

Technical Assistance to the Civil Society Organisations 2 (TACSO 2) from the IPA Beneficiaries
EuropeAid/133642/C/SER/Multi

Report

Regional Conference “Promotion of the CSF Guidelines: Current situation and way forward in monitoring, programming and progress reporting for the 2014-2020 period”

Hotel “Tirana International”, Tirana, 6-9 May 2014

CONTENTS

1. **Introduction**
2. **Methodology**
3. **Overview of the sessions**
4. **Evaluation results**
5. **Media coverage**
6. **Conclusions and recommendations for the future**

Annex A: Agenda

Annex B: Participant List

Annex C: Sample Formats of Target Setting Processes

Introduction

The Directorate General (DG) for Enlargement (ELARG) has developed the ‘Guidelines for EU support to civil society in the enlargement countries, 2014-2020’ (CSF Guidelines). The guidelines include a Results Framework which sets out the objectives, results and indicators for European Union (EU) support to civil society with the purpose of measuring progress at the country level as well as across the enlargement region over the next seven years.

Within the CSF Guidelines, it is foreseen that the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) will be involved in the yearly monitoring of the indicators and results with TACSO’s support. Yearly national and regional meetings should analyse the CSOs’ development in all the countries and their advancement towards the targets. The monitoring process of the CSF Guidelines was envisaged to commence with the Baseline report, whose purpose is to look at the starting position per indicators of the Result Framework of the CSF Guidelines. TACSO was tasked to collect the needed information for the development of the Baseline report. In parallel to this, the whole process related to the monitoring of the CSF Guidelines began after the extensive consultations for the development of the CSF Guidelines. Even though the DG ELARG Unit 3 invested a lot of time in promoting the CSF Guidelines and its future utilisation, it was important to arrange an opportunity where all major stakeholders would be present from the countries concerned. This opportunity was needed in order to launch and to position the CSF Guidelines as a key monitoring, programming and progress reporting document among those who would be held accountable for progress against a majority of indicators,

who would contribute to the process of monitoring and who would use the CSF Guidelines for future support of issues concerning the CSOs.

In cooperation with the DG ELARG Unit 3, TACSO organised a Regional Conference “Promotion of the CSF Guidelines: Current situation and way forward in monitoring, programming and progress reporting for the 2014–2020 period”, that was held in Tirana International Hotel in Tirana, Albania from 06–09 May 2014. Apart from the DG ELARG Unit 3, during the design process of the event, TACSO also consulted with government and CSO representatives who were present during the two preceding events organised by the Office for Cooperation with CSOs in Government of Republic of Croatia (November 2013 and April 2014). After this participative approach in the conference design, it was agreed that the main purpose of the Conference should be to launch the Guidelines as a key monitoring, reporting and programming EU orientation/streamlining document for matters related to the CSOs located in the Western Balkans and Turkey (WBT).

Furthermore, it was envisaged that the conference should be seen as an opportunity to initiate discussions on topics relevant to the full utilization of the CSF Guidelines; how would the national targets per indicators of the Result framework be defined; what is the possible role of government representatives should we wish to ensure the sustainability of the utilization, monitoring of, and progress reporting against the CSF Guidelines; what are the major topics deriving from the CSF Guidelines whose additional attention would contribute the most to the changes within the CSO environment and what is the most effective way for these topics to be addressed in the future. Finally, it was agreed that it would be beneficial for the countries concerned to receive a comparative overview among the countries based on the baseline findings per indicator of the Results Framework of the CSF Guidelines for the overall purpose of regional benchmarking.

The guiding principle in the selection of participants for this event was to ensure the maximum contribution to the discussions in relation to and arising from the objectives of the conference. At the same time, since the potential changes and progress along the CSF Guidelines is in their best interest, numerous CSOs were involved in the process of developing the CSF Guidelines; their motivation for implementation and changes along the CSF Guidelines as opposed to other stakeholders, such as governments in the region, is rather high. On the other hand, changes and progress along two thirds of the indicators of the Results Framework are under direct responsibility of governments. Having in mind the number of other priorities for the governments in the WBT, issues concerning CSOs and the enabling environment may not be at the top of their priority list as members of the governments in the region. Nevertheless, based on the indicators of the Results Framework, foreseen changes will require to be supported by a variety of resource Ministries and not only by the Offices/Units for Cooperation with CSOs. In order to support the Offices/Units for Cooperation with CSOs to gain support from their associated colleagues from the governments, it was assessed that it is of utmost importance, right from the beginning, to involve in the whole process of monitoring the CSF Guidelines representatives of other relevant resource Ministers to the largest positive extent. Finally, representatives from the EU Delegations EU were an essential driving force for ensuring that the CSF Guidelines are utilised to its maximum potential.

Having said the aforementioned, county delegations were composed of seven people: three

government representatives, two CSOs, one EUD, and a TACSO national RA. Adding to this additional guests and speakers consisted of resource persons, other CSOs, interested projects and donors, with the total number of participants being 76.

Methodology

Setting the Conference's objectives required a careful design of the processes during the Conference that would ensure maximum interaction among participants, full understanding of the prospects and benefits of applying the CSF Guidelines, and initiate thinking about what is really needed for its full utilisation. Also, it was envisaged to stimulate a need and desire for changes among gathered country delegations along the CSF Guidelines, thus building the initial ownership over the document among the key stakeholders.

Furthermore, since the programme of the Conference was almost a full three days, it was important to make sure to maintain the participants' engagement and to maintain solid conference dynamics throughout the whole programme.

Due to the ambitious objectives and the complexity of the processes deriving from the objectives, it was decided by TACSO to hire a professional facilitator, from MDF, Mr. Mike Zuyderduyn.

In terms of the design of the sessions, all sessions were designed so as to consist of a brief opening panel followed by either enabling individual reflections on the information presented during the panel, small group discussions, separate larger groups discussion, and in a few cases reflections to the panel presentations in plenum. It was deliberately decided to keep long panel presentations and plenum discussions to a minimum, and instead to create more space for smaller group discussions and enable the participation and contribution of as many participants as possible.

In order to trigger thinking and creativity, panels were carefully designed. Special attention was paid to the selection of panellists and their presentations. Presentations during the panels were kept short and focused, serving as the 'appetisers' for the discussions that followed.

Overview of the sessions

Session 1 - Stage setting: Why CSF Guidelines?

Four panellists (please refer to the attached agenda) gave their brief rationale about the need and benefits of having the CSF Guidelines, thus offering four different angles to the subject: 1) one from the creator of the document, 2) Government and EU accessions, 3) Policy development, 4) CSOs – who are the subject and main beneficiaries of the CSF Guidelines.

After a brief opening presentation, a flip chart was assigned to each panellist, where participants were able to auction their concerns and questions to all four presenters.

The main highlights of the discussion were:

- Can the CSF Guidelines be enforced in the region concerned, and how this will be done? – The EU is already making strong and steady references to the CSF Guidelines in discussions with governments and in their internal planning.
- How to maximise the effectiveness of the CSF Guidelines? - Information and consequent reporting against the CSF Guidelines should be kept short and simple.
- Is the position of the current Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) countries as opposed to Croatia, who did not have such a streamlining document during the accession process, better? – It gives a clear direction of the desired changes.
- What is the most effective way to foster changes along the set results of the Results Framework of the CSF Guidelines? – Instead of looking into and pushing for partial changes of the relevant laws and bylaws that will result in narrow modification of some aspects of the enabling environment, the desired changes should be initiated from the policy level.
- What does it mean for the CSOs? – Desired changes deriving from the CSF Guidelines should be regarded as a long-term process that will in particular directly impact the environment in which CSOs are operating and cooperating with governments.

Session 2 - Baseline: Comparative presentation of the baseline findings

The objective of this session was to present the Baseline or the starting position in the countries concerned per indicator of the Results Framework of the CSF Guidelines.

Information and data collected for the baseline had two main streams based on the types of indicators and data available, quantitative and qualitative, or the main grouping of the presented information were along the following axes: 1) CSO Enabling Environment and CSO and Government presentation (mostly qualitative), 2) CSO sustainability (mostly quantitative). For the purpose of developing the Baseline report, from axis one, TACSOS mainly relied on information gathered from the Balkan Civil Society Development Network (BCSDN) country reports developed within the EU funded Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) project, and some information was complemented with the TACSOS Needs Assessment reports. For the second axis, TACSOS outsourced research company Ipsos Strategic Marketing, who also extended their survey questionnaire to some questions where quantitative data was required for axis one. TACSOS compiled the information and data from both axes into an extensive Baseline report presenting the baseline information and data per country, per objectives, results and indicators of the Results Framework of the CSF Guidelines. The draft version of this document was used as a background material for the conference. In addition, in order to make such an extensive report more friendly and palpable to the reader, under the guidance of the DG ELARG Unit 3, TACSOS translated the key findings of the report into a more concise version of the report, a so called 'Traffic light'. The connotation to a traffic light was made because one of the three colours from a traffic light (red, yellow, and green) was assigned to each finding or 'diagnoses' presented in the report one of the colours from the traffic light was assigned, where red indicates that the situation is seriously lagging behind the desired situation, yellow indicates that there is some

progress but improvements are still needed, and green indicates that the situation is at a satisfactory level.

During the opening of the session, the process of development and purposes of the Baseline report and the countries' 'Traffic lights' were introduced, with the accent on the fact that the colours assigned within the countries' 'Traffic lights' should be regarded as initial and require further endorsements from the country delegations.

The session was structured along the aforementioned two axes. Since a majority of the information for axis one came from BCSDN, the panel consisted of BCSDN country presenters who tried to focus on the five major findings and recommendations deriving from the reports. After this part of the session, participants had an opportunity to approach BCSDN representatives and to ask more about the presented information and to talk about the Traffic lights within their country delegations.

The preliminary findings for axis two were presented by representatives from IPSOS Strategic Marketing. The presentation was structured so that it provides a comparative overview among the covered countries over the surveyed subjects. A major observation deriving from this session was that the presented information, notably by IPSOS and in the countries' 'Traffic lights' caused the biggest reaction among the participants.

As per the Ipsos report, participants' questions and concerns mainly related to the survey CSO sample size and stratification per country (mainly Serbia and Turkey). Some of the participants were of the opinion that a different methodology for the survey should have been applied, consisting of a questionnaire accompanied with an additional layer of verification of answers provided (mainly Turkey and Serbia). Furthermore, by having in mind other surveys in the respective countries when dealing with similar issues, some of the participants were of the opinion that the information presented by Ipsos largely deviates from the information already known to the participants (mainly Bosnia and Turkey). Finally, some representatives from the Offices for cooperation with CSOs were of the opinion that they should have been consulted in the process of formulating the questions for the survey conducted by the Ipsos (mainly Serbia).

In terms of the countries' 'Traffic Lights' some of the participants expressed their disagreement with the assigned colours to some of the aspects deriving from the Baseline report. They were of the opinion that the colours should be upgraded (mainly Turkey).

Finally, some of the participants, during the closed country discussions questioned the reliability of the methodology applied for the BCSDN country reports (mainly Bosnia).

The main responses given to the aforementioned concerns were:

Ipsos – the sample size does not need to follow the population size. In addition, it is difficult to define the sample size on the basis of the total number of registered CSOs, because the majority of the data related to the total amount of registered CSOs is missing or is not static. Sample stratification was based on the regions within the country as well as the willingness and availability of CSOs to provide answers to the questionnaires. The methodology proposed by some of the participants would have significantly increased the costs of the research, which would then put a question on the cost-effectiveness of the whole process of the Baseline and later on the monitoring of

the CSF guidelines. In order to understand the deviations from the known data in comparison to the data presented by Ipsos, further analysis should be conducted which is comprised of numerous aspects, which requires additional time and resources. Since the survey conducted by the Ipsos relates to the results of the CSF Guidelines that concern CSOs solely, progress along the results and indicators depend solely on the organisational development of CSOs, and governments cannot be held accountable for the consequent progress; therefore when commencing the survey, the common opinion was that there is no need for consultations with any other stakeholders other than CSOs. Furthermore, since the Ipsos survey relates to indicators of the CSO sustainability component of the CSF Guidelines, questions that were to be asked are rather straight forward, so there was no particular need for consultations on the formulation of the questions.

Traffic light and colours – the opening remark of session 2 highlighted that the suggested colours are provisional and were used as appetisers for discussion. The main purpose of the ‘Traffic lights’ is to trigger change and to make information presented in the Baseline reports palpable to the concerned stakeholders. Definitely, colours assigned in the presented ‘Traffic Lights’ are not definite and are subject to modifications based on the consensus of the stakeholders concerned, notably governments, the EU and CSOs.

BCSDN and methodology for their country reports – BCSDN has invested significant time in developing the Matrix that served as a base for the BCSDN country reports. In the process of its development, BCSDN used external expertise but also closely cooperated with governments as well. Country reports are based on the information that was available at the time of the reports’ development. Of course, this is a process and all parties concerned are at the beginning of this process. While working on their initial country research, BCSDN also identified areas for further improvements, for which integration they are already taking actions.

Session 3 – Targets: Desired directions in defining national targets per indicators

The objective of this session was to define the possible expectations and challenges in defining the country targets per CSF guidelines.

The session was initiated in the form of an interview where each of the panellists was asked a few questions along the following main pillars:

- Purpose and expectations of setting targets
- Typical bottlenecks / lessons learned in setting good targets
- The role of the government in setting targets? Specific parts in governments to be considered?
- What should a target look like? Is it a number added to a variable / indicator, a more narrative description of a desired situation or what? What is the criterion for a good target (SMART?).
- Who would be in charge of drafting such targets, who should be involved?
- Who decides on the level of ambition (what target to be set?)
- What does the target setting process ideally look like?
- Who monitors and reports on progress towards targets?

The opening interview was followed by working group discussions, where groups consisted of country representatives. The objective of the work in the working groups was to try to format the target setting process. Groups were asked to answer the following questions:

- Who leads the target setting process?
- Who needs to be a partner (p), consult(c) or be informed (i)?
- How will the process take shape? What kind of activities should set the targets?
- Who decides / signs off on the targets?
- Who will monitor and report on the progress?

For insights on what the groups have produced, please refer to Annex C where sample country reports for Bosnia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (hereinafter referred to as Macedonia) and Montenegro are enclosed.

Session 4 - Roles: The most effective roles of the Government offices/focal points for cooperation with CSOs and other relevant government representatives could have in monitoring, progress reporting and programming along the CSF Guidelines and factors influencing such a role

The objective of this session was to understand how, if any, the monitoring is conducted by the governments in the region along some of the aspects of what the CSF Guidelines look like today.

Panellists were government representatives from Serbia and Montenegro, but later, other country government representatives were also asked from their table to shortly, in plenum, respond to the following questions:

- how the government currently monitors and reports on the conduciveness of the environment for civil society activities and the capacity of CSOs to be effective and accountable independent actors (i.e. actual experience)
- key challenges faced in undertaking this monitoring and reporting.

This session was followed by three mixed working groups with the objective to think about what the desired situation would look like in 2017 during which time the CSF Guidelines are being successfully monitored, reported upon and used for programming, to think jointly about how to get there, and to assess the risks per country for the some of the suggested scenarios.

During this working group part, it was not so important to produce some tangible plans that can immediately be applied in each of the subject countries, but rather to take participants through the joint process of the visualisation of ideal scenarios, and to initiate discussions and dialogue in the delegations of the respective countries about the whole process, with the hope that the discussions and dialogue would continue after the conference.

General remarks deriving from the mind-maps, for the CSF Guidelines to be successfully monitored, reported upon and used for programming, the Conference participants expressed that the following was needed:

- Government understanding of and ownership of the Guidelines / having integrated them in their own strategies that are actively disseminated and implemented / monitored.
- Legislation in place for public consultations resulting in the systematic cooperation mechanisms / policy dialogue between the government and CSOs, including feedback mechanisms concerning each other's inputs
- Trust / mutual accountability between the governments and CSOs and open about capacity concerns, including:
 - Government demonstrating commitment, support and transparency
 - CSOs demonstrating commitment to capacity development
- EU taking the guidelines seriously in the broader negotiation processes related to programmatic support and accession

Session 5 – Change: Initiating changes along the issues/themes deriving from the CSF Guidelines

Session 5 was dedicated to talking about the issues deriving from the CSF Guidelines that need the most attention because either they have the greatest impact on the CSOs or create different opportunities for the development of CSOs.

Panellists were asked to advocate or 'sell' the three most important issues / themes deriving from the CSF guidelines that need immediate attention / efforts, and to offer arguments for it.

Panellist 1 advocated for:

1. Capacity Building of CSOs - Skills to understand the systems, instruments, and effects of the creation of public policies
2. Capacity Building in relation to the CSF Guidelines - to understand the underlining role of the CSF Guidelines, an enabling environment is the beginning of the process

Panellist 2 advocated for:

1. What about Philanthropy?
 - Individual
 - Corporate
 - Enabling environment
 - Develop CSO capacities related to engagement in philanthropic activities
 - Self-regulation
2. Social inclusion (keep innovating, service provision, social entrepreneurship)
3. Public-private partnership, inter-sectorial cooperation, bring business on board – working together

Panellist 3 advocated for:

1. Getting official data and opening the data (map of what is available, quality, accessibility)
2. Self-assessment of monitoring capacity and the system on the government side – improving the monitoring system, and government strategies

3. Serious investments in the capacity building of civil servants and CSOs to engage (political will, time and money)
4. Get in order tax regime for individual and corporate giving, and non-financial support

Panellist 4 advocated for:

1. Philanthropy
 - Changing behaviour (capacity building of the organisation, communication skills, planning skills, building trust in the community)
 - Change of people (funders/donors)
 - Building active citizens
2. Communication
 - Where are we going, what we are doing to our neighbours, become sustainable in the longer-term?
3. Capacity building to effectively engage in developing public policies
 - To understand how the system works

Additional themes suggested by the participants:

1. Public funding
2. Public funding for social services
3. Social inclusion

Other concerns also suggested by participants:

1. Diversification of funding
2. Swift political will
3. Synergy and regional learning
4. Reduce distance between government and CSOs (government to simplify procedures, language).

Evaluation of the event

Participants were asked to evaluate the quality and content of the event via evaluation sheets given to them at the end of the conference. A total of 26 questionnaires were completed. Please see the summary results below:

The content of the conference	Average scores
How would you assess the relevance of the topics covered in the regional conference?	4,63
How would you assess the effectiveness of the conference, i.e. did the conference reach its objectives?	4,22
To what extent are your expectations met?	4,24
The concept of and methodologies used in the conference	
How would you assess the overall concept of the conference?	4,27
How would you assess the variety of topics covered during the conference?	4,24
How would you assess the overall design of the process of the conference?	4,23

How would you assess session 1: Why CSF guidelines?	4,62
How would you assess session 2:	
Baseline presentation of objectives 1, 2, 3	4,28
Baseline presentation of objectives 4, 5, 6	3,98
How would you assess session 3: Desired directions in defining national targets per indicators?	4,26
How would you assess session 4: Roles - The roles of the Government offices/focal points for cooperation with CSOs and other relevant government representatives in monitoring, progress reporting and programming along the CSF Guidelines?	4,22
How would you assess session 5: Change: Initiating changes along the issues/themes deriving from the CSF Guidelines?	4,13
How did you like the interactive parts of the conference?	
Q&A after the opening panel?	4,46
Welcome cocktail?	4,51
Road map for target setting?	4,39
Mind mapping?	4
Brainstorming?	4,04
Country monitoring planning?	4,47
Conference materials	
How would you assess the materials used for the conference?	4,31
Conference materials	
How would you assess the materials used for the conference?	4,44
Networking opportunities	
How would you assess the opportunities to network with the other participants attending the conference?	4,67
Capacity Building Opportunity	
How would you assess the new perspectives you gained from the conference?	4,47
How would you assess that the new perspectives you gained from the conference will contribute to the future work of your organisation?	4,45
Logistics and accommodation	
How would you assess the overall coordination during the preparation of the conference?	4,71
How would you assess the logistics related to the conference?	4,85
How would you assess the accommodation?	4,83

In general, participants found the topic of the Conference very relevant and that it met their expectations. In addition, they appreciated the opportunities to discuss and share their views and opinions related to the required country approaches in the future utilisation of the CSF Guidelines.

Media coverage

In order to gain visibility for the event, with the support of the TACSO Albania Office and the EU Delegation to Albania, a media advisory was sent to above 200 Albanian media. Since the conference had regional coverage, TACSO ensured that journalists from Macedonia and Turkey

were also present. Unfortunately, there were no journalists available to attend the Conference that would have covered the Serbian/Bosnian/Montenegrin speaking region.

A press conference was held on May 7 from 11 to 11.45 am, and attended by over five Albanian TV houses and over four Albanian press media, including Turkish and Macedonian journalists.

Representatives from the DG ELARG Unit 3, the EU Delegation to Albania, SIPU International, as well as Croatian and Serbian governments took part in the press conference; each highlighting what kind of importance the CFS Guidelines has for the development of CSOs in the Western Balkan and Turkey region.

Conclusions and recommendations for the future

A major **conclusion** from the participants' side was that due to the structure of the conference participants and conference design, the main outcome of the conference was the joint ownership of the CSF Guidelines by the key stakeholders. In addition, based on the reaction from the participants to some of the presentations (mainly Ipsos report) and work group discussions, participants expressed a great need for their participation and contribution to all aspects concerning the CSF Guidelines, first with the baseline and monitoring, but also in the further refinement of the indicators of the CSF Guidelines.

The recommendations were:

- Refinement of the indicators – DG ELARG Unit 3 is open to some refinement of indicators if needed.
- Targets – should be further developed throughout national consultations facilitated by TACSO
- Traffic lights – should also further be reassessed through national consultations facilitated by TACSO
- Ipsos baseline report – should go through the national commenting process, and TACSO can explore the need for additional national presentations of the Ipsos's country reports
- TACSO should develop briefings deriving from the Baseline reports and countries' Traffic light for the Progress reports
- Develop national action plans (governments, CSOs and EUDs) on how to conduct monitoring, use regional conferences for cross checking from country to country – process to be facilitated by TACSO
- Perhaps develop a board that would oversee what actions from the action plans have been implemented
- Look into the options of improving data collection at the level of government institutions
- Provide required training, including government representatives that will contribute to the improvement of the overall monitoring process

- TACSO to continue addressing topics deriving from the CSF Guidelines and as indicated under session 5. Of course, topics like public funding being one of the most important, but the rest of the suggested topics should not be neglected as well. For example corporate social responsibility and philanthropy should be given greater attention since this area enables mission driven CSOs and supports the development of all issues indicated under the component 3 of the CSF Guidelines.

Annexes

Annex A: Agenda

May 6th

15:00 Arrival of participants

Session 1 - Stage setting: Why CSF Guidelines?

17:00 – 19:00 Opening remarks by *Mr. Yngve Engstrom, Head of Operations, Delegation of European Union to Albania on behalf of Ambassador Ettore Sequi* and *Mr. Taylor Michael, Director for Development Consulting SIPU International*

- DG ELARG Unit 3 position – *Mr. Nicola Bertolini, Head of Section, European Commission, DG Enlargement Unit D3, Regional Cooperation and Programmes*
- Advantages of having CSF Guidelines during the Accession Process - *Mr. Igor Vidačak, PhD, Head of the Office, Office for Cooperation with NGOs in the Government of the Republic of Croatia*
- Effects of the CSF Guidelines on the CSOs' overall capacities (institutional and organisational) – *Mr. Dragan Golubović, Public Policy and Legal Expert*
- Possible CSO positions in relation to the CSF Guidelines – *Ms. Tanja Hafner-Ademi, Executive Director BCSDN*

Session wrap up and Q&A

19:00 – 21:00 Welcome cocktail

May 7th

9.00 – 9.20 Recap from Session 1

Session 2 - Baseline: Comparative presentation of the baseline findings

9:20 – 11:00 Comparative presentation of the baseline findings for indicators under objectives 1 and 2
(*Panellists: members of BCSDN and Jasenka Perović, TACSO Capacity Building expert*)

11:00 – 11:45 Coffee break
Including press conference (30 minutes)

11.45 – 13:00 Comparative presentation of the baseline findings under objectives 3, 4, 5 and 6
(*Panellists: members of BCSDN and Ipsos, Research Company*)

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch Break

Session 3 – Targets: Desired directions in defining national targets per indicators

14.30 – 15.30 Session opening (Plenary)

(Panellists: Mr. Nicola Bertolini, Mr. Igor Vidačak, some EUD representatives TBD)

15.30 – 15.45 Coffee break

15.45 – 17.00 Mapping of steps forward in defining the national targets per indicators (working groups)

17.00 – 17.30 Harvesting of working groups' findings

May 8th

9:00 – 9:30 Recap from sessions 1, 2 and 3 and facilitator's instruction in relation to the presentation of Session 3's findings

Session 4 - Roles: The most effective roles of the Government offices/focal points for cooperation with CSOs and other relevant government representatives could have in monitoring, progress reporting and programming along the CSF Guidelines and factors influencing such a role

9:30 – 11:00 Opening session (plenary) with Q&A

(Panellists: Ms. Ivana Ćirković, Director of the Office for Cooperation with CSOs, Government of the Republic of Serbia, Ms. Danka Latković, Head of office for Cooperation with CSOs, The General Secretariat of the Government of Montenegro, others TBD)

11:00 – 12:30 Mapping of possible steps to overcome defined challenges against monitoring, programming and progress reporting (working groups)

12.30 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 15.30 Continuation of the working groups' work (work group)

Coffee can be served during the WG discussions

15.30 – 16.00 Harvesting WG findings in relation to both sessions 3 and 4

16.00 – 17.30 Presentation of WG findings

May 9th

9:00 – 9:30 Recap from the previous days

Session 5 – Change: Initiating changes along the issues/themes deriving from the CSF Guidelines

9:30 – 11:00 Session opening (*Panellists: Mr. Dragan Golubović, Ms. Tanja Hafner-Ademi, Ms. Aleksandra Vesić Antić, Catalyst and Ms. Mia Vukojević Executive Director of Trag, proposed by the FPA SIGN for Sustainability, Ms. Jasenka Perovic, TACSO Capacity Building expert*)

11:00 – 11:30 *Coffee break*

11:30 – 12:30 Conference wrap up

Annex B: Participants List

Promotion of the CSF Guidelines: 'Current situation and way forward in monitoring, programming and progress reporting for 2014-2020 period'

Hotel "Tirana International", Tirana, 6-9 of May 2014

List of Participants

EC Brussels representatives

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr. Nicola Bertolini	<i>Head of Section</i> DG ELARG Regional Cooperation and Programmes

TACSO PARTICIPANTS

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Ms. Oriana Arapi	<i>Director of Strategic Planning Unit</i> Office of the Prime Minister
2	Mr. Gentian Elezi	<i>Deputy Minister</i> Ministry of the European Integration
3	Ms. Bardhylka Kospiri	<i>Deputy Minister</i> Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth
4	Mr. Erand Ibrahim	<i>Head of Civil Society and Strategy Unit</i> Directorate for Priorities Delivery and European Secretariat Ministry of European Integration
5	Mr. Mihallaq Qirjo	<i>Country Director</i> The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe Albania LAG
6	Mr. Goran Kučera	<i>Senior Advisor for Civil Society</i> Ministry of Justice of Bosnia and Herzegovina
7	Mr. Midhat Dzemic	<i>Head of Department</i> Directorate for European Integration Bosnia and Herzegovina
8	Mr. Predrag Golubović	<i>Senior Associate for civic associations, foundations and national minorities</i>
9	Ms. Amra Seleskovic	<i>Directress of Vesta Association</i> President of the TACSO BH LAG
10	Mr. Habit Hajredini	<i>Director of the Office for Good Governance</i> Office of the Prime Minister Republic of Kosovo
11	Ms. Trendeline Dreshaj Rexha	<i>Senior Officer on Good Governance at the Office of Prime Minister</i> Office on Good Governance

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
12	Mr. Besim Kajtazi	<i>Director of Legal Office</i> Office of the Prime Minister
13	Mr. Veton Mujaj	<i>Executive Director</i> Syri i Vizionit LAG
14	Mr. Jovan Petreski	<i>Unit for Cooperation with NGOs</i> General Secretariat of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia
15	Mr. Dushan Tomshic	<i>Associate</i> Ministry of Labour and social policy
16	Ms. Aleksandra Vukovikj	<i>Coordinator of the fundamental rights area</i> <i>(under I-Political criteria, Human rights and protection of minorities and Chapter 3.23. Judiciary and fundamental rights)</i> Secretariat for European Affairs
17	Mr. Zoran Ilieski	<i>Executive Director</i> Youth Coalition SEGA LAG
18	Ms. Danka Latković	<i>Head of Office for cooperation with NGOs</i> General Secretariat of the Government of Montenegro
19	Mr. Ivan Šikmanović	<i>Independent advisor in Ministry of interior of Montenegro</i>
20	Ms. Jelena Burzan	<i>Head of the Chief Negotiator's Office</i> Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration NIPAK
21	Ms. Bojana Kaluđerović	<i>Head of Quality Assurance Division/Directorate for Finance and Contracting of the EU Assistance Funds</i> Ministry of Finance
22	Mr. Zlatko Vujović	President of the Board Center for Monitoring and Research CeMI LAG
23	Ms. Ivana Cirkovic	<i>Director</i> Government of the Republic of Serbia Office for cooperation with Civil Society Director
24	Mr. Dragan Mrkalj	<i>Advisor for planning and project preparation in the field of infrastructure and environment (covering also planning and programming of civil society, media and culture)</i> European Integration Office
25	Mr. Vladimir Vukicevic	<i>Consultant for Human rights</i> Ministry of Justice and Public Administration
26	Ms. Tamara Filipovic	<i>Project Manager</i> NUNS Serbia LAG
27	Ms. Damla Yazar	<i>Junior Expert</i> Ministry of Development
28	Mr. Murat Başer	<i>Expert</i> Ministry for EU Affairs
29	Mr. Bumin Kağan İsmailoğlu	<i>Foundation Expert</i> Office of the Prime Minister

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
30	Mr. Murat Girgin	<i>Deputy President</i> Department of Associations Ministry of Interior
31	Mr. Tezcan Eralp Abay	<i>General Coordinator</i> Civil Society Development Centre Association LAG
1	Mr. Gordan Velev	<i>Network coordinator</i> ASB Belgrade
2	Ms. Mia Vukojević	<i>Executive Director</i> Trag Foundation (member of SIGN)
3	Ms. Aleksandra Vesić Antić	<i>Senior Adviser</i> Catalyst
1	Ms. Tanja Hafner Ademi	<i>Executive Director</i> BCSDN
2	Ms. Klotilda Kosta	<i>Director of Programs</i> Partners Albania (member of BCSDN for Albania)
3	Ms. Šejla Karamehić	<i>Project Manager</i> Center for Promotion of Civil Society (CPCD) (member of BCSDN for BiH)
4	Mr. Dren Puka	<i>Program Officer</i> KCS Foundation (member of BCSDN for Kosovo)
5	Ms. Simona Ognenovska	<i>Project Officer</i> Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (member of BCSDN for Macedonia)
6	Ms. Ana Novaković	<i>Executive director</i> Centre for Development of Non-Governmental Organizations (member of BCSDN for Montenegro)
7	Ms. Bojana Selaković	<i>Program Manager for Public Policies</i> (member of BCSDN for Serbia)
8	Ms. Sezin Dereci	<i>Project Coordinator</i> (member of BCSDN for Turkey)

SIPU International

No	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1.	Mr Michael Taylor	<i>Director Development Consulting</i>

TACSO CONFERENCE MANAGEMENT TEAM

No	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr Palle Westergaard	<i>Team Leader</i> Regional Office
2	Ms. Jasenka Perović	<i>Capacity Building Expert</i> Regional Office
3	Ms. Sanela Tunović-Bećirović	<i>Communication Expert</i> Regional Office

No	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
4	Ms. Marijana Aksin-Mačak	Team Leader Assistant/AFO Regional Office

TACSO SUPPORT TO FACILITATION OF THE PROCESS

No	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
5	Mr Genci Pasko	Resident Advisor Albania
6	Ms Slavica Draskovic	Resident Advisor BiH
7	Ms Ardita Metaj-Dika	Resident Advisor Kosovo
8	Ms Sunchica Sazdovska	Resident Advisor Macedonian Office
9	Mr. Goran Đurović	Resident Advisor Montenegro Office
10	Ms Zorka Raskovic	Resident Advisor Serbia
11	Ms. Ayça Bulut Bican	Resident Advisor Turkey
12	Ms Ornela Xhera	AFO Albania

RESOURCE PERSONS

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr. Igor Vidačak	Director /Office for Cooperation with NGOs Government of the Republic of Croatia
2	Mr. Dragan Golubović	International Consultant
3	Mr. Luben Panov	Program Consultant European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL)

LEAD FACILITATOR

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr. Mike Zuijderduijn	Managing Director MDF Training & Consultancy

GUESTS (Serbia IPA Project)

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Ms. Branka Andjelkovic	Team Leader EU Support to the Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society

MEDIA REPRESENTATIVES

No	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr. Evren Gönül	Coordinator IPS Communication Network (BIANET)
2	Ms. Elizabeta Veljanovska Najdeska	Senior Journalist Macedonian Information Agency - MIA

EU DELEGATION OFFICES

1	Mr. Yngve Engstroem	Head of Operations EU Delegation to Albania
2	Mr. Stefano Calabretta	Task manager for Civil Society EU Delegation to Albania
3	Mr. Džemal Hodžić	Programme Manager EU Delegation to Bosnia and Herzegovina

4	Ms. Gaby Haggmüller	<i>Team leader/ Social Development</i> EU Office in Kosovo/ EU Special representative
5	Ms. Irena Ivanova	<i>Civil Society Task Manager</i> EU Delegation to Macedonia
6	Mr. Romain Boitard	<i>Task Manager</i> EU Delegation to Macedonia
7	Ms. Lise Pate-Yilmazer	<i>Sector Manager</i> EU Delegation to Turkey

GUESTS (IPSOS)

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr Predrag Kurcubic	<i>Research Director, Media CT and Public Affairs</i> Ipsos Strategic Marketing
2	Mr Marko Uljarevic	<i>Researcher</i> Ipsos Strategic Marketing

GUESTS

	Name	Position and Organisation/ Institution
1	Mr. Samir Omerefendic	<i>Project Manager</i> Reinforcement of Local Democracy - LOD UNDP BiH
2	Ms. Biljana Dakić- Đorđević	<i>Senior Program Officer</i> Balkan Trust for Democracy – German Marshall Fund of the United States
3	Ms. Selen Lermioğlu Yilmaz	<i>EU Project Coordinator</i> TUSEV Turkey
4	Mr. Zeljko Bogut	<i>Secretary</i> Ministry of Justice of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnia and Herzegovina – Session 3 Work Group Report

Country approach to CSF Guidelines targets

Strategic Objectives (Targets)

- Establishing mechanisms for the transparent allocation of public funds to CSOs on a project-based approach (including criteria, awarding, monitoring, reporting)
- Establishing an e-database of all registered CSOs
- Creating a strategic document for the enabling environment for CSOs in BiH

Happening now:

- Amended rules for consultation w/civil society before the Council of Ministers (CoM) for adoption. Prepared for the entities as well
- Proposal before the entities' government for amending the tax law (concerning civil society)
- Mechanism for consultations w/civil society (for IPA II) before CoM for adoption
- Methodology for more transparent allocation of funds to civil society is adopted and institutionalized in 26 municipalities and FBiH (entity)
- Production of web platform for on-line consultations w/civil society (state and entity level)
- Revision of BiH draft strategy for civil society enabling environment (Framework recommendations)
- CoM will revise the 2007 Agreement (in order to start the implementation-realistic approach)

Priority action to be taken

Idea 1: Building of the most feasible institutional mechanisms (strategy documents, department, public consultations).

Pre-conditions: (Provision of official approval of CSF Guidelines by BH CoM, including commitment)

First step	By whom	When
Information for CoM BH about the reference and CSF Guidelines	Ministry of Justice BH	May
Information for civil society about the EU CS Guidelines	TACSO BH LAG, Ministry of Justice BH	May
Information for CBGI project	EU DEL BH	May
Building capacities of CSOs in using established institutional mechanisms (necessary for effective usage of constitutional mechanisms)	TACSO & Resource Centres	→
Monitoring cooperation between CSOs and institutional mechanisms	TACSO & Resource Centres	→

Ensuring technical and IT preconditions for effective participation of civil society in policy debate	EU/CSF	2014-2015
---	--------	-----------

Idea 2: Establishing an e-database of all registered CSOs

Starting activities

First step	By whom	When
The analysis of law requirements related to reporting	TBD	TBD
Development of proposal for e-database	TBD	TBD
Consultations with relevant governmental authorities and CSOs	TBD	TBD
Establishment of e-database	TBD	TBD
Information campaign towards CSOs	TBD	TBD
Adoption of the regulation for legitimacy of the E-database as obligatory step for CSOs	TBD	TBD
Monitoring of the functioning of the e-database	TBD	TBD
Reporting on data available for the public	TBD	TBD

Macedonia – Session 3 Work Group Report

Country approach to CSF Guidelines targets

1. CURRENT STATE OF PLAY (if something has been already done related with the CSF Guidelines)

* Second Government Strategy for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) is in place and contains targets that correspond to the targets from the CSF Guidance

* National consultations regarding CSF Guidelines were held and resulted with a frame with targets defined for the national level

2. & 3. LEAD AND INVOLVEMENT (who should take the lead and who should be involved)

On this issue, the mandate should be given to the Council for Cooperation between the Government and CSOs when established. However, until its establishment, the leading role should be under the Unit for Cooperation with NGOs.

Stakeholders that should be involved are:

- LAG
- Inter-ministerial network
- Broader CSOs community
- Donor community

4. & 5. PROCESS AND DECISION (what the process should look like, what are the activities and how to decide on the targets)

- The focus of the process for defining the national targets should be on those indicators with yellow and red findings from the baseline study
- Consultations should be organised with all relevant stakeholders
- Consensus should be reached on priorities and targets

6. MONITORING

- EC
- SEA
- Government Unit for Cooperation with NGOs
- CSOs independently

DIMENSION: INSTITUTIONAL SET UP FOR COOPERATION

1.1. Speed up the process of the establishment of the Council for Cooperation between the Government and CSOs

Key activities:

Step 1: Establishing a working group by the Government (including CSOs)

Step 2: Preparation of the proposal on the Council about its mission / objectives, structure

Step 3: Consultations

- Within Inter-ministerial network
- With CSOs

Step 4: Preparation of acts for the establishment of the Council

Step 5: Selection/nomination of Council members

- Open call for CSOs

WHO: Working group + Experts

WHEN: Second half of 2014

PRE-CONDITIONS: Political will

RISK ASSESSMENT: Level of political commitment

PREVENTION OF RISKS: Expectations from EC

Montenegro - Session 3 Work Group Report

Country approach to CSF Guidelines targets

What is happening already?

- Strategy for Development of NGOs
- Action plan for chapter 23/Negotiation with the EU

Who leads the target setting process?

- Council for Cooperation with the Government and NGOs

Who needs to be a partner, consultant or be informed?

P: relevant ministries, other state bodies, Delegation of the EU, Coalitions of NGOs, Union of municipalities, Resource centre.

C: OSCE, UNDP, TACSO, local authorities.

I: citizens, media and universities.

How will the process take shape?

- Develop action plan (with budget allocation)
- Consultation with partners
- Use of existing documents (strategies).
- Set up methodology for setting targets

Who will decide on the targets?

- Government based on Council opinion.

Who will monitor and report on the process?

- Council for Cooperation of with the Government and NGOs (in cooperation with ministries)