control their activities, to initiate new legislation on NGOs and external aid.

More info:

<http://www.bicusa.org/en/Project.48.aspx> and <http://anticorruption.kg/?s=kumtor&x=0&y=0>

Global, CSO & LA - World Vision (WV) 's social auditing and accountability method

Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) is a local level social auditing, accountability and advocacy methodology that transforms the dialogue between Citizens, Community Based Organizations and various levels of local and national government in order to improve services. CVA works by educating citizens about their basic human rights and equipping them with a set of tools designed to empower them to protect and enforce those rights. CBOs work collaboratively with government and service providers to compare reality to the local legal articulation of their rights, and government's commitments. CBOs rate government's performance against criteria that they generate and then work with other stakeholders to influence decision-makers to improve services, using a simple set of advocacy tools.

CVA is now implemented in 209 Area Development Programmes in 29 countries. Demand for CVA continues to be strong. Fortunately, donor interest is growing, for example DFID, AusAid and CIDA have funded this approach. Research is done in partnership with DFID, Oxford University, Columbia University, 3ie, AusAID, and independent academics. WV has now documented the learning and begun to offer it to the broader development community.

More info: http://www.worldvision.org.uk/search-results/*/q/citizen+voice+in+action/sa/GO/

Cambodia, CSOs - One year advocacy on draft NGO Law

Cambodia's chairmanship of ASEAN and its political eagerness to gain a non-permanent seat in the UN Security Council led to the acceptance of CSOs inputs on the draft Law on NGOs (four rounds of drafting).

More info: <http://www.ccc-cambodia.org/lango.html>

Moldova, CSOs - EU/CoE joint action "Democracy Support Programme" (2010-2011).

Often the presence of International / EU NGOs in partner countries may help the local NGOs to easier establish trustful cooperation with the partner government structures.

More info: <http://www.moldovadialogue.eu/project-definition>

Kenya, CSOs – the Social and Public Accountability Network

The partners use SPAN as a platform to create a national dialogue on the effectiveness of decentralised funds and discuss new solutions and initiatives for the disbursement of such funds. This dialogue enabled them to directly input into Kenya's Decentralisation policy, as well as the overall Devolution structure adopted in Kenya's new constitution in 2010.

More info: <http://www.tisa.or.ke/about-span/>

El Salvador, CSO – National Health Forum

In 2010 a National Health Forum was established to allow for consensus-based decisions on the right to health, universal coverage, inclusion, quality and civic engagement. Many CSOs have received advocacy capacity building and it is felt that their views are adequately reflected in most key health-related policies.

More info: <http://www.phmovement.org/en/node/2917>

Kyrgyzstan, CSO & LA – Public Steering Committees

Regulations on Public Steering Committees in the Kyrgyz Republic approved in 2010-2011 support the dialogue between CSO and Government to arrange public accountability.

Bhutan, CSO & media - Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC)

This commission is responsible for all policy proposals and screening: any comments are welcome from the CSOs and media via their website and workshops are frequently held to discuss key policy issues.

More info: <http://www.gnhc.gov.bt/about-us/>

Global, Trade Unions - Social dialogue in development

<http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication/attachment/268453?download=true&ts=12edd101546>

In this sense: see EESC opinion REX/296 §3.5 http://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/FIN_en.pdf

Global, CSOs – The Civil Society Dialogue network (CSDN) on EU peace building policies

The CSDN incorporates a number of innovative aspects: Meetings are jointly planned by civil society (EPLO), the EEAS and EC, with all three commenting on and deciding on topic, agenda, format, participants etc. There is a strong focus on policy issues to avoid “dialogue about dialogue”.

More info: <http://www.eplo.org/civil-society-dialogue-network.html>

Kenya, CSO – Children participation in Policy Dialogue

In Kenya participation of child rights organisations and children in UNCRC State Party reporting is a good example of CSO and children's involvement in policy dialogue. CSOs are part of the committee chaired by the government from the beginning and participate in implementation of a joint plan and bring their special expertise on e.g. children's consultation. In addition, CSOs prepare their own supplementary report.

Transparency International:

<http://www.transparencyindia.org/projects.php?id=35>

<http://www.tiuganda.org/index.php/projects/intergrity-project>

<http://www.tighana.org/giipages/publication/TISDA%20LAUNCH%20REPORT%202011>

<http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publications/top/73>

Ukraine, CSOs – Reintegration of former prisoners with a local civic council

An example of a local civic council in Sumy city (Ukraine), which has established strong cooperation between local civil society organisations and local government.

More info:

<http://issuu.com/gurtrc/docs/handbook?mode=window&backgroundcolor=%23222222>

CSO Advocacy actions regarding EC funding rules and regulations

E.g. work on the Practical Guidelines (PRAGs) trying to make the guidelines more "civil society friendly".

More info: <http://euclidnetwork.eu/projects/policy-and-advocacy-work/reform-of-european-funding.html>) and <http://euclidnetwork.eu/projects/policy-and-advocacy-work/making-the-practical-guide-work-for-civil-society.html>

Case-studies on question 6: How can progress related to CSO participation in policy dialogues at country level be measured and monitored?

Cambodia – Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC)

In Cambodia, 19 technical working groups (TWG) chaired by government representatives, with facilitation from donor representatives and participation from CSOs, have the opportunity to discuss and dialogue with the Cambodian authorities. The TWG have discussed and come up with the Joint Monitoring Indicator (JMI), a tool for monitoring aid and the development of Cambodia.

More info: <http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/>

Case-studies on question 7: What are the most effective entry points for CSOs in “participatory budgetary processes”?

Ghana, CSO – Budget Advocacy

The Centre for Budget Advocacy (CBA) is effectively engaged in budget analysis and advocacy in Ghana. Tracking various disbursements from government's budget by CSOs also provides an effective entry point for CSOs to participate in the budgetary processes annually. By using the District Assemblies Common Fund and the Capitation Grant, CSOs have over the years advocated for improvements in both the transfer and use of these funds for the benefit of the public through their participation and input into government's annual budget consultation processes. In sum, the ability to conduct a total analysis of the country's annual budgets, coupled with the effective role CSOs play in monitoring and tracking budget disbursements and expenditure items, have provided CSOs with the most effective 'spaces' to participate in the government's annual budget formulation processes.

More info: <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/4915.pdf>

Global, CSOs – WorldVision in Participatory Budget Processes

World Vision (WV) has demonstrated in different contexts that Community Based Organizations (CBO) can successfully take part in participatory budgeting when:

1. Engagement starts at the local level, in a specific sector, and with concrete issues that grassroots groups of vulnerable citizens have identified (e.g. based on focus groups).
2. Starting by auditing services and later shifting to budgets and funding allocations.
3. Facilitators disaggregate the groups by sex, age, vulnerability, to generate dialog about the issues that most concern them and agreement on measures of service delivery performance.
4. Social Auditing: Early in the process, locals gather evidence of quality and quantity, of concrete issues with standardized measures. Even children and youth can gather evidence well (e.g. in Brazil with videos, and in India with a scorecard with symbols for rating).
5. External research indicates that the community scorecard method of evidence collection for social auditing is more effective than other methods of accountability or budgeting.
6. After local analysis of the evidence, there should be dialog with other actors, local authorities, the private sector, civil servants and other CSO. They discuss reasons for the gaps and how to reach improvements. This often leads local authorities to include the most prioritized recommendations in the next local budgeting process.

7. Evidence is aggregated and compared across a large number of sites to reach district, province, and national conclusions. Thus CBO can advocate about specific recommendations on policies, government commitment or funding allocations.
8. The evidence gathering has led CBOs to request information about the costs of services, the reason for apparent lacks of investment, and thus about specific budgets (e.g. the district per district allocation for community health centres). CBOs then compare budgets to expenditures and results, detect anomalies or corruption, and bring this comparative analysis to spaces of advocacy.
9. Typically, the dialog, evidence gathering and advocacy have led afterwards to invitations for active CS' representatives (chosen by peers or authorities) to participate in formal committees responsible for budgetary review, decisions about allocations, and monitoring of budget implementation (e.g. in Brazil, in the District and Provincial Health Oversight Committees). CBO members have developed skills in the previous steps to fulfil this role well. In some cases, this has resulted in an invitation to participate in national committees.
10. Reaching a few clear conclusions and “quick wins” of advocacy motivates the local CBO to continue participating and monitoring more complex processes (such as financing), and to further resolve barriers to quality or quantity of services, including the detection of corruption or inefficient use of funding.
11. When the experiences have been effective, local authorities and national governments have started to mainstream the citizen accountability and budgeting approach. For example, in Uganda, the local citizen groups had focussed on health and nutrition. As a result of the actions described above, they were successful in influencing the national policy and external coordination (e.g. on Scaling Up Nutrition). The government then chose to use the same methodology in the sector of education.

Various examples on participatory budget processes

See this website for case studies and methodologies, also on monitoring of public expenditures.

More info: http://www.ansa-africa.net/index.php/toolkits_and_methodologies/

Experiences from three East African countries shows that district level engagement has been effective in Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania with local and regional organisations monitoring use of funds and highlighting the needs of local communities – resulting in significant changed budget allocations. Other outcomes include increased dialogue between district officials and communities and increased openness on budgetary allocations.

Kyrgyzstan – Budget hearings and Public Advisory Boards

In Kyrgyzstan, there are legal norms that allow citizens to participate in the budgetary processes via budget hearings. It can also be done through existing formations at the local level such as Public Advisory Boards on the AO/municipality level, who ensure public participation in local governance processes and promote public interests during public policy making.

More info: http://centralasia.usaidallnet.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/u4/oti-kr_program_update_2011_06_24_june_final.pdf

Brazil, CSOs - Public Policy Councils

In Brazil, Public Policy Councils are a good mechanism to ensure social control over public policies. They are integrated by CS representatives that are mandated by citizens (e.g. neighbour associations; specific beneficiary groups; etc). **More info:** <http://www.citeulike.org/user/tapiocante/article/1789408>

Transparency International created accountability mechanisms such as "development pacts" and uses CSOs to petition governments for relevant information on public services and related budgets.

More info: http://archive.transparency.org/news_room/in_focus/2010/development_pacts

Case-studies on question 8: Responding to the Communication on Budget Support, how could the EU promote CSOs role in "domestic accountability" and in oversight functions?

Pakistan, CSOs – District level complaint handling mechanisms

In Pakistan, district level complaint handling mechanisms are established which gives the right to citizens to lodge concerns and complaints against misuse of resources. An independent/impartial institution can manage the complaint handling mechanism. This practice is used by some INGOs/NGOs during emergencies including Church World Service -Pakistan/Afghanistan. (CWS-P/A)

More info: <http://www.cwspa.org/>

Uganda, CSOs – Water sector monitoring via a network & Budget Advocacy Group

In Uganda, in the water sector some CSOs have tried to monitor the accountability in the government through a network called UWASNET. E.g. they have raised issues where contractors' work was not done well due to corruption, in the joint sector review meeting and the government has tried to rectify the problem. All this was connected to domestic accountability.

More info: <http://uwasnet.org/>

Secondly, a network of Ugandan CSOs cooperates to develop a shadow budget under the framework of the Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group that monitors and reviews budgets by sector.

More info: <http://www.fowode.org/publications/Civil%20Society%20Alternative%20Proposals.pdf>

Case-studies on question 11: What approaches should be developed to improve donor support to Capacity Development of CSOs?

Bosnia Herzegovina, CSO & LA - UG ToPeeR Network

In Bosnia Herzegovina one supports and strengthens a network outside the traditional call for funding. Interesting is the practice of mentoring (CSPC- CPCD Sarajevo) and use of Consultants (Mozaik Foundation in Sarajevo). UG ToPeeR is this network which provides support to organizations, empowering them to acquire knowledge and skills of interaction in political dialogue, and planning to participate in community development.

France, CSOs – Funds targeted at capacity building, and audits

The FRIO ("Fonds de Renforcement Institutionnel et Organisationnel") aims at supporting NGO's own organisational development efforts. Also, the F3E ("Fonds pour la promotion des études préalables, des études transversales et des évaluations.") aims at supporting evaluation and audit missions on

NGO projects and initiatives.

More info : <http://www.centraider.org/les-outils/financements-associations/538-frio---fonds-de-renforcement-institutionnel-et-organisationnel---juillet-2012.html> and <http://f3e.asso.fr/EVALUATION.html>

Global - Technical assistance programmes,

E.g. TACSO (Technical Assistance for Civil Society Organisations), operating in the Western Balkans and Turkey should be connected to grassroots organisations in order to increase their outreach and impact. The trainings should be followed by engaging in projects that pilot new context-dependent approaches (as for example social enterprise competitions, social finance simulations and so forth) and methodologies as peer-to-peer approaches that can include reciprocal exchanges. **More info:** <http://www.tacso.org/project-org/consortium/?id=24>

Global - Exchanges

E.g. the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs programme, is a successful example of an exchange programme where young entrepreneurs job shadow-experienced entrepreneurs. Such a programme could be adapted for Civil Society and established in other areas and regions to strengthen capacity.

More info: <http://www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu>

Case-studies on question 14: Should the EU support CSOs in implementing mechanisms for improving internal governance? If yes how?

Cambodian Voluntary Certification System

It exists since 2007 and is based on a Code of Ethical Principles and Minimum Standards for NGOs - drafted in a consultative process by the CSO sector in Cambodia, for the CSO sector in Cambodia, to promote best practice in governance. **More info:**

<http://www.ccc-cambodia.org/ccc-program/voluntary-certification.html>

West-Africa/Europe – Self Regulatory Mechanisms

WACSI (West African Civil Society Institute) in Ghana has for example been discussing partnering with One World Trust (OWT) to run programmes in West Africa that will encourage CSOs to have self regulatory mechanisms.

More info: <http://wacsi.org/>

Case-studies on question 17: In your view, what are the implications and opportunities for CSOs related to the above-mentioned trends?

Pakistani WebTV

In Pakistan, a web TV exists. Such platforms by CSOs offer spaces for common people to discuss and have dialogue on important issues, which can lead to policy changes at the national level.

More info: www.maati.tv.



The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of B&S Europe and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.