Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

Monitoring Framework

INDICATOR **2:**

Civil Society Organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development

Methodology

Draft for consultation

Summary:

Civil society organisations maximise their development impact when the legal framework, the practices of governments, and the behaviour of development partners foster a greater role for CSOs; and when CSOs' own work is carried out in line with the effectiveness principles.

The original indicator 2 measured these multiple dimensions through a multi-stakeholder dialogue process organised around a common questionnaire. However, the previous methodology did not allow properly reflecting incremental progress, or capturing the specific characteristics of each country context, limiting the chances for a substantive country-level policy dialogue and action.

The revised indicator improves the questionnaire and eases the multi-stakeholder reporting process, while addressing the two issues described above.

Note: The following draft methodology, put forth by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, builds on substantive contributions made by the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness and the Task Team on CSO Enabling Environment and Development Effectiveness, the Task-Team 2016 stock-take exercise and complementary analyses carried out by these two networks, the advice of the Global Partnership Monitoring Advisory Group, the implications of the Nairobi Outcome document, and the conclusions from the April and November 2017 meetings of the Global Partnership group of experts working on indicator 2.

Background

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognise the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (Global Partnership or GPEDC) as a solid foundation to drive more effective development co-operation. To meet the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership must deliver evidence and data that address the needs of countries in better monitoring the effectiveness of their development efforts. In the Nairobi Outcome Document, the international development community stressed the need to "update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind".

To address these challenges, the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership outlined an inclusive strategy to refine the monitoring framework, following a three-track approach:
1. Strengthening the current 10 indicators to ensure their relevance for the 2030 Agenda context;

2. Adapting the scope of monitoring to address major systemic issues critical to the 2030 Agenda, such as climate change, gender equality, conflict and fragility as well as progressively reflecting all the modalities and development co-operation actors;

3. Enhancing the impact of the monitoring process by improving the quality and inclusiveness of country-level monitoring and facilitating follow-up and action on the results.

The refinement of the Global Partnership monitoring framework is guided by the Nairobi Outcome Document, the technical advice of the Monitoring Advisory Group and the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, and lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, including feedback from participating countries. The refinement began in April 2017 and is drawing on the technical assistance of expert groups, related to specific thematic areas, paired with iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders and country-level testing.

The refined indicators will be used in the third Global Partnership monitoring round, scheduled to be launched in May 2018. Further revisions will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises. Findings from the third monitoring round will feed into high-level political processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL

INDICATOR 2: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS OPERATE WITHIN AN ENVIRONMENT THAT MAXIMISES THEIR
ENGAGEMENT IN AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT

1. Introduction

This document presents a proposal to refine the Global Partnership indicator [*indicator 2*] measuring the **enabling environment and development effectiveness of Civil Society Organisations** (CSOs). The indicator is part of the current Global Partnership Monitoring Framework, which is undergoing a refinement process to respond adequately to the effectiveness challenges of implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

To refine the indicator methodology, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team collaborated with multi-stakeholder group composed by experts from Civil Society Organisations, governments of partner countries development partners, and academics. This document presents the current measurement and shortcomings as identified by the Monitoring Advisory Group, the lessons learned from past monitoring round and the conclusions from the April and November meetings of the Global Partnership expert group working on indicator 2. Comments received on this draft proposal will inform the final methodology for indicator 2.

This proposal is open for general consultation and will be piloted in four countries during March 2018. Based on feedback received and lessons learned from the consultation and pilots, the methodology will be further refined and finally submitted to the Global Partnership Steering Committee. Upon Steering Committee endorsement, the refined indicator will be rolled out as part of the third monitoring round starting in May 2018.

2. Rationale

Civil society organisations play a vital role in enabling people to claim their rights, in promoting rights-based approaches, in shaping development policies and partnerships, and in overseeing their implementation, as recognised in the Busan Partnership Agreement (GPEDC, 2011). Their contribution to sustainable development, in leaving no one behind, and in keeping governments accountable for their commitments is recognised by all development actors and enshrined in the Nairobi Outcome document (GPEDC, 2016). The political, financial, legal and policy context in which CSOs work, as well as the ways in which these development actors organise themselves and with other partners deeply affects the effectiveness of their operations and their substantive contribution to achieve development outcomes.

Through their endorsement of the Busan Partnership Agreement, 165 governments committed to create an enabling environment for CSOs as to maximise their contribution to development (GPEDC, 2011). In the same line, CSOs committed in Busan to make their operations more transparent and accountable, and ultimately more effective, responding to other internationally agreed

commitments, such as the '*Istanbul Principles for CSO development effectiveness*' (Open Forum, 2010). The 2016 Nairobi Outcome document also reflected governments' determination to reverse the trend of closing civic space for civil society and to accelerate progress in providing an enabling environment for civil society, in line with internationally agreed rights (GPEDC, 2016). Finally, all the parties committed to encourage inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms at country level, supported by capacity building measures.

3. Current methodology

Substantive focus

The current indicator 2 assessed the extent to which governments and development partners contribute to an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs). It also assessed the extent to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations.

The indicator covers these two substantive issues throughout a structured questionnaire, organised in four thematic modules that explore stakeholders' respective efforts to maximize CSO contributions to development:

> (1) Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies.
>
> (2) CSO development effectiveness.
>
> (3) Official development co-operation with CSO.
>
> (4) Legal and regulatory environment in which CSOs operate.

The original questionnaire was developed in 2014 and rolled out in 2015. The questionnaire contained 16 binary questions ("yes"/"no"), with space under each question to provide a qualitative description of the situation at country level.[1] To facilitate the accuracy and comprehensiveness of these narrative responses, guiding sub-questions aimed to facilitate understanding of the question.

Original methodology for the data collection process

For the 2016 exercise, the data collection process was conceptualised as to be organised around country-level multi-stakeholder dialogues, among governments, CSOs and development partners. The Monitoring Guide encouraged to rely on existing engagement processes and fora (e.g. CSO platforms and roundtables with governments and development partners) to carry out the dialogue, relying on an alternative *ad hoc* "focal point-based model" if needed. In the *ad hoc* process, focal points for development partners and for CSOs were to liaise with their constituencies and participate in the process as representatives of those constituencies.

The government was encouraged to initiate a discussion around the 16-item questionnaire and seek an agreement with development partners and CSOs on a consensus response to each of the

---

[1] The qualitative questions included in each module drew on technical work carried out by the *CPDE Working Group on CSO enabling environment* (CPDE, 2013) and the *Task Team on Enabling Environment and Development Effectiveness* (TTCSO, 2011); building on the *Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness* (Open Forum, 2010); and the *International Framework for CSO Development* (Open Forum, 2013)*.

questions. Should parties did not manage to agree on some or most questions, development partners and CSOs were able to qualify their disagreement and particular viewpoints in a separate response sheet (i.e. a minority report to allow for dissent).

4. Overall assessment

Technical guidance from the Monitoring Advisory Group[2] and the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment

The Monitoring Advisory Group and the stock-take exercise carried out by the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment confirmed this indicator as high relevant and consistent with the multi-stakeholder character of the Global Partnership, the implementation of the principles for effective development co-operation, and the role of CSOs in implementation of the SDGs (GPEDC, 2016b; TTCSO, 2016). The recommendations from the Monitoring Advisory Group and the Task-Team stock-take exercise can be clustered around two main issues:

1) Fine tune the assessment tool. Suggestions included simplifying the questionnaire by using alternative input methods (e.g. scales rather than yes/no answers, reducing the length of narratives); improving guidance for reporting; and translating the questionnaire in other widespread languages among participating countries, beyond English/French/Spanish (e.g. Arabic, Portuguese).

2) Strengthening the multi-stakeholder dialogue. Suggestions included encouraging national co-ordinators to make full use of the monitoring time frame; improve guidance to undertake the multi-stakeholder dialogue; consider ways to strengthen the representativeness of focal point model.

Lessons from rolling out the indicator in the 2016 monitoring round

The indicator generated useful evidence and dialogue in most countries. However, the exercise served to identify methodological and process issues. Fifty-nine countries (73%) reported on this indicator as part of the 2016 monitoring round, but the nature of the multi-stakeholder engagement as well as the quality and comprehensiveness of the answers provided varied considerably amongst the reporting countries. Most countries carried out the consultations resorting to "focal points" for the different constituencies (e.g. CSOs, trade unions, development partners), while others consulted with existing fora and dialogue platforms between government and CSOs. In few cases, other mechanisms to gather inputs were used, such as online surveys or targeted consultations.[3] The government was ultimately tasked with drafting the responses, but the different stakeholders were allowed to dissent and provide alternative responses in case of disagreement (TTCSO, 2016).

---

[2] The Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) was established in 2015 to provide technical expertise and advice to strengthen the Global Partnership monitoring framework and ensure its relevance in the evolving post-2015 landscape. The group is composed of 12 high-level experts from developing country governments, development co-operation providers, think tanks and civil society organisations. From mid-2015 to late 2016, the MAG performed a full assessment of the 10 indicator monitoring framework and the monitoring process.

[3] Post-monitoring review suggest incomplete application of the monitoring guidance with varying degrees of uptake of these methods (TTCSO, 2016). A multi-stakeholder dialogue did not happen in all reporting countries. Some national co-ordinators chose alternative mechanisms (e.g. online or emailed surveys, selected focus groups) to seek out feedback from CSOs. The use of focal points was uneven as the level of participation from different groups of stakeholders.

5. Refinement proposal

Taking into account the Nairobi Outcome document, and building on the Monitoring Advisory Group recommendations, the findings of the Task Team stock-take, and the lessons learned from the 2016 monitoring round, the multi-stakeholder group of experts working at the refinement of indicator 2 made suggestions on how to fine tune the questionnaire, and improve the reporting process[4]. The main directions for refinement provided by the expert group can be summarised as follows:

- reflect the Nairobi Outcome Document, the Istanbul Principles and the 2030 Agenda;

- simplify the questionnaire and re-word questions to better reflect the current global agenda;

- maintain the current structure around four thematic modules;

- provide responses scales reflecting degrees of progress or scenarios and turn guiding sub-questions into narrative guidance instead, or integrate some of them into response scales;

- improve the process to create more meaningful dialogue by providing better guidance, targeted training opportunities and a staged timeline with intermediary deadlines for reporting;

In line with the directions above, the proposed refined questionnaire reflects the ambitions of the Nairobi Outcome Document, the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. The module 2 on CSO development effectiveness has been strengthened to better reflect the Istanbul Principles for CSO development effectiveness.

The revised questionnaire maintains the original structure around the **four modules.** These were confirmed as relevant and appropriate to reflect the enabling environment for CSOs to effectively contribute to development: (1) Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies; (2) CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency; (3) Official development co-operation with CSOs; and (4) Legal and regulatory environment for CSOs.

The questionnaire contains sixteen qualitative questions. The former binary "yes/no" answers are replaced with a four-level scale reflecting degrees of progress or scenarios that allow for more nuanced responses. For each level within the scale, **"characteristics of practice"** are provided to help respondents identifying the answer that better reflects the reality in their own country. A visual example of how the questionnaire will look like in practice is provided in Annex I.

Contextual data sourced from existing global indicators will be provided in the reporting tool to inform the discussion of the indicator questionnaire. This dashboard provides a picture of the country's performance in areas which are relevant for CSO's engagement and contribution to development.

---

[4] The expert group is composed by members of and the Task Team representing governments of partner countries, CSOs and development partners. The working group met in April 2017 and in November 2017. Within this expert group, a core group of experts composed by one representative from CSOs, one from partner country governments, and one from the development partners collaborated closely with the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team in the technical work of refinement.

The findings from this country level questionnaire will be complemented by additional information on the policies and practices of development partners that have an impact on the ability of CSOs to operate effectively. This information will be collected in parallel by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team.

The revised methodology captures the effective partnership between governments, civil society organisations, and official development partners. As such, it could provide the basis to measure SDG target 17.17 "*Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships*". At the moment, the current indicator measuring that target, SDG 17.17.1 (amount of US dollars committed to public-private partnerships on infrastructure) does not capture the dimension related to the effective partnership between governments and civil society organisations – an important data gap in the current SDG framework.

6. Methodology

Data collection method for the questionnaire

Country-level multi-stakeholder dialogue among government, CSOs and development partners is suggested as the best approach to report on indicator 2. This approach generates an entry point to discuss CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness issues at country level and strengthens the mutual understanding of progress and challenges. Where possible, the national co-ordinator is encouraged to use existing in-country platforms, engagement processes and fora to undertake the multi-stakeholder dialogue (e.g. CSO platforms and roundtables with governments and development partners).

The government-led multi-stakeholder dialogue will be geared to provide consensus responses to the proposed questionnaire[5]. Key steps suggested to undertake the dialogue are the following:

1) identification of focal points for CSOs and development partners prioritising their ability to convey representative views of their constituency[6];

2) the government shares the questionnaire materials and guidance in advance with the identified focal points for intra-constituency consultations;

3) focal points carry out consultations with their respective constituencies to provide consolidated feedback to the government;

4) the government convenes the relevant parties to the multi-stakeholder dialogue and invite parties to reach consensus on the responses. The government will register the responses that have reached greater consensus.

Recognising the challenges encountered by many countries in implementing the multi-stakeholder dialogue during the 2016 monitoring round, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team will be providing improved guidance within the monitoring guide, online training, and "how to" guidance which will include country examples of approaches used to collect data for this indicator in the past monitoring

---

[5] In case there are particular observations or disagreements on the responses, invited parties are allowed to reflect these remarks in an additional sheet.

[6] The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team will share with national co-ordinator a list with suggested focal points for CSOs, development partners, trade unions, and parliamentarians for their active involvement in the full monitoring process.

round. In addition, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team web-based help desk will support stakeholders throughout the monitoring exercise.

Revised questionnaire (overview)

Module One: Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies

1A. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

1B. In the context of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to what extent does the government consult CSOs in the prioritisation, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs?

1C. To what extent do CSOs have the right in law and in practice to access relevant government information for effective participation in consultations with the government?

1D. To what extent have the results of recent consultations with CSOs informed government design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Module Two: CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency

2A. To what extent are partnership equitable and based on mutual relationships between financing CSOs and their CSO partners?

2B. To what extent do CSOs participate in CSO-initiated co-ordination, including mechanisms (e.g. platforms, networks, associations) that facilitate CSOs engagement in policy dialogue and/or co-ordination among CSOs at national or sectoral level?

2C. To what extent are CSOs implementing their development work guided by international human rights standards? (e.g. human rights based approaches)

2D. To what extent are CSOs aligning with CSO-led accountability mechanisms to address CSOs' transparency and multiple accountabilities?

2E. To what extent do CSOs make available information on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development to the public, including to the government?

Module Three: Official development co-operation with CSOs

3A. To what extent do development partners consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of their development co-operation policies and programmes?

3B. To what extent is the promotion of an enabling environment for CSOs (e.g. political, financial, legal and policy aspects) an agenda item in development partners' policy dialogue with the government?

3C. To what extent do development partners make available information about their CSO support to the public, including to the government?

Module Four: Legal and regulatory environment

4A. With respect to the rights to freedoms of assembly and expression, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable CSOs to exercise these rights in law and in practice?

4B. With respect to the freedom of association, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable in law and practice CSO formation, registration and operation?

4C. To what extent are CSOs working with marginalized populations and at-risk groups effectively protected from discrimination?

4D. To what extent does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for domestic CSOs?

For comparison: Original questionnaire (2016 monitoring round)

Module One: Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies

Q1. Are CSOs consulted by the government in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies? (Yes/No)

Q2. Do CSOs have the right to access government information? (Yes/No)

Q3. Are there resources and/or training opportunities for addressing capacity building of all stakeholders (including government, CSOs and co-operation providers) to engage meaningfully in multi-stakeholder dialogue? (Yes/No)

Module Two: CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency

Q4. In practice, are there CSO-managed processes in place to address transparency and multiple accountabilities in CSO operations? (Yes/No)

Q5. Do CSO-initiated co-ordination processes exist to facilitate consolidated and inclusive CSO representation in policy dialogue (e.g. umbrella organisation, CSO network, consultation practices)? (Yes/No)

Q6. Do mechanisms exist to facilitate co-ordination on programming among CSOs (collaboration to optimise impact and avoid duplication), and with other development actors? (Yes/No)

Q7. Are there other significant initiatives related to CSO development effectiveness principles [Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness] being implemented at the country level? (Yes/No)

Q8. Do CSOs report annually to government on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development? (Yes/No)

Module Three: Official development co-operation with CSOs

Q9. Do providers of development co-operation consult with CSOs on their development policy/programming in a systematic way? (Yes/No)

Q10. Are providers promoting a CSO enabling environment in their co-operation with civil society? (Yes/No)

Q11. Is the promotion of a CSO enabling environment an agenda item in providers' policy dialogue with partner governments? (Yes/No)

Q12. Do providers share information on their CSO support with the government? (Yes/No)

Module Four: Legal and regulatory environment

Q13. Is there a recognition of and respect for CSO freedom (association, assembly and expression), in the Constitution and more broadly in policy, law and regulation? (Yes/No)

Q14. Is the legal and regulatory environment enabling for CSO formation, registration and operation? (Yes/No)

Q15. Does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for CSOs? (Yes/No)

Q16. Does the legal and regulatory environment marginalise certain groups? (Yes/No)

ANNEX I. METHODOLOGY FOR INDICATOR 2

1. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Data Collection method

A government-led multi-stakeholder dialogue among government, CSOs and development partners will be implemented to provide consensus responses to the proposed questionnaire. In case there are particular observations or disagreements on the responses, invited parties are allowed to reflect these remarks in an additional sheet.

Key steps suggested to undertake the dialogue are the following:

1) identification of focal points for CSOs and development partners prioritising their ability to convey representative views of their constituency[7];

2) the government shares the questionnaire materials and guidance in advance with the identified focal points for intra-constituency consultations;

3) focal points carry out consultations with their respective constituencies to provide consolidated feedback to the government;

4) the government convenes the relevant parties to the multi-stakeholder dialogue and invite parties to reach consensus on the responses. The government will register the responses that have reached greater consensus.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire is structured around four thematic modules: (1) Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies; (2) CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency; (3) Official development co-operation with CSOs; and (4) Legal and regulatory environment for CSOs.

It contains sixteen qualitative questions organised around 4-level scale responses reflecting degrees of progress or scenarios that allow for more nuanced responses. For each level within the scale, "characteristics of practice" are provided to help respondents identifying the answer that better reflects the reality in their own country.

Contextual data sourced from existing global indicators will be provided in the reporting tool to inform the discussion of the indicator questionnaire. This dashboard provides a picture of the country's performance in areas which are relevant for CSO's engagement and contribution to development.

---

[7] The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team will share with national co-ordinator a list with suggested focal points for CSOs, development partners, trade unions, and parliamentarians for their active involvement in the full monitoring process.

2. REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE

2.1. Questionnaire overview

Module One: Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies

1A. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

1B. In the context of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to what extent does the government consult CSOs in the prioritisation, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs?

1C. To what extent do CSOs have the right in law and in practice to access relevant government information for effective participation in consultations with the government?

1D. To what extent have the results of recent consultations with CSOs informed government design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Module Two: CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency

2A. To what extent are partnership equitable and based on mutual relationships between financing CSOs and their CSO partners?

2B. To what extent do CSOs participate in CSO-initiated co-ordination, including mechanisms (e.g. platforms, networks, associations) that facilitate CSOs engagement in policy dialogue and/or co-ordination among CSOs at national or sectoral level?

2C. To what extent are CSOs implementing their development work guided by international human rights standards? (e.g. human rights based approaches)

2D. To what extent are CSOs aligning with CSO-led accountability mechanisms to address CSOs' transparency and multiple accountabilities?

2E. To what extent do CSOs make available information on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development to the public, including to the government?

Module Three: Official development co-operation with CSOs

3A. To what extent do development partners consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of their development co-operation policies and programmes?

3B. To what extent is the promotion of an enabling environment for CSOs (e.g. political, financial, legal and policy aspects) an agenda item in development partners' policy dialogue with the government?

3C. To what extent do development partners make available information about their CSO support to the public, including to the government?

Module Four: Legal and regulatory environment

4A. With respect to the rights to freedoms of assembly and expression, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable CSOs to exercise these rights in law and in practice?

4B. With respect to the freedom of association, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable in law and practice CSO formation, registration and operation?

4C. To what extent are CSOs working with marginalized populations and at-risk groups effectively protected from discrimination?

4D. To what extent does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for domestic CSOs?

2.2. How will it look to participants?

The infographics below provide a snapshot on how the questionnaire will look in the reporting tool:

A1. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Step 3

L1. No consultations in the past 2 years.	**L2. Occasional consultations**, but the **quality of consultation is not sufficient** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).
L3. Frequent consultations of **'good enough' quality** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	**L4. Regular** and **institutionalised** consultations of **excellent quality** (with reference to full inclusive participation, agreed content, adequate format allowing dialogue and feedback).

Choose your answer

Go to next question!

A2. In the context of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to what extent does the government consult CSOs in the prioritisation, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs?

Step 4

L1. A consultation around the SDGs has **not started** in the country yet.	**L2.** Some **selected CSOs** are being consulted around **SDG mainstreaming** or around SDG implementation and monitoring.
L3. A **diversity of CSOs** are being consulted around **SDG mainstreaming, implementation,** and **monitoring.**	**L4.** A **diversity of CSOs** are being consulted around **SDG mainstreaming, prioritisation, implementation,** and regular **SDG monitoring** as part of **an institutionalised process.**

2

Module 1: Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies

A1. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Step 1

L1. No consultations in the past 2 years.	**L2. Occasional consultations**, but the **quality of consultation is not sufficient** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).
L3. Frequent consultations of **'good enough' quality** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	**L4. Regular** and **institutionalised** consultations of **excellent quality** (with reference to full inclusive participation, agreed content, adequate format allowing dialogue and feedback).

Click to read the characteristics of practice that help you to answer the question

Step 2

A1. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Characteristics of good practice

* Consultations occur **more than once a year.**

* The government invites a **wide number of CSOs** to the consultation but selection criteria are not clear.

* Some CSO/s may have been consulted in defining the themes for consultation.

*The format allows for dialogue and provision of feedback.

L1. No consultations in the past 2 years.	**L2. Occasional consultations**, but the **quality of consultation is not sufficient** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).
L3. Frequent consultations of **'good enough' quality** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	**L4. Regular** and **institutionalised** consultations of **excellent quality** (with reference to full inclusive participation, agreed content, adequate format allowing dialogue and feedback).

Characteristics of good practice

* Consultations normally occur **once a year.**

* The government invites some selected CSOs to the consultation.

* The government sets **content for consultation.**

* The format is one-directional and does not allow for **dialogue**, with no space for feedback or inputs (e.g. informative meeting, survey).

1

2.3. Detailed questionnaire

MODULE 1: SPACE FOR MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

1A. To what extent does the government consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

Hint Box
A good practice consultation is inclusive of a diversity of CSOs, takes place with regularity and frequency, involves dialogue, allows for advanced access to relevant documents, and provides feedback.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **No consultations** in the past two years.	➢ **No consultation** in the past two years.
Level 2 **Occasional consultations**, but the **quality of consultation is not sufficient** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	➢ Consultations normally occur **once a year** on select development policies. ➢ The government invites some selected CSOs to the consultation. ➢ The government sets **content for consultation** on policies and strategies at the end of the policy making process. ➢ The format is one-directional and does not allow for **dialogue**, with no space for feedback or inputs (e.g. informative meeting, survey).
Level 3 **Frequent consultations** of **mixed quality** (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	➢ Consultations occur **more than once a year**, on many but not all major development policies. ➢ The government invites a **wide number of CSOs** to the consultation but selection criteria are not clear. ➢ Some CSO/s may have been consulted in defining the themes for consultation and the latter take place at stages of decision-making processes where change in policy directions is possible. ➢ The format allows for dialogue and provision of feedback.
Level 4 **Regular** and **institutionalised** consultations of **consistent good quality** (with reference to full inclusive participation, agreed content, adequate format allowing dialogue and feedback).	➢ Consultations occur **more than once a year** and include the full range of major national development policies. ➢ **Institutionalised processes are regular**, predictable and transparent. ➢ Criteria for CSO participation are open and transparent, with no restrictions. ➢ The content of the consultation is set in co-operation with CSOs at stages of the decision-making process where change in policy directions is possible. ➢ The format allows for dialogue and provision of feedback.

1B. In the context of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to what extent does the government consult CSOs in the prioritisation, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs?

Hint Box
A good practice consultation is inclusive of a diversity of CSOs, takes place with regularity and frequency, involves dialogue, allows for advanced access to relevant documents, and provides feedback.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 A consultation around the SDGs has **not started** in the country yet.	➢ **No consultation around the SDGs** has taken place in the country. ➢ The government may not have started a process of SDG mainstreaming yet.
Level 2 Some **selected CSOs** are occasionally being consulted around **SDG mainstreaming** or around SDG implementation and monitoring.	➢ There is **no institutional space** and/or an established process that facilitates CSOs participation in consultations around SDGs. ➢ The government has been carrying out **ad hoc and occasional consultations with select CSOs around SDGs**. These CSOs are not consulted across different phases of SDG process (e.g. determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➢ If the country undertakes a **Voluntary National Review** (VNR), selected CSOs are only invited to review meetings.
Level 3 A **diversity of CSOs** are being consulted in ad hoc processes around **SDG mainstreaming, implementation,** and **monitoring.**	➢ There is **no institutional space and/or an established process** that facilitates CSO participation in consultations around SDGs. ➢ The government has been carrying out **regular consultations around SDGs with stakeholders**, including with a diversity of CSOs, which have been consulted in several but not all phases of SDG process (determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➢ If the country undertakes a **Voluntary National Review**, a diversity of CSOs is invited to attend review meetings and contribute to the VNR report with data and evidence.
Level 4 A **diversity of CSOs** are being formally consulted around **SDG mainstreaming, prioritisation, implementation,** and regular **SDG monitoring** as part of **an institutionalised process**.	➢ The government has established **formal procedures to consult a diversity of CSOs** throughout different phases of the SDGs process (determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➢ There is a multi-stakeholder partnership to advance implementation of SDGs that include CSOs. ➢ If the country undertakes a **Voluntary National Review**, a diversity of CSOs is invited to attend review meetings, contributes to draft the VNR report with data and evidence and is represented in the national delegation at the HLPF. ➢ Data and evidence from CSOs are used as inputs to monitor and reporting on SDG implementation.

1C. To what extent do CSOs have the right in law and in practice to access relevant government information for effective participation in consultations with the government?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **No legal framework** exists for access to information and CSOs have **little or no access** to information.	➢ There is **no policy or right to information legislation** in the country. ➢ Access to information on proposed legislation is not available or very difficult.
Level 2 Right to access may exist in law, but there are **very significant limitations in the law and/or in its implementation**, excluding CSO access to most relevant information in practice.	➢ There is a policy or right to information legislation in the country but there are significant limitations, **limiting the access in practice and usefulness of the information** (cost, broad secrecy laws, lengthy non transparent processes). ➢ Practices to access information differ among government departments. ➢ Information is **not disclosed and disseminated in a timely manner.** ➢ Information disclosed is not comprehensive and the language is extremely technical.
Level 3 Law exit, but CSOs have mixed experience in timely access to **relevant and comprehensive information**.	➢ There is a policy or right to information legislation in the country with **transparent procedures for accessing detailed information**. ➢ Comprehensive **information disclosure is mixed** and may not be released in a timely manner for the purposes of CSOs roles. ➢ The language of most government documents is accessible to non-technical audiences. ➢ Information is disclosed online and offline.
Level 4 CSOs have **full access** to **relevant, comprehensive information,** with **sufficient time** for CSOs to prepare related initiatives, including participation in consultations (2-4 weeks) – early draft of relevant documents, with the ability to request additional information if needed.	➢ Law and regulations exist with transparent process for accessing or excluding information, with **an appeal process for excluded documents**. ➢ Information is disclosed and disseminated in a **timely** manner. ➢ Disclosed information is **comprehensive and the language is accessible** to non-technical audiences. ➢ The government generally attends to requests for additional information.

1D. To what extent have the results of recent consultations with CSOs informed government design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **No consultation** occurred in the past two years.	➢ In the past two years, the government has **not organized any significant consultation** with CSO around any national policies.
Level 2 **Indications that only minor comments** provided by CSOs through consultations at best are taken into account in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.	➢ Consultations with CSOs take place, but **only minor comments are normally taken on board** or no advice taken on board. ➢ In general, it is particularly difficult to ascertain how much of the CSO recommendations were taken on board. ➢ No responses to CSO papers.
Level 3 **Indications that advice and evidence** provided by CSOs through consultations is **occasionally taken into account** in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.	➢ Consultations with CSOs take place, and indications that **some substantive elements of CSO advice and evidence are normally taken on board**. ➢ There is not a clear government mechanism to provide consistent post-consultation feedback with reasons for accepting or rejecting CSO recommendations. Feedback is at the government's discretion. ➢ Occasional specific responses to CSO papers and recommendations
Level 4 **Indications that advice and evidence** provided by CSOs through consultations is **consistently** taken into account and reflected in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.	➢ Consultations with CSOs take place, and **substantive elements of CSO advice and evidence are normally addressed** at the end of the process. ➢ The government **provides responses** to major CSO recommendations, with explanations for accepting or rejecting the received recommendations. ➢ Government consistently provides responses to CSO papers and recommendations. ➢ The government reports on a regular basis on how citizens' recommendations are being used in decision-making processes.

2A. To what extent are partnership equitable and based on mutual relationships between financing CSOs and their CSO partners?

> **Hint Box**
>
> Equitable CSO partnerships, in all their diversity, are expressions of social solidarity through long term collaborations based on shared values and mutually agreed goals. Such partnerships are rooted in trust, respect and leadership of partner country CSOs. They require deliberate efforts to counter-balance inequalities in power between financing CSOs and partner country counterparts, the realities of gender inequities and women's exclusion, and sometimes-large disparities in capacity. Equitable partnerships are characterized by negotiated programming and shared responsibilities, mutual decision-making and accountability, and processes for addressing any potential conflict. Programming priorities are derived from implementing partners' goals and priorities.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 Most domestic CSOs experience **short term, often one-off, project relationships**, which are sole expressions of the financing CSO programming interests.	➢ Very short term partnerships based solely on domestic CSO implementation of financing CSO projects. ➢ Relationship defined by **only fiduciary reporting requirements** imposed by the financing CSO – which can be domestic or international.
Level 2 Most domestic CSOs experience **longer-term partnerships** with financing CSOs, **but still largely based on projects**, which are defined by the financing CSO.	➢ Partnerships can be longer-term through **implementations of a series of projects** designed **by the financing CSO**. ➢ Domestic CSOs respond to **programmatic priorities of the financing CSO**. ➢ Domestic CSOs must limit project activities that meet reporting requirements (log frames) set out by the financing CSO. ➢ Beyond fiduciary requirements and narrative reporting, partnership arrangement are characterized **by periodic visits and oral discussions led by the financing CSO**.
Level 3 Most domestic CSOs have **long-term programmatic partnerships** with financing CSOs (3 to 5 years), which are **based on discussions** between the funded CSO and the financing CSO. The interests of the financial CSO define the elements of the partnerships relationship.	➢ While individual projects may form part of the partnership relationship, the latter is **defined by shared goals and program priorities** over the medium term (3 to 5 years). ➢ Shared goals and program priorities are still **largely in response to the programmatic priorities of the financing CSO**. ➢ Often there is a written **partnership agreement**, which establishes a specific schedule for reporting, but mainly based on the information needs, programming results and fiduciary requirements of the financing CSO. ➢ There is **little attention to the priorities of the funded CSO,** its mandate and accountability to its constituencies, and its needs for capacity development.
Level 4 Most domestic CSOs have **long-term partnership relationships (5 to 10 years)** that are the **results of deliberate negotiations and shared programming interests and solidarity** between the funded CSO and the financing CSO.	➢ **Long-term partnerships include programming activities involving both partners** that are negotiated and periodically renewed over a 5 to 10 year period. ➢ **Domestic funded CSOs take the leadership** in defining the shared priorities of the partnership based on their reflection of country realities. ➢ The partnership is reflected in a written partnership arrangement, which sets out **space and opportunity for mutual decision-making, mutual**

	learning, **core institutional support, capacity development** and **iterative joint programming**.
	➢ Narrative and fiduciary reporting is **based on the funded CSO program cycle** (understanding the limitations for the financing CSO derived from official provider support for that CSO).
	➢ **Mutual responsibilities and accountabilities** are explicitly set out.
	➢ There is an explicit and clear **process to address conflict** that is mutually agreed by the partners.

2B. To what extent do CSOs participate in CSO-initiated co-ordination, including mechanisms (e.g. platforms, networks, associations) that facilitate CSOs engagement in policy dialogue and/or co-ordination among CSOs at national or sectoral level?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **No national platforms.** CSO co-ordination mechanisms are **largely ad hoc** and have **short-term project oriented goals**.	➢ **No national CSO platforms through which government engages CSOs** in policy or programmatic dialogue at national level. ➢ Local CSOs come together around development partner or government initiated projects. ➢ Dialogue with Government or development partners is through government/development partner-selected CSOs.
Level 2 **Weak CSO co-ordination.** CSO co-ordination mechanisms **exist in a few sectors,** but are **mainly sustained by the interests of development partners or national governments** in these sectors.	➢ The motivation for and the creation of CSO platforms for sector **co-ordination derive mainly from development partner/government-driven interests and not CSOs**. ➢ Issue-specific national and sectoral co-ordination mechanisms may be initiated by CSOs, but are weak, often dominated by a few larger CSOs in the capital city. ➢ Several CSO platforms may compete with each other for participation in policy dialogue prioritised by government / development partners.
Level 3 **Not one** inclusive, representative CSO-initiated platform, but **different CSO-initiated co-ordination mechanisms exist** at both sector level and national levels and are **sustained by the interests of domestic CSOs** to improve their development effectiveness.	➢ There are **several independent co-ordination mechanisms** recognised by the government or development partners, but there is **no one inclusive, representative national platform** that is CSO- managed. ➢ CSO co-ordination mechanisms may be initiated by either domestic or international CSOs. ➢ The effectiveness of these co-ordination mechanisms can vary over time, due to weak CSO leadership, lack of internally generated resources or limited engagement by, and low accountability to domestic CSOs. ➢ Overall, CSO co-ordination mechanisms are inclusive and representative of the diversity of local/national CSO space and generate a cadre of national/local CSO leadership, but at the same time compete with each other.
Level 4 **Major national CSO-initiated platform.** Inclusive national and sectoral CSO-initiated platforms co-ordinate many areas of CSO development and emergency responses and enable more effective CSO engagements in **both national sectoral programming and national policy dialogue**.	➢ Domestic CSOs have taken initiative to form **inclusive, representative CSO platforms** at both the national and sectoral level. ➢ The national platform engages with other CSO co-ordination mechanisms and **provides leadership for, and accountability to, the whole CSO sector**. ➢ The national platform is initiated by domestic CSOs and is widely **acknowledged to be representative** of CSOs by Government and/or development partners. ➢ The **membership** of co-ordination mechanisms **contribute to their financial sustainability** in addition to funding received from development partners. ➢ The national platform has established **a code of ethics and good practice for CSOs** (based on the Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness and codes for good humanitarian practice) to improve the quality of CSO development efforts.

2C. To what extent are CSOs implementing their development work guided by international human rights standards? (e.g. human rights based approaches)

> **Hint Box**
>
> A human rights based approach (HRBA) seeks to analyse the inequalities which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practises and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress. It does this by integrating human rights norms and principles into every area of development co-operation, including the process itself, and in every thematic area of work. This helps to promote the sustainability of development work, empowering people themselves - especially the most marginalized - to participate in policy formulation and hold accountable those who have a duty to act.
>
> An HRBA implies that CSOs have initiated capacity development processes that empower their constituencies/communities to represent directly constituency/community interests in development. CSOs as independent development actors concretely participate in efforts to change the underlying conditions affecting progress in Agenda 2030's economic, social and environmental pillars. CSO initiatives take into account disaggregated programmatic objectives in relation to women's rights issues in their program planning and implementation, relevant to their mandate. CSOs are making specific efforts to take into account the interest of marginalized peoples and/or social movements in the context of their programmatic priorities (such as rural people, peoples' organizations, organizations lead by indigenous people, workers movements, movement of migrants and displaced people, organizations of people living with disabilities).

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **CSOs** in the country generally **do not have explicit policies aligned by international human right standards** to guide their own development practices.	➢ Most CSOs working in the country **do not have explicit policies** intended to guide their own development practice based on human rights-based approaches. ➢ Most CSOs working in the country **do not have explicit policies relating to women's & children's rights and the empowerment of women** and girls, or other marginalized sectors, which are intended to guide their programming priorities and strategies.
Level 2 CSOs in the country generally have **policies guided by international human rights standards,** but **the evidence of practice is minimal** and only among a few large CSOs.	➢ In designing the necessary elements of their programs, few CSOs **engage vulnerable constituencies and local partners in analysing and take account local power dynamics** affecting their program goals. ➢ Few CSOs give priority to **encouraging local engagement and/or participation in multi-stakeholder policy dialogues**, where these opportunities exist or could exist. ➢ In designing and assessing their programs, most CSOs make **few efforts to disaggregate needs based on gender relations** and women's empowerment. ➢ CSOs do not develop or participate in regular **training for their staff in programming skills related to human rights-based approaches** or women's rights in their programs.
Level 3 CSOs generally have **policies guided by international human rights standards,** and there are significant efforts among some to ensure **that these policies guide actual CSO practices**.	➢ Some CSOs are working with local partnerships that **strengthen the organizations of marginalized populations**. ➢ Some CSOs have program activities that are strengthening **vulnerable communities' capacities and leadershi**p to engage local/national power holders to claim their rights (including direct participation in multi-stakeholder dialogues). ➢ **Gender disaggregated data** and women's empowerment approaches are regularly part of CSO programming practices. ➢ Staff from CSOs participates in **periodic training programs** to develop programming skills related to human rights-based approaches.

Level 4	
CSOs generally have **policies guided by international human rights standards,** and there is evidence that most work in ways that **institutionalize these policies to guide actual CSO practices**.	➢ CSOs actively **engage and take direction from locally inclusive leadership in vulnerable communities**, including local women and women's organizations, or other marginalized sectors, in determining program priorities and approaches.
	➢ Most CSOs are working with local partnerships that **strengthen the sustainability of organizations of marginalized populations**, including their engagement with local power holders, and supporting human rights defenders.
	➢ CSOs are **supporting domestic CSO co-ordinating mechanisms and platforms** to actively promoting **human rights-based approaches** and **regular skill training in rights approaches** with the CSO community.
	➢ CSOs are deliberately opening space for **vulnerable communities' leadership**, including women's representatives and/or organisations, **to participate in multi-stakeholder policy dialogue** and actively address issues of shrinking CSO space.

2D. To what extent are CSOs aligning with CSO-led accountability mechanisms to address CSOs' transparency and multiple accountabilities?

> **Hint Box**
> CSOs are accountable in many ways and at different levels to their constituencies, to their governance structures, to their programming counterparts and to government regulatory bodies. In many countries accountability of CSOs is also guided by CSO initiated and agreed codes of conduct and standards, which are the foundation of CSO accountability mechanisms. These standards cover best practice in governance, CSO transparency, human rights with respect to staffing, financing and programming practices.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 There is **no CSO-initiated and generally agreed code of conduct or accountability mechanism** at country level.	➢ **CSO accountability** is at the individual level and the minimal requirements of government law and regulations. ➢ **CSO transparency** is mainly the result of CSO program information available on their web site and any legal requirements to report to government. ➢ Accountability is largely **driven by fiduciary obligations** to development partners.
Level 2 CSO **accountability mechanisms are under discussion** through a representative CSO platform. Individual CSOs maintain accountability through their linkages with global CSO networks and International NGOs codes and mechanisms.	➢ Individual CSO accountability to constituencies is voluntary, episodic and self-managed. ➢ **Agreement on CSO standards and codes for accountability mechanisms is difficult** due to divisions among domestic CSOs. ➢ Some influential **national CSOs are associated with global CSO-managed standards and their respective accountability mechanisms** and processes. ➢ CSOs **regularly report to Government**, and these reports are accessible to the public virtually/via web.
Level 3 Broadly representative **CSO-initiated standards/codes exist for accountability mechanisms** through CSO platforms, but **no formal procedures to certify adherence** or develop new capacities consistent with the standard.	➢ National **CSO standards and codes inform accountability mechanisms** set out expectations of ethical practices in the internal management of the CSO, basic requirements for transparency, as well as good practices in programmatic relationships/partnerships. ➢ **A condition of membership in a CSO platform is adherence to the platform's standards or code**, but there are no formal processes to certify adherence. ➢ Most CSOs with web sites **make available the constitutive organisational documents and policies**, including where feasible the names of board members. ➢ CSOs **report regularly to Government** and these reports are accessible to the public.
Level 4 There are CSO-initiated and managed **accountability mechanisms,** guided by standards and codes of conduct, through representative platforms. A **majority of the domestic CSOs are associated** to these platforms, which actively certify good practices within the CSO community.	➢ **Most CSOs across sectors are associated with national CSO managed accountability mechanisms with their respective standards and codes**. ➢ National accountability mechanisms generally have **formal processes to confirm their adherence** to the standards / code of conduct, which must be renewed periodically. ➢ National /sectoral platforms promote their codes of conduct with their constituencies, and **carry out capacity development programs with national/local CSOs**. ➢ In general, CSOs make **accessible to the public constitutive organisational information and program information** including through national CSO platforms and/or publishing to the IATI transparency Standard. ➢ There is an open and accessible **government country level information platform** for disclosure of CSO information on CSO reported development activities.

	➢ CSOs pro-actively provide relevant **organisational information to partners** as part of the partnership relationship, and have a transparent complaints mechanism.

2E. To what extent do CSOs make available information on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development to the public, including to the government?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 There is **no country-level information platform** for CSOs to share information about their contribution to development.	➢ There are **limited reporting requirements for CSOs** to disclose basic information regularly to government and the public. ➢ Very **few CSOs disclose information about their activities** and results. ➢ When disclosed, the information is normally presented scattered and not in an aggregate form.
Level 2 There is **a country-level information platform** for CSOs to share **aggregated information** about their contributions to development but use is still limited.	➢ There are **some government reporting requirements for CSOs** to report basic information regularly to government and the public. ➢ **Some CSOs disclose information about their activities and results**, either because they are mandated to do so (e.g. receiving public funding) or by own will, usually on reports or their websites. ➢ When disclosed, the **information is presented in an aggregate form**.
Level 3 There is **a country-level information platform** for CSOs to share **aggregated information** about their contributions to development increasingly used by CSOs.	➢ There are **significant government reporting requirements for CSOs** to report relevant information, and there is **good compliance** with these requirements. ➢ **Most CSOs disclose information about their activities and results**, usually on their web site. ➢ The disclosed information is normally presented in an **aggregated manner.**
Level 4 There is **a country-level information platform** for CSOs to share **aggregated and disaggregated information** about their contributions to development *being used by most CSOs*.	➢ There are **significant government reporting requirements for CSOs** to report relevant information, and there is **good compliance** with these requirements. ➢ There is **an open and accessible country-level information platform or disclose information on development activities**, including information on CSO contributions. ➢ **Most CSOs** disclose information about their activities and results. ➢ The disclosed information is typically presented in a **disaggregated manner**, reporting on supported sectors or programmes, sources of financing, beneficiaries, results achieved and so on.

MODULE 3: DEVELOPMENT PARTNER SUPPORT FOR CSO ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

3A. To what extent do development partners consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of their development co-operation policies and programmes?

> **Hint Box**
>
> A good practice consultation is inclusive of a diversity of CSOs, takes place with regularity and frequency, involves dialogue, allows for advanced access to relevant documents, and provides feedback.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **No opportunities** for CSOs to engage with development partners in the past two years.	➢ Development partners have **no explicit policies guiding consultations** with CSOs. ➢ There are **no consultations with CSOs on the design, implementation and monitoring** of development co-operation policies and programmes. ➢ Development partners have no explicit process to consult with CSOs.
Level 2 Consultations with CSOs are **occasional and limited** to some individual development partners and **selected** CSOs and focus only on the **implementation of donor programs**.	➢ Development partners generally have a policy guiding consultations with CSOs, but it is **not systematically implemented** or assessed. ➢ Opportunities for CSOs to engage on the design, implementation and monitoring of development co-operation policies and programmes are **unpredictable and episodic**. ➢ There is **no co-ordinated process for development partners** to consult with a diversity of CSOs. ➢ The content for consultation is largely **set by development partners** and focuses on pre-determined provider policies and priorities.
Level 3 Consultations with a diversity of CSOs are **frequent and co-ordinated** among development partners, focusing not only on the implementation of donor programmes. However, the agenda is largely set by the development partners.	➢ Development partners generally have **comprehensive policies guiding consultations with CSOs and they are implemented**. ➢ There is a **co-ordinated process for development partners** to consult with CSOs, but selection criteria for CSOs participation are not transparent. ➢ Consultations with CSOs take place at a stage in development partner decision making **when change may still be possible.** ➢ Consultations at the country level are mainly on pre-determined development partner programs and priorities and **seldom focus on their overarching policies** (both sector and institutional policies).
Level 4 Consultations with a diversity of CSOs are **regular, institutionalised and co-ordinated** among development partners, focusing not only on the implementation of policies and programs, but also on determining development partner's priorities.	➢ There are **regular and planned opportunities for CSOs to engage** with development partners on their overarching policies, country programs and priorities, program implementation and assessment. ➢ Consultations are **with a diversity of CSOs** and the selection criteria for CSOs participation is open and transparent. ➢ A comprehensive CSO consultation policy is being implemented. ➢ Consultations with CSOs take place at a stage in development partner decision making **when change may still be possible, with feedback to CSOs** following consultations**.** ➢ The content of the consultation is **set in co-operation with CSOs** and can include development partner's institutional policies and priorities & guidance in implementing provider-determined programming. ➢ Consultations are **structured for dialogue** and feedback of CSO views on government policies and their implementation.

3B. To what extent is the promotion of an enabling environment for CSOs (e.g. political, financial, legal and policy aspects) an agenda item in development partners' policy dialogue with the government?

Hint Box

It is considered that the enabling environment issue is included and pursued as an agenda item in policy dialogue when it is directly addressing political, financial, legal or policy constraints experienced by CSOs that reduce their potential contribution to development, as well as proposals to remedy those constraints.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 Development partners **don't include an enabling environment agenda** as an item in their policy dialogue with the government.	➢ Issues affecting a diverse civil society are **not addressed in the policy dialogue** between development partners and the government.
Level 2 Some development partners **occasionally include some elements of the enabling environment agenda** as an item in their policy dialogue with the government, particularly **if CSOs lobby on specific issues**.	➢ CSO enabling environment are **not a regular part of the development partner's policy areas in dialogues** with the partner government. ➢ Development partners do not regularly monitor issues for CSO enabling environment in main programming countries. ➢ **Development partner may respond to CSO lobbying on specific issues**.
Level 3 Most development partners **include the enabling environment agenda** as an item in their policy dialogue with the government, make remedial proposals but often based on specific issues, and **not in a systematic way** with follow up.	➢ CSO enabling environment issues are **raised routinely with partner governments** in policy dialogue. ➢ Development partners have **independent ways to monitor issues affecting the CSO enabling environment** and pro-actively bring these issues into policy dialogue. ➢ Development partner may work with like-minded development partners to raise particular areas of concern for the CSO enabling environment with partner country governments. ➢ Development partners may be **engaged in global and regional initiatives on enabling environment issues** (e.g. Working Group for the Community of Democracies).
Level 4 Most development partners **systematically include the enabling environment agenda,** with remedial proposals in their policy dialogue with the government, and engage with domestic CSOs in monitoring the enabling environment and following up their dialogue with government.	➢ Development partners' policies call for **systematic monitoring of CSO enabling environment issues** at the country level and their inclusion in policy dialogues with government. ➢ Development partners may **create opportunities for CSOs to engage their government** on enabling environment issues. ➢ Development partners **engage domestic civil society in monitoring enabling environment** issues and are responsive to their concerns and inform CSOs about their dialogue with government. ➢ Development partners are actively engaged in global and regional initiatives that address enabling environment issue, and are **systematically responsive to urgent situations for civil society.**

3C. To what extent do development partners make available information about their CSO support to the public, including to the government?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 Most development partners **do not make available** information about their support to CSOs.	➢ For most development partners, information on development partner support to international and domestic CSOs working in the country is **not available**.
Level 2 **Some development partners** make available **aggregate information** on their support to CSOs.	➢ **Most development partners report to international online databases**, such as those managed by IATI or the OECD but this information is **not easily accessible or usable** by partner countries for development planning, budgeting, execution and monitoring and evaluation. ➢ Some development partners are **making available aggregate information on their support to CSOs at country level** (through reports on their web sites), which may include geographical or sector/thematic information, but not activity level or beneficiary level information.
Level 3 **Most development partners** make available **aggregate information** on their support to CSOs.	➢ Most major development partners **disclose aggregate information on their support to CSOs at country level, which may include geographical or sector/thematic information**, but not activity level or beneficiary level information. ➢ The information is **accessible at country level** (e.g. through development partner or government reports or websites).
Level 4 **Most development partners** make available **disaggregated information** (sectors, programmes, objectives, financing, results) on their support to CSOs, with appropriate safeguards.	➢ Most major development partners disclose disaggregated information on their support to CSOs at country level, which may **include detailed geographical, sectoral, thematic, beneficiaries and activity level information (with appropriate safeguards to protect vulnerable individuals or communities).** ➢ The information is **broadly accessible at country level**, through one or more accessible mechanisms, including aid management platforms, transparency portals, or development partner reports or websites.

MODULE 4: LEGAL, REGULATORY AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

4A. With respect to the rights to freedoms of assembly and expression, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable CSOs to exercise these rights in law and in practice? (Average of the two scales)

(a) Freedom of Assembly

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 Most peaceful Assemblies are **prohibited in law or practice**. Any formation of assemblies is swiftly dissolved with force.	➢ Organizers are always required to obtain **advance permission**, even for gatherings of a few individuals, which are usually denied. ➢ **Vague prohibitions**—such as assemblies that are "political" and that disturb "public works"— have been used against those promoting views unfavourable to the government. ➢ Public assemblies in **many key public locations are banned and particular social groups targeted**, including the use of disproportionate force against participants, human rights defenders or journalists monitoring the assembly. ➢ Assembly organisers are **responsible for the cost of public services related to the assembly** (e.g. police, clean-up, or medical care).
Level 2 **Many peaceful assemblies are prohibited in law or practice**, with severe restrictions on assemblies which can take place only in government designated areas.	➢ Some assemblies may be allowed, but **any formation of assemblies, seen to be illegal, is swiftly dissolved with force**. ➢ While advance **permission** (or "advance **notification**" procedure) is required, **gatherings of a few individuals may be tolerated**. ➢ **Vague prohibitions**—such as assemblies that are "political" are used against those promoting views unfavourable to the government. ➢ Public assemblies in **many key public locations are severely restricted and often not allowed**, and appeal processes are generally futile (not prompt or fair). ➢ Law enforcement often **uses disproportionate physical means** leading to serious injuries to participants, including widespread arrests.
Level 3 Most peaceful assemblies are allowed in law and practice, although **some issues or groups may be subject to discriminatory decision-making**.	➢ **Peaceful assemblies are allowed, but are subject to a notification** procedure with a few days' advance notice and most spontaneous assemblies, except for small groups are not allowed. ➢ The law provides some **blanket time and location restrictions**, such as working hours in front of the parliament and other key government buildings. ➢ Regulatory authorities typically **provide reasons for restrictions**, and organisers can **appeal them** through an administrative (not necessarily independent) procedure. Law enforcement has **an explicit legal obligation to protect participants of assemblies**, but in **practice do not actively distinguish** between peaceful protesters and those promoting unrest and violence, sometimes with mass and targeted arrests.
Level 4 Law and practice clearly recognise the right to peaceful assembly and **most peaceful assemblies are allowed in practice**, regardless of the issue being raised or the groups participating.	➢ **Only large assemblies or assemblies that may disrupt traffic require advance notification**. ➢ Blanket restrictions on time and location of assemblies are few or non-existent. ➢ Regulatory authorities **promptly provide reasons for any restrictions, and organisers can quickly appeal them** (within a few days) through an independent court. ➢ Law enforcement has an **explicit legal obligation to protect participants of assemblies**, including assemblies occurring at the same time and place and counter-demonstrations, with approaches to de-escalate violence.

(b) Freedom of Expression

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Level 1	**The right to seek and receive information:**
News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are fully controlled by government. CSO staff, journalists are often threatened, arbitrarily arrested, attacked, abducted, tortured, or killed for exercising their freedom of expression. Government apparatus conducts mass illegal surveillance and interception of communications.	➢ Alternative media that criticises politics or culture is **swiftly shut down** and CSOs/individuals are unable to publicly share information that is prohibited by the government. **The right to share information:** ➢ Threats, **attacks** and other actions against the voices of CSOs, individuals and journalists are **condoned** and rarely investigated. ➢ The law provides various **broad restrictions that are commonly used to censor criticism** of the government or other sensitive topics, creating a strong culture of self-censorship and fear of reprisal. **Right to privacy:** ➢ The government conducts mass surveillance and data collection, and the law provides **no effective safeguards** against such practice.
Level 2	**The right to seek and receive information:**
Government control of news, internet media and expression by CSOs is extensive, but some alternative media exist. Arbitrary arrests, threats and other actions against non-state actors are sometimes investigated. Laws and/or practice provide few effective safeguards against arbitrary surveillance.	➢ Alternative media exist but are **often disrupted** or shut down. ➢ Independent journalists can be **detained, prosecuted and attacked or killed**, which sometimes prompts an investigation. **The right to share information:** ➢ The law provides **some broad restrictions on expression** that can be used to censor criticism of the government or other sensitive topics. ➢ Laws affecting the freedom of expression are **applied inconsistently creating a strong self-censorship culture** & fear of reprisal. **Right to privacy:** The government **conducts illegal surveillance** and the law has broad grounds to justify surveillance, with no judicial approval needed.
Level 3	**The right to seek and receive information:**
News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are mostly free of control by the government, with **some instance of government interference. Threats and arbitrary actions against CSOs, individuals and journalist are often investigated**. Government apparatus conducts legal surveillance and interception of communications, but may also conducts illegal or questionable interceptions.	➢ Although there are **instances of government interference, the public can freely access foreign media and CSO information** and a wide range of independent media that criticises politics or culture. ➢ Attacks on journalists, media and CSOs for their expression of views are investigated and not subject to impunity. **The right to share information:** ➢ Restrictions on **expression mainly related to national security, public safety, and respect for the rights of others** resulting in some censorship regarding public policy, culture, or other sensitive topics. ➢ A culture of public sharing of information exists. **Right to privacy:** ➢ While government apparatus often conducts legal surveillance, there are **many reported suspected instances of illegal surveillance** and personal data collection, with the law providing some safeguards.
Level 4	**The right to seek and receive information:**
News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are **generally free of control by the government. CSOs,** individuals and journalists are rarely threatened or physically attacked; and the government apparatus generally	➢ The public can **freely access foreign media and a wide range of independent media and CSO voices** that criticises politics or culture, with little government control of media. ➢ Physical attacks on CSOs, individuals or journalists for their expression of views is investigated without impunity. **The right to share information:**

conducts only legal surveillance and interception of communications and collection of personal data.	➢ Laws with **narrow restrictions on the freedom of expression** do not generally result in censorship regarding public policy, culture, or other sensitive topics. Due to law and practice, there is a very strong culture of political expression, including information critical of government.
	Right to privacy:
	➢ The government apparatus **generally conducts** *legal* **surveillance**, with few reported instances of suspected illegal surveillance or data collection.
	➢ Law and/or practice provide several **effective safeguards against arbitrary surveillance**, interception, or data collection.

4B. With respect to the freedom of association, to what extent does the legal and regulatory framework enable in law and practice CSO formation, registration and operation?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 **Registration is mandatory, difficult, lengthy and required periodically**. The CSO law contains vague prohibitions that are clearly inappropriate under international law.	**Formation/Registration:** ➢ The **registration process is unclear, lengthy (6 months to a year or more), burdensome**, and often requiring personal or sensitive information (such as personal assets), or involving multiple authorities. Registration fees are high and CSOs often must pay bribes to registration officials. ➢ Unfavourable decisions, or no decisions, are common for advocacy-oriented CSOs or CSOs associated with marginalised groups. **Operation:** ➢ **Law and practice prevent and/or interfere with CSO activities**; projects /programs are routinely delayed or hindered by permission requirements. ➢ The government **regularly paints certain advocacy or human rights CSOs** as undermining a country's culture/religion, as national security threats or foreign agents—**threatening them with serious reprisal**. ➢ CSOs are subject to **swift suspension or dissolution** by the regulatory authority (as opposed to a court) for violating any provision of the governing law.
Level 2 Registration is voluntary but remains a difficult process, especially for advocacy-oriented groups. **Law and practice mainly hinder the activities of advocacy-oriented CSOs, but not service organisations working without foreign funding.**	**Formation/Registration:** ➢ Registration is an unclear, **lengthy (6 months to 1 year) process** and lacks some basic protections against arbitrary decision-making (strict timelines for registration authorities' responses, clear legal grounds for rejection, or any appeal processes). ➢ **Registration processes might be costly** due to high fees or costs related to travel or obtaining required documentation. ➢ In practice, **certain groups**, such as those that promote LGBTI rights or right of other marginalised groups encounter **a high level of difficulty obtaining registration, or can't register under existing law**. **Operation:** ➢ The CSO law contains **vague prohibitions, such as on "political activity"** or on "threatening national unity," which are frequently applied against human rights organisations, foreign-funded organisations, and advocacy-oriented CSOs. ➢ Government officials have **broad discretion to inspect the activities and finances of organisations** and often have launched inspections on human rights organisations and foreign-funded CSOs. ➢ CSOs are **subject to direct suspension or dissolution by the regulatory authority**, with only an administrative appeals process provided.
Level 3 **Registration is voluntary, a one-time process, and moderately difficult**. With a few exceptions, law and practice do not hinder the activities of CSOs.	**Formation/Registration:** ➢ There are **some mechanisms to facilitate registration**, such as registration units in several areas of the country, low fees, or only a few simple documents required. ➢ **A few organisations may receive what appear to be arbitrary rejections**, such as those seen as threats to "national security", but have some protections through **appeal processes**. **Operation:** ➢ CSOs are **generally allowed to operate freely**. They may have notification requirements, such as notifying local officials of projects. Regulatory investigations have been conducted for some CSOs that are advocacy-oriented or receive foreign funding. ➢ Law and practice **do not prevent CSO involvement in decision-making processes or government projects**.

	➢ The law provides **clear, delineated powers for the government to interfere in internal CSO management** and suspension or dissolution is based on law, with an appeal process provided.
Level 4 Registration is a voluntary one-time fast, fair and efficient procedure. **Law and practice actively promotes the activities of CSOs, including advocacy and human rights groups.**	**Formation/Registration:** ➢ Registration is **not any more burdensome for a CSO than it is for businesses** or other types of legal entities and cases of discrimination are the exception. ➢ The law and practice **protects CSOs from arbitrary decision-making in the registration process** (strict timelines for registration authorities' responses, clear legal grounds for rejection, and judicial appeals processes). **Operation:** ➢ CSOs are generally **allowed to operate freely, including human rights organizations** and those critical of government. ➢ The law provides for involuntary suspension and **dissolution only by the order of an independent court**. Judicial appeal is available, and dissolution only occurs when all appeals have been exhausted. ➢ The law **clearly defines the scope and powers of bodies regulating CSOs**, including powers of inspection.

4C. To what extent are CSOs working with marginalized populations and at-risk groups effectively protected from discrimination?

Hint Box

Marginalised people frequently experiencing different forms of marginalisation, vulnerability or discrimination might include trade unions, women's rights organisations, organisations of particular ethnic groups, human rights organizations, and organisations of indigenous peoples, religious minorities, environment or land rights organizations, LGBT organizations, or organizations of people with disabilities.

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups have no legal protections in practice and **often experience severe discrimination** and/or **harassment** from public authorities.	➢ Legal, regulatory and policy protections **do not exist** to safeguard targeting marginalized groups. ➢ Government **harassment is widespread** through suspension/dissolution of organizations, public labelling of organizations and leaders as threats against national unity, stability or security, etc. ➢ The activities of CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups are **monitored by security agents**. ➢ There is a **broad culture of impunity for illegal threats** and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups.
Level 2 CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups have some legal protection, but these are **applied inconsistently, with few if any administrative or juridical recourses**.	➢ **Legal, regulatory and policy protections exist** to safeguard against targeting marginalized populations, **but recourse does not exist in practice**. ➢ CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups are subject to harassment by public authorities, which can include freezing bank accounts, administrative hurdles, spreading misinformation, shutting down activities, etc. ➢ There is a **broad culture of impunity for illegal threats** and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups.
Level 3 There is **minimal discrimination and harassment in practice**, but public authorities **may scrutinise activities or harass specific organisations**.	➢ Laws, regulations and policies exist to safeguard CSOs working with at-risk populations, though **at times some CSOs still experience harassment or discrimination**. ➢ Administrative and judicial actions against discriminatory practices have been taken forward through **legal due process, but are often not successful**. ➢ There are domestic and international challenges to impunity for actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups.
Level 4 Laws, regulations and policies **effectively safeguard CSOs working with marginalized populations** and discriminatory actions are an exception.	➢ Laws, regulations, and procedures are **in place to safeguard CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups**. ➢ **No culture of impunity** exists for those responsible for illegal threats and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups. ➢ Government officials and **law enforcement are trained in how to implement the laws and regulations fairly for all CSOs**, particularly for those working with marginalized and at-risk populations.

4D. To what extent does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for domestic CSOs?

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice

Level 1
 Access to national and international resources is **highly restricted**.
	➢ CSOs **receiving international resources** are subject to one or more of the following situations:
	    a) Must **obtain special registration** and receive case-by-case approval in order to access to funds.
	    b) Subject **to legal restrictions on their work**, such as on advocacy or human rights activities.
	    c) Often undergo **regulatory or criminal investigation** and are subject to media campaigns painting them as national threats.
	    d) There are extensive measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs specifically and disproportionately.
	 ➢ CSOs do **not benefit from tax exemptions** and individual/corporate donations receive no tax benefit.
	 ➢ CSOs **cannot legally or in practice access government grants** and contracts.
	 ➢ CSOs **cannot earn income** from goods and services; the law makes it illegal or not feasible.

Level 2
 Access to either national or international resources is **possible, but is** subjected to **government restrictions**.
	➢ CSOs **receiving international resources** are subject to one or more of the following situations:
	    a) Must **register with a particular body** to access resources, which monitors the flow of resources to CSOs.
	    b) Subject to **some legal restrictions on their work**, such as on advocacy or human rights activities.
	    c) Often **undergo regulatory investigation (but not criminal investigation)**.
	    d) There are extensive measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs specifically and disproportionately.
	 ➢ Some government grants are tailored for CSOs, but only to carry out **government projects in traditional service areas**.
	 ➢ CSOs are eligible for basic tax exemptions, but the **process for receiving tax exemptions is unclear, lengthy, or onerous** and there are no tax benefits for individual / corporate donations.
	 ➢ The majority of CSOs **cannot earn income** from goods and services in practice; the law makes it not feasible (e.g. tax treatment of earnings).

Level 3 CSOs **can access** national and international resources **but some formal and informal limitations** exist.	➢ CSOs **do not need to register** or obtain government approval to access national and international resources. ➢ There are some **measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs** specifically and disproportionately. ➢ The process for **receiving tax exemptions for CSOs is clear**, not lengthy or onerous. ➢ **Tax benefits for individual and/or corporate donations** to not-for-profit CSOs exist, but with procedures that are **unclear**, lengthy, or onerous. ➢ CSOs have **access to government contracts** for service provision as well as government grants specifically for CSOs to engage in not-for-profit work, but are inconsistently implemented. Criteria and procedures for awarding contracts and/or grants are often **unclear or perceived as unfair.** ➢ A sizable segment of CSOs **can earn income** from goods and services.
Level 4 CSOs **can access** national and international resources	➢ CSOs receiving international funding do not need to register this funding with government beyond reporting regulations for total revenue and **rarely undergo regulatory investigation**.

with few or no restrictions.	➢ Measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing **apply to all individuals and legal entities**, and do not target CSOs disproportionately.
	➢ The process for receiving **tax exemptions is clear**, not lengthy or onerous.
	➢ The law provides **tax benefits for individual and/or corporate donations to not-for-profit CSOs** with procedures that are generally straightforward.
	➢ **Multiple government grants are available to a diverse range of CSOs**, with clear, open and transparent criteria and legally binding procedures for CSOs to access government grants and contracts.

3. SCORING METHOD

While the position of a country in the various scales provides substantive information around the individual elements being address, it does not allow for a quick and direct comparison. In order to follow the performance of participants over time and to be able to compare countries, it seems useful to have an overall score for this indicator.

To provide qualitative categories that represent the enabling environment for CSOs to maximise their engagement and contribution to development, it is suggested the following scoring and aggregation method:

1. Module score. For each question within each module, the position in the scale will determine the number of points according to the table below.

Position in scale	Points
Level 1	0 point
Level 2	1 point
Level 3	2 points
Level 4	3 points

As the four modules do not contain the same number of questions, the sum of points for each module is converted in a standardised score that accounts for this difference:

$$Module\ score = \frac{Points\ scored\ based\ on\ answers\ provided}{Max\ points\ for\ the\ module}$$

Max points achievable for each module

	Number of questions	Max points possible
Module 1	4	12
Module 2	5	15
Module 3	3	9
Module 4	4	12

Example Country A

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4
Points scored	5	9	6	10
Max points possible	12	15	9	12
Standardised scores	**0.42**	**0.60**	**0.67**	**0.83**

2. Country score. The average score among the four modules will provide the final score for each country (0-1).

	Module 1. Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue	Module 2. CSOs development effectiveness	Module 3. Official development assistance with CSOs	Module 4. Legal and regulatory environment	Enabling environment for CSOs (average score among 4 modules)
Country A	0.42	0.60	0.67	0.83	**0.63**
Country B	0.08	0.20	0.56	0.58	**0.36**
Country C	0.67	0.80	0.78	0.83	**0.77**

Country scores will translate into four qualitative categories based on the following ranges:

Range of scores	Enabling environment for CSOs
Total score from 0 to 0.25	**Limited**
Total score from 0.26 to 0.50	**Narrow**
Total score from 0.51 to 0.75	**Moderate**
Total score from 0.76 to 1	**Extensive**

Possible ways of showing results:

Enabling environment for civil society			
Limited	**Narrow**	**Moderate**	**Extensive**
Country A	Country B	Country D	Country E
	Country C		

	Status of enabling environment for CSOs		
	2018	**2020**	**Trend**
Country A	Limited	Narrow	↑
Country B	Narrow	Narrow	↔
Country C	Narrow	Limited	↓

REFERENCES

Amnesty International (2017). *Annual report 2016/2017*. Available at
https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2017/02/amnesty-international-annual-report-201617/.

Balkan Civil Society Development Network (2016). *Monitoring Matrix Regional Report 2016: Violations* to *Basic Freedoms and Impeded CSO Financial Sustainability*. Available at
http://www.balkancsd.net/monitoring-matrix-regional-report-2016-violations-to-basic-freedoms-and-impeded-cso-financial-sustainability/

CIVICUS (2017). "2017 State of Civil Society Report". Available at
https://www.civicus.org/index.php/state-of-civil-society-report-2017.

CIVICUS (2017). People under attack, Findings from the Civicus monitor. Available at
https://www.civicus.org/index.php/state-of-civil-society-report-2017

Community of Democracies (2017), "The Importance of Ensuring an Enabling Environment for Civil Society as it Relates to the Sustainable Development Goals", Working Group on Enabling and Protecting Civil Society, June 2017. Available at
http://www.community-democracies.org/new-study-the-importance-of-enabling-environment-for-civil-society-as-it-relates-to-the-sdgs/

CPDE (2013). "A CPDE Contribution to the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Monitoring Framework: Indicator Two". *CPDE Working Group on CSO Enabling Environment Technical Note*; Accessed on 1 December 2017 at
http://csopartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/CSO-Contribution-to-Indicator-2.pdf

Forum Syd (2017), "Shrinking Space for Civil Society: Challenges in Implementing the 2030 Agenda". Available at http://www.forumsyd.org/PageFiles/8150/PO150943_Rapport_5maj_web.pdf.

GPEDC (2011), *Busan Partnership Agreement*. Busan, Korea: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation; accessed on 1 December 2017 at
http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/OUTCOME_DOCUMENT_-_FINAL_EN2.pdf

GPEDC (2015). "Monitoring Guide 2015-2016". *Technical Note.* Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at
http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf

GPEDC (2016a). *Nairobi Outcome Document*. Nairobi, Kenya: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation; available at
http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/OutcomeDocumentEnglish.pdf

GPEDC (2016b). *A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: delivering effective development co-operation in support of Agenda 2030*. Final report of the GPEDC Monitoring Advisory

Group. Available at
http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/MAG-Final-Report.pdf

GPEDC (2017a). "Summary of the Informal meeting on the refinement of Global Partnership Indicator 2". *Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*, Paris.

GPEDC (2017b). *The Global Partnership Monitoring Framework for 2030 - Concept Note*. Available at http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Concept-note-Global-Partnership-Monitoring-Framework-2030.pdf

Human Rights House Foundation (2017), "Funding Civil Society: How adaptable international donors can support organisations under increasing restriction," Oslo and Geneva, October 2017.

Human Rights Watch (2018). *World Report 2018*. Available at https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/world_report_download/201801world_report_web.pdf.

International Center for Not for Profit Law (2017). *Building Alliances, Strengthening Freedoms,* Annual Report 2016 – 2017. Available at http://www.icnl.org/news/2017/ICNL%20Annual%20Report%202016%20-2017.pdf.

Open Forum (2010). *Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness*. Istanbul: Open Forum's Global Assembly.

Open Forum (2012). *International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness*. Siam Reap: Open Forum.

Oxfam Deutschland (2017), *Civil society threatened all over the world*. Discussion Paper. Available https://www.boell.de/sites/default/files/uploads/2017/02/discussion_paper_civil_society_threatened_all_over_the_world.pdf.

TTCSO (2011). "CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment: A Review of the Evidence". *Task Team on Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment*. Available at https://taskteamcso.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/evidence-of-progress-on-aaa-en_d1813.pdf

TTCSO (2016). "Global Partnership Initiative 12: Stock-take of Indicator 2 Monitoring". *Task Team on Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment*. Available at https://taskteamcso.com/gpi-12-stock-take/