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## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACESS</td>
<td>Alliance for Children’s Entitlement to Social Security (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td><em>Agencias de Cooperación</em> (Honduras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>Action on Disability and Development (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-CS</td>
<td>Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKFC</td>
<td>Aga Khan Foundation Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Antiretroviral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCCP</td>
<td>Building Community Capacity Project (Guyana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Budget Information Service (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>The Community Agency for Social Enquiry (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBU</td>
<td>Children’s Budget Unit (of IDASA – see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIC</td>
<td>Canadian Council for International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECI</td>
<td><em>Centre d’étude et de coopération internationale</em> (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFPEN</td>
<td>Civil Society Inclusion in Food Security and Poverty Elimination Network (Vietnam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Centre for International Studies (Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>Canadian Hunger Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCR</td>
<td><em>Conseil National de Concertation et Coopération des Ruraux</em> (Senegal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td><em>Communauté rurale</em> councils (Senegal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSP</td>
<td>Coastal Rural Support Program (Mozambique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Civil Society Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPR</td>
<td>Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (Zambia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish Agency for International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Donor Consortium (Bangladesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECIM</td>
<td>Donor Exchange, Coordination and Information Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESC</td>
<td><em>Plateforme des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels</em> (Mali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPG</td>
<td>Development Partners’ Group (Tanzania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO</td>
<td>Donor Liaison Office (Bangladesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNL</td>
<td>European Centre for Not-For-Profit Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOCC</td>
<td>Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCISS</td>
<td>Enhancing Interaction and Interface Between Civil Society and the State to Improve Poor People’s Lives (Sierra Leone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSP</td>
<td>Education Sector Strategic Plans (Mozambique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>UN Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECONG</td>
<td><em>Fédération des collectifs d’ONG du Mali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Foundation for the Philippine Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDPRD</td>
<td>Global Donor Platform for Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCAP</td>
<td>Global Call to Action against Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO-NGO</td>
<td>Government-non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRS</td>
<td>Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB</td>
<td>Gender-responsive budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTG</td>
<td>Gender Thematic Group (Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPC</td>
<td>Highly Indebted Poor Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>High Level Forum (on Aid Effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICNL</td>
<td>International Centre for Not-For-Profit Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDASA</td>
<td>Institute for Democracy in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>International development partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>International Development Research Centre (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFID</td>
<td>International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPED</td>
<td>IBON Partnership in Education for Development (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPL</td>
<td>Impact Planning and Learning System Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF</td>
<td>International Planned Parenthood Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISG</td>
<td>International CSO Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS</td>
<td>Joint Assistance Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Logical framework approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOASP</td>
<td>Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale (Senegal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBA</td>
<td>Niger Basin Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRMP</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management Program (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCN</td>
<td>Office for Cooperation with NGOs (Croatia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official development assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARPA</td>
<td>Mozambique’s action plan for the reduction of absolute poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBA</td>
<td>Program-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETS</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEM</td>
<td>Promotion of a Literate Environment in Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Participatory monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Participatory Poverty Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAs</td>
<td>Partnership Programme Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROAGRI</td>
<td>Government of Mozambique’s strategy for the agricultural sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVO</td>
<td>Private voluntary organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Development Foundation of West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAp</td>
<td>Sector-wide approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWG</td>
<td>Sector working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGNP</td>
<td>Tanzania Gender Networking Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANI</td>
<td>Voluntary Action Network of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>Voluntary organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCD</td>
<td>World Commission on Dams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSC</td>
<td>World University Service Canada (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Federation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A READER’S GUIDE

1. This document is one of three related documents being made available at the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness by the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness (AG-CS). The others are the AG-CS’ Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations, which is the AG-CS’ main product, and the Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book.

2. This Exploration of Experience and Good Practice paper and the Case Book are intended to illustrate the recommendations found in the Synthesis. They are thus intended as reference documents for readers looking for empirical material relating to one or more of the AG-CS recommendations. It is intended that readers should familiarize themselves with the Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations first, and that they would then turn to this paper and the Case Book on a selective basis. It is not suggested to read this paper cover to cover. Readers are encourage to treat this as a reference paper and to look for the sorts of cases that would most interest them, referring to the Case Book for more details.

3. The primary purposes of this Exploration of Experience and Good Practice paper are as follows:

   • to illustrate the AG-CS recommendations;
   • to provide a sense of how these can play out in practice;
   • to occasionally supplement these with a reference to existing guidelines; and
   • to provide a base for a forward agenda on civil society and aid effectiveness.

4. Both the Exploration of Experience and Good Practice and the Case Book are based to a very large extent on case studies submitted to the AG-CS for consideration. In the reference section of this paper are listed 75 such cases, sorted by country, all of which are available on the AG-CS’ extranet site. The Case Book contains 26 cases of two and a half to four pages each, while the Experience and Good Practice paper contains considerably more references and text boxes, each dealt with in a more summary way, including cases drawn from the literature and the Internet.

5. The three companion documents do not have identical status as AG-CS products. Unlike the Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations, which is a formal AG-CS consensus document, the other two documents remain the responsibility of the authors. Although AG-CS members have had the opportunity to review earlier drafts of the Experience and Good Practice paper, the paper remains a working draft or “first edition,” and the judgments and views included in it are those of the authors, including those authors of the original case studies. Readers are invited to submit feedback to the AG-CS to help address omissions or errors, or to share additional cases or experience.

6. One of the AG-CS’ recommendations for the forward agenda is that each stakeholder group should commit to individually and jointly explore, adapt and pilot the types of good practices presented here, and to track progress on these practices to inform ongoing learning and dialogue (recommendation 19). Consideration is being given to the establishment of a multi-stakeholder reference group to help move such a process along between now and the next HLF in 2010/11. Until such a group is established, readers interested in participating in such a piloting exercise are invited to contact the authors to express their interest via the AG-CS extranet site or bilaterally with AG-CS members.
STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE PAPER

7. This paper follows the outline of the AG-CS *Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations*. For ease of reference, the actual recommendations are replicated at the beginning of each corresponding section and are highlighted with a shaded background. Readers can refer back to the *Synthesis* for the rationale of these recommendations.

8. There are three major chapters in the paper:
   - one on Recognition and Voice,
   - one on Enriching and Implementing the Paris Declaration aid effectiveness principles), and
   - one on CSO Effectiveness, which adopts a thematic perspective.

9. Readers will observe some overlap in the recommendations made by the AG-CS due to the inter-relatedness of the various themes. In addition, cases featured in one section usually have elements that fit in other sections. We have slotted each case where it speaks most directly to one of the AG recommendation, occasionally cross-referencing the same cases in other parts of the document.

10. We have complemented this form of presentation with a number of questions, also highlighted in grey shading, to help explain what we attempt to illustrate in each section or subsection. In what follows, we list these questions, and offer some notes on what the reader will find in the paper under each one.
WHAT TO LOOK FOR

Recognition and Voice (recommendations 1-3)

What are examples of some of the diverse and distinct roles played by civil society and of the results that ensue from these activities?

11. The paper provides examples of civil society organizations (CSOs) in democratization, service delivery, humanitarian relief, research, advocacy, and public-awareness raising, and shaping social values. CSOs are also important aid actors, raising substantial financial contributions for international development purposes, as well as being recipients or channels for official development assistance (ODA).

What does it mean, operationally, for donors and governments to “recognize” CSOs as development actors in their own right?

12. The paper looks for donor or government “recognition” of CSOs in policy statements or day-to-day practice of collaboration with CSOs. Examples of policy-level recognition of civil society can be found in policy statements at all levels, from local to national to international.

What are some practical examples of “regular and systematic” or of less formal spaces for effective CSO participation in policy dialogue?

13. Numerous examples of such dialogue exist, again from local to national to supra-national level. Examples include the UNDP CSO Advisory Committee, GAVI, or the AG-CS itself. In some cases, the space provided is more ad hoc and may be provided only in response to pressure, as seen in the case of the farmer lobby for smallholder plantation debt relief in Indonesia.

Civil Society and the Paris Declaration (recommendations 4-11)

How does the respect and promotion of “local and democratic ownership” manifest itself in different cases involving CSOs?

14. Evidence suggests that CSOs are having some success in their push for greater involvement in the design, implementation or assessment of development strategies and initiatives whether these are poverty reduction strategies (PRSs), sector strategies, or decentralized development strategies. Sometimes governments and donors actively facilitate this involvement, and support it through capacity development to reinforce different stakeholders’ capacity to exercise ownership.

How does the respect and promotion of alignment broadly understood manifest itself in different cases involving CSOs?

15. Sometimes CSOs’ priorities align with government priorities, sometimes not, yet may still be locally owned and respond to local needs. The paper includes examples of alignment that involve alignment with CSO priorities and non-governmental country systems connected to the individuals and communities who are the intended ultimate beneficiaries of aid.

What are some examples of governments and CSOs engaging together in program-based initiatives? Are there cases that illustrate the combination of more programmatic approaches with approaches that encourage diversity, innovation and bottom-up initiative?
16. We provide examples of CSOs and governments playing complementary roles in program-based initiatives in both the education and rural development sectors of Mozambique and elsewhere. CSOs can add richness by virtue of the diversity of priorities and approaches that they adopt in response to the diversity of their own constituencies and experience.

What are the features of “alternative” approaches to results-based management, and how well do they work? What can be cited of efforts by each stakeholder group to promote greater accountability to beneficiaries?

17. This section points to pockets of practice illustrating new approaches to results-based management that emphasize emergent change and complexity, and increasing concern for “downward” accountability to intended beneficiaries. Other topics covered are efforts at multi-stakeholder monitoring and evaluation, transparency and access to information. Examples are provided of social accountability measures such as participatory budget and expenditure monitoring.

CSO Effectiveness (recommendations 12-17)

What examples can be cited of good enabling environments for civil society or of efforts to improve the enabling environment?

18. This is a broad subject area, worthy of much more attention than it is accorded in this paper, which relates to: legal and judicial systems; ensuring promotion and protection of human rights; structures and processes for multi-stakeholder dialogue; CSO-specific policies and legislation; and taxation regulations. Examples are provided from Croatia and India amongst others.

What are some examples of good donorship in terms of its impact on CSO effectiveness?

19. We were able to exploit numerous examples of donor approaches in support of CSOs by both official donors and CSOs acting in a donor capacity, although more work is needed on the link between the choice of funding models and their impact on CSOs’ ability to fill their roles as development and aid actors while delivering development results.

What are some examples and features of successful international or country-level CSO partnerships?

20. These include a number of efforts already cited in other sections, for example the way that CSOs joined forces in the Mali consultations on civil society and aid effectiveness, or the combined CSO effort in Senegal around the agro-sylvo-pastoral legislation, as well as some famous cases such as the Jubilee debt relief initiative, and examples of North-South partnerships where the donor-recipient aspect is of lesser importance.
RECOGNITION AND VOICE

ROLES PLAYED BY CSOs

21. In this section we address the following question:

What are examples of some of the diverse and distinct roles played by civil society and of the results that ensue from these activities?

22. Civil society is inherently diverse, and CSOs fill a range of roles in social and economic development in any country, many of which are beyond those supported through official development assistance (ODA). Acknowledging that there are many different ways in which CSOs’ various roles can be sliced, the AG-CS draws particular attention to:

   a) mobilizing grassroots communities and poor or marginalized people;
   b) monitoring the policies and practices of governments and donors and reinforcing the accountability of government and donor bodies through the application of local knowledge;
   c) engaging in research and policy dialogue;
   d) delivering services and programs;
   e) building coalitions and networks for enhanced civil society coordination and impact;
   f) mobilizing additional financial and human aid resources; and
   g) educating the public, and helping to shape social values of solidarity and social justice (AG-CS 2008, pg. 4).

CSOs as development actors in their own right

23. Within their various development and aid roles, CSOs are able to deliver results to varying degrees of efficiency and effectiveness. There is considerable evidence of CSO effectiveness, though most of what is documented is at the project or program level. With a few exceptions, there is little in the way of meta-assessment of civil society’s contribution to development and aid. What this section of the paper seeks to demonstrate through examples is that CSOs, when pursuing their own ideas and agendas in their own ways, fulfill a myriad of roles that clearly contribute to development.

24. Worldwide, civil society has played an integral role in processes of democratization and the pursuit of human rights and good governance. Indeed, it was the high profile of this role in Latin America and in the demise of Soviet-era regimes from the 1980s that earned civil society a place in donor countries’ good governance and democratization plans. In many Latin American countries, civil society became synonymous with democracy and anti-militarism, while in Eastern Europe it was civil society that challenged the totalitarian state. In Poland, the Solidarity trade union of shipyard workers pursued negotiation and dialogue with officials that peacefully challenged their authority. CSOs, academics and the media in Hungary were also central to the “peaceful revolution” that led to reform in Hungary (Miszlivetz and Ertsey 1998, pg. 74).
25. A more recent example is Pakistan in 2007, where the peaceful protests of the Supreme Court Bar Association and other pro-democracy activists made it difficult for the Pakistani leadership to carry on business as usual in its incarceration of key legal and judicial professionals and related anti-democratic actions. Sometimes forceful, sometimes more incremental, the contribution of CSO activism to democratic development and good governance is evident through history.

Box 1 - CSOs and the election process in Democratic Republic of Congo

In 2007, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) went through a peaceful and transparent electoral process. Congolese churches, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and associations provided civic education that helped to mobilize the populace. Their efforts elicited a high level of participation, with over 25 million individuals registering to vote in the lead-up to the elections. CSOs trained 60,000 civic educators across the country to raise awareness of the stakes surrounding the election, democratic principles, and citizens’ electoral rights, as well as rules and regulations. Supportive tools such as community radio, posters, comics and theatre were also developed by local CSOs. A CSO Cadre de concertation de la société civile pour l’observation des élections was put in place to observe the election process across the country.


26. CSOs can also be effective in delivering services and programs, and are often particularly effective in reaching marginalized populations. They are often recognized for their ability to deliver services effectively at modest cost, although this does not necessarily follow in all cases. Their ability to reach out and cater to populations that might not otherwise be adequately served often justifies the special costs associated with relatively small-scale or decentralized initiatives.

27. Through the programs they deliver to affected populations, CSOs often introduce new agendas or innovative approaches that can then be taken up on a larger scale. For example, it was close contact with people living with HIV and AIDS in Africa and elsewhere that allowed CSOs to develop what are now standard practices in HIV/AIDS prevention and care. Anonymous testing within existing health facilities was identified as a way to increase the numbers of people presenting themselves for testing as it reduced visibility and thus fear of ostracism, while peer education and counselling were developed to establish broad outreach in prevention and support between people of the same background, speaking the same language, living similar experiences.

28. The field of small-scale savings and loans schemes and microfinance similarly demonstrates the creativity and innovation of CSOs. With banks not serving the needs of Africa’s poor, CSOs have been at the forefront of the growing savings and credit movement. Across the continent an estimated 4 million borrowers and 6 million savers benefit from microfinance institutions (Amoako 2008, pg. 5).

29. The example of IBON Foundation’s Partnership in Education for Development illustrates CSO innovation in service provision aimed at societal transformation.
Box 2 - CSO Innovation: The IBON Partnership and Transformative Education

IBON Foundation Inc. is a capacity development organization focused on knowledge building. It was established in 1978 by a group of church people and professionals to disseminate socio-economic information and analysis during the dark years of dictatorial rule in the Philippines. It was created against a backdrop of rampant violations of human rights.

IBON has a long background in education. Its flagship publication, *IBON Facts and Figures* first appeared in 1978 and was applauded by progressive educators who saw its value as an instrument complementing the government’s elementary and secondary education program in social studies, civics, and human rights education.

In 1994, IBON developed the IBON Partnership in Education for Development (IPED) in response to demands from the formal education sector for transformative education and a revitalized curriculum. More than 200 partner schools currently subscribe to IBON publications and textbooks. Most of these are private schools in urban areas but there are also a handful of major public high schools and some rural private schools. The IPED program seeks to develop the capacities of students, teachers, and school administrators, for social analysis and social action.

It currently publishes five monthly and three quarterly publications for students and a number of textbooks in subject areas such as language, history, civics, and economics. The program also produces audio-visual teaching aids such as CDs and video documentaries and engages in student leadership training through lectures and roundtable discussions on current social issues.

IBON produces a bi-monthly journal for teachers and educators called “Education for Development Magazine” that contains news and features from a CSO and grassroots perspective. As an accredited service provider with the Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC), IBON conducts teacher-training programs and organizes forums and symposiums for teachers and educators, and annual educators’ conferences on themes such as peace building, corruption, and governance. Teachers and educators attending these activities earn credits with the PRC that are a requirement for their professional advancement. IPED works with progressive educators to help schools review and formulate their vision and mission statements, curricula, and extension or outreach programs.

IBON sees its transformative education approach as a way for formal education to become part of the Philippine’s overall process of social transformation and development.

*Extracted from: “IBON Partnership in Education for Development (IPED).” Case Study (2008).*

30. CSOs often play a critical role in the delivery of humanitarian relief in response to natural disasters or socio-political unrest. Because CSOs often combine humanitarian relief and development efforts while maintaining a long-term presence on the ground, they can help to bridge the transition from relief to development through practical programs. This is recognized in the Good Humanitarian Donorship framework that includes principles that specifically address ways to facilitate CSOs fulfilling this role (International Meeting on Good Humanitarian Donorship 2003). CSOs have developed their own humanitarian principles and standards such as the *Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards*, and are influential in policy discussions to help ensure that the international community is sufficiently responsive to crises around the world (Sphere 2004).
Box 3 - Humanitarian Assistance in Zambia

The International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (ICRC) is the largest international CSO focused on humanitarian relief. It identifies itself as an independent, neutral organization ensuring humanitarian protection and assistance for victims of war and armed violence, though the societies are also active in responding to natural disasters. They provide direct assistance, and are often responsible for the coordination of non-governmental humanitarian response on the ground. They are also active in the protection of civilians, prisoners, and detainees by ensuring respect for humanitarian law, minimizing the dangers to which people are exposed, preventing or putting a stop to violations committed against them, upholding their rights, making their voices heard and providing them with support. They also restore family links of people affected by conflict.

Hodi is a Zambian CSO created to enhance the capacity of community-based and intermediary organizations working in rural Zambia. Its work covers a variety of development and humanitarian initiatives. Hodi’s current humanitarian effort is in two refugee camps hosting approximately 40,000 Congolese refugees. There, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees funds Hodi’s community and education services. Their community services cater to the social needs of refugees with a focus on the special needs of unaccompanied minors, women, and children, especially in regards to gender-based violence, and the management of community structures and programs such as income generation and micro-credit schemes. In the education sector, Hodi’s responsibilities are in both formal and informal education and range from pre-school to tertiary education. Hodi facilitates recruitment of teachers and acquisition of school materials, and ensures that the Congolese curriculum is followed.


31. CSOs play a central role in mobilizing communities and individuals toward development ends. The example of CSO involvement in the electoral process in the DRC presented above demonstrates popular mobilization in the pursuit of democracy, and the case of Butoke, below, provides an example of how communities can be helped to help themselves in achieving higher levels of food security. This case is marked with an arrow (⇒) to indicate that more details are available in the Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book. The next box illustrates cases from Africa of CSOs acting as vehicles for citizen and community involvement in education.

32. CSOs mobilize people to contribute to community development initiatives through financial or in-kind contributions including volunteer time. An example is from World Vision’s ENHANCE program in Ghana, which grew out of recognition of the need to extend government initiatives to address malnutrition and preventable disease among children under five, particularly in remote areas in which World Vision had been working for some time. Together with community members, the organization developed a community-based and integrated approach to managing childhood illnesses, and mobilized community members to implement a volunteer-based program with support of government health staff (World Vision Case Study 2008).
**Box 4 ⇒ Grassroots Development in Western Kasai**

Butoke is a grassroots CSO founded in 2004 to address problems of hunger and malnutrition in Western Kasai province of the Democratic Republic of Congo. From the start, Butoke combined a humanitarian approach to address immediate needs with a longer-term development approach, by providing food for work, and managing a nutrition centre while introducing new seeds, basic tools, and low-cost agricultural techniques such as row planting and proper spacing to village associations.

Beneficiaries tended to be primarily widows and others whose nutritional status was the most precarious, but all village associations contain a mix of members. The approach has been successful in reaching large numbers of people at low cost, using a formula that can be replicated to scale as resources become available. Butoke’s program has filled an institutional void in an area of the DRC in which the economy, the government and even the social fibre of society itself had been devastated by years of war and bad governance.

Butoke’s programs have reached a large population. Starting work in 2004 with 20 village associations on 19 ha, Butoke by 2007 was reaching a population of 19,000 small farmers – with their families, a population of about 120,000 people – whose nutritional levels are thus being improved, albeit marginally, through access to more abundant, more nutritious crops. In 2006, Butoke was supporting the school fees of 665 orphans (up from 278 in 2004), was treating approximately 6,500 cases per year in nutrition and primary health centres, and was rehabilitating approximately 200 severely malnourished children per year. It was providing counselling on responsible sexuality for approximately 5,000 people per year.

The example of service and respect for human rights and dignity that inspire Butoke as basic values in its work provide hope and inspiration for the population, who can see in this a different way of doing things. Butoke is helping to break down the barriers to gender equality and change attitudes towards the handicapped and downtrodden in a society that tends to blame orphans, widows, and the handicapped for their own misfortune as bewitched people to be isolated, shunned, and often dispossessed.

*Extracted from:* “Grassroots Development in Western Kasai” in the Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book (2008).

**Box 5 - CSOs as Community Mobilizers in the Education Sector in African Countries**

CSOs across Africa are vehicles for citizen and community involvement in education, both in terms of their contributions to schooling at local levels, and to policy dialogue locally and nationally.

- In Burkina Faso, parents contribute to schooling through payment of fees, construction of teachers’ houses, and occasional costs like teachers’ travel. Students’ Parents Associations exist in many areas. Women’s involvement in school has been bolstered by the Associations of Educating Mothers. The National Education Campaign Coalition works closely with the Ministry of Education.
- In the Gambia, functional School Management Committees exist in most schools. The Government involves civil society in education sector dialogue, and recognizes their role in implementation. The National Education Campaign Coalition collaborates with the Ministry of Education.
- In Kenya, vibrant School Management Committees responsible for the management of resources exist in many areas. Accountability mechanisms include: sub-committees on procurement; the use of public notice boards to show funds received at the school; reporting to parents through annual general meetings and submission of primary school accounts books for audit. Elimu Yetu Coalition is involved in sector dialogues with the Ministry of Education.
- In Cameroon, Parent-Teacher Associations mainly participate through financial contributions to school projects. Bureaucratic red tape and centralized decision-making is a major obstacle to dialogue with civil society on education.

*Extracted from:* Africa Network Campaign on Education for All (no date).
33. CSOs are often at the forefront of advocacy for innovative policy and practice as well. For instance, CSOs have been leaders in advancing a rights-based approach to development. A rights-based approach is grounded in the international human rights framework, using the human rights standards and principles of the international covenants and declarations as the basis for dialogue and action as outlined in the case of ForoSalud and CARE Peru presented below. In this case, a CSO coalition mobilized local voices and brought their message into policy dialogue with government.

34. CSOs’ ability to identify innovative approaches grounded in local knowledge, and their ability to articulate evidence-based policy positions, is a product of the action research they undertake, whether purposefully designed as such or within the realm of monitoring and evaluation of their initiatives.

Box 6 - ForoSalud’s Rights-based Approach to Health in Peru

ForoSalud is a CSO network in Peru that has been using a rights-based approach since its creation in 2001. Its work is focused on sexual and reproductive rights and access to medicines. Over the past 5 years, CARE Peru and ForoSalud have worked in partnership to advance strategies for making health policies and institutions more responsive to the rights of poor and marginalized people and establish participatory and inclusive mechanisms for the planning, provision and evaluation of health services. This work has contributed to a new vision of health policy emphasizing health as a universal human right, against the backdrop of a health sector reform considered excessively focused on efficiency and cost recovery. This human rights stance on health has several implications:

- prioritization of quality health services that actually reach the most poor and excluded;
- establishing citizens’ participation in policy decision-making at national and regional levels; and
- setting standards for social surveillance of health policies and public health services.

In 2004, the program was able to seize upon the appointment of a new Minister of Health and a visit to Peru of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health to organize a series of capacity building meetings and workshops that led to the endorsement of cross-cutting principles of a rights-based approach by the Ministry of Health.

In collaboration with Physicians for Human Rights, the network has also designed and implemented a citizen and civil society-based accountability mechanism, promoting citizen surveillance on health services and social programs’ quality and effectiveness in the regions. Through this initiative, Quechua and Aymara women community leaders and regional offices of the human rights Ombudsman work together to monitor women’s health rights, particularly their right to good quality, appropriate maternal health services.

This exercise has yielded positive results in terms of improved attitudes and practices on the part of health service providers. It has also served to identify areas needing improvement, such as reduced hours of service and charges for medicines that should otherwise be free. Rural women leaders are now empowered to pursue such issues, in collaboration with the Ombudsman and ForoSalud.

35. The findings and analysis from non-profit research institutes, universities and colleges and think tanks also bring new policy and program ideas and approaches for uptake by CSOs, donors and governments alike as featured below.

**Box 7 - CSOs and Research: Think Tanks Provide the Evidence Base to Support Reform**

Independent think tanks are among civil society actors offering data and analysis to advance development. The number of think tanks active worldwide has grown considerably over the past few decades for a variety of reasons, not least of which is growing recognition of the need for timely and pertinent information upon which to make decisions. Examples of successes include:

- The Korea Development Institute, which made the case for Korea’s move into the global economy, and for converting the country’s economy from a capital-based to a knowledge-based one.
- The Institute of Applied Economic Research in Brazil, which highlighted inequality, recommended decentralization of public services, and then helped design municipally-led education and health programs. Their efforts led to the expansion of food stamp programs and initiatives to widen access to literacy programs for the country’s poorest people.
- The Malaysian Institute of Economic Research, which provided the evidence to facilitate Malaysia’s shift from an exporter of natural resources to a processing and manufacturing center, and promoted the establishment of tax allowances and deductions, location incentives and other stimulants for direct foreign investment.
- **The Consortium pour la Recherche Économique et Sociale** in Senegal, which collaborated with the Ministry of Education in preparation of the second phase *Programme décennal de l’éducation et de la formation* (the education strategy). Their findings and analysis had a significant impact on the way in which the education sector policy is understood through increased attention to questions of efficiency and effectiveness and application of a results-based performance management approach.

Extracted from: Amoako (2008), and "Création d’un centre de recherche indépendant en analyse des politiques économiques et sociales." Case Study (2008).

36. Through their public education programs and the opportunities that they provide for direct engagement in development work, CSOs also help to develop values of solidarity and social justice that broaden interest and support for development efforts. CSOs are often very effective at working with the media, providing the media with facts and analysis, while the media give voice to CSOs’ positions and publicize their efforts. The Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) network in Zambia, for instance, is considered “a vital source of alternative, reliable, factual analysis and informed opinion” for journalists (PANOS 2008, pg. 44). This CSO network provides digestible information to the media, and has taken journalists to visit poverty monitoring sites in rural Lusaka, facilitating journalists’ access to the voices of poor people. The Global Call to Action against Poverty, also known as the Make Poverty History Campaign, provides an example of public education, awareness-raising, and effective advocacy.
Box 8 - CSOs in Public Education and Advocacy: The Global Call to Action against Poverty

In September 2004, a group of civil society actors including NGOs, international networks, social movements, trade unions, women’s organizations, and faith-based groups met in Johannesburg and launched the Global Call to Action against Poverty (GCAP). GCAP aimed to make 2005 the year when governments could take decisive action to deliver on their promises of the Millennium Declaration and make poverty history.

GCAP is now a growing CSO alliance working together across more than 100 national platforms. What sets GCAP apart from most campaigns is that, in addition to being a coalition of international organizations, it also operates on national and regional levels.

In 2005, GCAP members and supporters undertook more than 38 million actions around the world to put pressure on politicians and world leaders who were attending crucial meetings that could, if the right decisions were made, commit to overcoming poverty. On October 16-17, 2006, 23.5 million people around the world Stood Up Against Poverty and, in doing so, set a new Guinness World Record and sent out a powerful message to national and global political leaders.


CSOs as aid donors, recipients and partners

37. This section illustrates the importance of CSOs as actors in the aid system as aid donors, recipients and partners. Estimates provided to the AG-CS by the OECD-DAC Secretariat suggest that developed country CSOs raise between $20 to $25 billion annually in contributions to development assistance, while an estimated 10% of total ODA is channelled to and through these same CSOs (AG-CS 2008, pg. 4-5). Tracking CSO flows is notoriously sketchy due to inconsistencies in reporting to the DAC, and because decentralized flows from CSOs and official donors directly to developing country CSOs tend to be missed, but there is no question that CSOs are important aid actors.

38. Figures for funding raised or received by developing country CSOs as recipients are available from CIVICUS Civil Society Index country reports. For example, a 2004 study of 290 NGOs in Chile found that 31% raised funds from “national private organizations”; 69% were partially funded by “international organizations”; 74% tendered for grant funding from government (Fundación Soles 2006, pg. 33). In Montenegro, 74% of NGOs receive funds from foreign donations, 35% from local government sources, 34% from “government and public administration bodies,” 31% from Montenegrin citizens, and 25% from corporate donors and the same portion from membership fees (Muk, Uljarević and Brajović 2006, pg.29). In Nicaragua in recent years, CSOs received an average of approximately US$150 million, representing approximately 20% of total ODA flows to the country. Some of this funding flows directly from official donors, some from Northern CSOs, and some is ODA channelled through the government (Alliance 2015 2007, pg. 36).

39. A recent study, Key Trends in International Donor Policy on Civil Society, provides figures on several donors’ flows to and through CSOs. For example, in fiscal year 2004, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) apportioned 25% of its total aid budget (32% of its bilateral aid), to U.S. private voluntary organizations (PVOs), while an estimated 24% of overseas expenditure by PVOs was covered by USAID (CIS 2007. pg. 14). Norway channels approximately one-third of its bilateral aid to a mix of domestic, international and developing country CSOs, with about one quarter provided for humanitarian purposes (ibid, pg.
28). Sweden and Canada channel about 27% and 20% of their total ODA appropriations, respectively, to and through CSOs.

40. Several boxes in other sections of this paper illustrate the contributions of CSOs as aid actors – the case of Butoke, for instance, or that of the Aga Khan Foundation Canada.

**RECOGNITION**

**RECOMMENDATION 1: THE AG-CS RECOMMENDS THAT ALL DEVELOPMENT ACTORS RECOGNIZE:**

A) THE IMPORTANCE AND DIVERSITY OF CSOS AS DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN ACTORS IN THEIR OWN RIGHT (RECOMMENDATION 1A);

B) THAT CSOS HAVE DISTINCTIVE AND LEGITIMATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAKE TO DEVELOPMENT AND AID EFFECTIVENESS, AND THAT THEIR EFFORTS COMPLEMENT THOSE OF OTHER DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS (RECOMMENDATION 1B); AND

C) THAT A STRONG CIVIL SOCIETY IS AN ASSET THAT WORTH DEVELOPING AS PART OF A SOCIETY’S EFFORT TO TRANSFORM ITSELF AND DEEPEN DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE IN A WAY THAT INCLUDES ACCOMMODATION AND SUPPORT FOR COMPETING VISIONS AND DISSENT (RECOMMENDATION 1C).

41. In this section we provide examples in answer to the question:

**What does it mean, operationally, for donors and governments to “recognize” CSOs as development actors in their own right?**

42. A growing number of countries in both the developed and developing world are explicitly recognizing the role of CSOs in policy statements of various sorts.

43. Occasionally, governments and CSOs work together to develop a statement of shared values and ways of working together. For example, in Canada, an *Accord between the Government and the Voluntary Sector* was elaborated in 2001. This accord articulates shared values and guiding principles including independence, interdependence, dialogue, collaboration, and accountability to the public (VSI 2001). Follow-up activities included joint development of guidelines such as *A Code of Good Practice on Policy Dialogue* (2002).

44. Recognition of civil society in policy happens at various levels. An example of how the issue is addressed supra-nationally can be found in the case of the Niger Basin Authority’s (NBA).

**Box 9 - CSOs and the Niger River Basin Authority**

The Niger Basin Authority (NBA) is a joint management institution covering ten West and Central African countries sharing an interest in the sustainable development of the Niger River basin. As part of the process of implementing the NBA’s 2002 Shared Vision, civil society and CSOs have been formally recognized as stakeholders. This involves official recognition in ministerial resolutions and adoption of mechanisms ensuring civil society participation, including the institutionalization of seats for CSOs in the steering committee as well as decentralized participation mechanisms. Of course, official recognition in policy is not sufficient to ensure that recognition is borne out in practice. In the NBA case, civil society’s views are now being taken into account in policies and planning, such as in the design of the Water Charter. However, CSOs are still seen as adversaries rather than allies in some of the participating countries, and their contributions are seen as suspect rather than adding value.

*Based on: Bazie (2008).*
45. Recognition by international bodies is often grounded in existing legal frameworks elsewhere. For example, the Council of Europe’s Recommendation on the legal status of NGOs in Europe (2007) draws from the Statute of the Council of Europe and the European Social Charter, and from the United Nations Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The Recommendation recognizes that “the existence of many NGOs is a manifestation of the right of their members to freedom of association...and of their host country’s adherence to principles of democratic pluralism” (CoE 2007, pg. 1). It asserts “the essential contribution made by NGOs to the development and realization of democracy and human rights and … to the cultural life and social well-being of democratic societies” (ibid).

46. The boxes below present four examples of official recognition of civil society as important development actors and partners. The first box features examples at national level, and the second an example from the Canadian province of Quebec. The first two examples in the first box are elaborated in greater detail in the enabling environment section of this paper, and all three are further elaborated in the Case Book.

Box 10 - Recognizing Civil Society in National Policy: ⇒ Croatia, ⇒ India and ⇒ Colombia (Recommendation 1)

Croatia’s National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development from 2006 to 2011 is values-based and emphasizes respect for civil society autonomy as a foundation for state-civil society relations. It supports pluralism and freedom of action and speech. The strategy acknowledges the role of CSOs as active participants in public policy making and implementation as well as in helping to guarantee constitutional values such as freedom, democracy, equality, peace, social justice, respect for human rights, conservation of nature, rule of law and private property.

India’s National Policy on the Voluntary Sector is a commitment to encourage, enable and empower an independent, creative and effective voluntary sector, with diversity in form and function, so that it can contribute to the social, cultural and economic advancement of the people of India. The policy emphasizes that all laws, rules and regulations relating to voluntary organizations should safeguard their autonomy, while simultaneously ensuring their accountability.

In Colombia, the G24 group of donors, and government, have come to recognize the importance of the participation of CSOs as fundamental actors in the aid and development agenda, giving them full voice and representation in various policy dialogue processes. In particular, CSOs have been given full recognition as participants in the London-Cartagena-Bogota process in which the International Cooperation Strategies for 2003-2006 and 2007-2010 have been developed.

Box 11 - Quebec’s Policy on Community Action (Recommendation 1)

Since 2001, the Canadian province of Québec has put in place a policy called “L’action communautaire: Une contribution essentielle à l’exercice de la citoyenneté et au développement social du Québec” (“Community Action: A fundamental contribution to citizenship and social development in Quebec”). The policy was developed by an interdepartmental committee made up of representatives from 20 government departments and agencies and the Réseau québécois de l’action communautaire autonome, comprised of 16 community organizations, and involved a broad-based consultative process.

The policy places community organizations at the heart of Québec’s social practices and recognizes their role in the province’s social and economic development while allowing them to maintain their independence and freedom of action. It is accompanied by a guide on funding mechanisms and accountability requirements. The policy puts forward three funding approaches: project support, service agreements, and core support for the overall mission of the organization. Government bodies are encouraged to prioritize core support in order to support autonomous community action.


**VOICE**

47. CSOs have different ways of carving out the space that they need to articulate their voice through letters to officials, one-on-one meetings, the media, or demonstrations. However, the AG-CS recommendation suggests that there is merit in establishing regular and systematic spaces for CSOs to engage in dialogue with policy makers as standard practice. The provision of such spaces can strengthen accountability, democracy and human rights. Its absence is part of the experience and root causes of poverty, particularly for systemically marginalized groups (O’Neil, Foresti and Hudson 2007).

**RECOMMENDATION 2: THAT REGULAR AND SYSTEMATIC SPACES BE PROVIDED FOR THE VOICE OF CSOS OF DIFFERENT PERSUASIONS AND ORIENTATIONS TO BE HEARD AT ALL STAGES OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PLANNING, NEGOTIATION, IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION), AND THAT THIS BE RECOGNIZED AS STANDARD PRACTICE THAT NEEDS TO BE ACTIVELY PROMOTED AT ALL LEVELS FROM LOCAL TO INTERNATIONAL.**

48. Here we seek to answer the question:

**What are some practical examples of “regular and systematic” or of less formal spaces for effective CSO participation in policy dialogue?**

49. Illustrations of spaces for the voice of civil society are provided below, followed by some elements of practical guidance. Additional examples are available in the section on local and democratic ownership.

50. There are many models for systematic dialogue between CSOs, donors and governments. Ebrahim and Herz (2007, pg. 19) distinguish three approaches:

- Policymakers can unilaterally convene a consultation with CSOs.
- They can create an independent, multi-stakeholder body.
- Or they adopt a collaborative approach, in which CSOs and policy-makers share responsibility for the dialogue process and monitoring its outcomes.
51. Any one of these approaches may constitute good practice, though experience suggests that CSOs’ voices are more likely to be heard under the *independent* and *collaborative* models. For many CSOs seeking to influence policy, formal dialogue mechanisms can be risky. Fear of co-optation can undermine CSOs’ willingness to engage in policy dialogue in formal forums with governments and donors – indeed, there are members of civil society who are adamantly against close dialogue with the institutions they wish to influence. Maintaining a critical stance from the outside is one tactic to foster reform. Engaging in dialogue from “inside the tent” in another. All parties in policy dialogue benefit from being aware and frank about the risk of co-optation, and need to understand the shift in approach which is entailed when moving from outside to inside the tent and back (Brown and Fox 2001). The following case provides an example of a CSO network carefully managing an opportunity to work from inside the tent in order to protect its independence.

**Box 12 ⇒ Platform on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in Mali (Recommendation 2)**

In Mali, the *Platorme des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels* (DESC – the Platform on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) produced a report on the status of economic, social and cultural rights in the country. In response to this alternative report, the Malian authorities asked the platform to help produce the state’s official report by joining an inter-ministerial unit set up for that purpose. DESC turned down this invitation, asserting its position as independent advocate. However, the platform agreed to assist the government in terms of awareness and training for state officials to support them in writing the official report.

*Extracted from: “La Platforme des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels au Mali.” Case Study (2008).*

52. The multi-stakeholder dialogue adopted by the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness (AG-CS) is itself an interesting example, since one of the objectives of the AG-CS process was precisely to facilitate space for CSO voice to be heard in discussions on aid effectiveness. The AG-CS process has galvanized numerous instances of multi-stakeholder dialogue, some of which is ongoing.

53. In many instances, as illustrated by the case of Mali below, this has led to the establishment of arrangements for ongoing dialogue. In most cases it has also spurred greater collaboration *within* stakeholder groups. One of the outcomes in the Mali case was a Joint Declaration prepared by the organizing committee, made up of eleven Malian and Mali-based international CSOs, which was brought to the AG-CS International Forum as part of their contribution to the dialogue.

54. For the most part, the impetus for dialogue on civil society and aid effectiveness has come from CSOs themselves, though in some cases donors have taken the lead. The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) for example organized a thirteen-country consultation focused on rural and agricultural development (GDPRD 2008, Ahmed and Langenkamp 2008).

**Box 13 - The Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness (Recommendation 2)**

The AG-CS was created in January 2007 to advise the OECD-DAC’s Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. The AG-CS brings together donors, developing country governments, and CSOs from both developed and developing countries. It emerged in response to growing interest among CSOs to engage with donors and developing country governments on issues of aid effectiveness, and to a growing
from other stakeholders that the discussions and agreements on aid effectiveness had until then not been sufficiently sensitive to the particularities of civil society.

In the lead-up to the Accra High Level Forum (HLF) the AG-CS has catalyzed the inclusion of CSOs in dialogue with the Working Party and its Steering Committee, and in the HLF itself, thus carving space for civil society voice. Based on its own analysis and an extensive consultation process, it has elaborated a number of consensus recommendations on civil society and aid effectiveness, as published in its *Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations*.

The AG-CS has benefited from a high level of commitment from its members, and their ability to negotiate their positions in good faith based on early establishment of a common understanding of key principles. Divergent standpoints have at times been prominent and hotly debated. CSOs have been concerned, for example, with deepening and enriching the aid effectiveness agenda to address issues such as conditionality, human rights, and accountability to the ultimate beneficiaries of aid. Donors and governments have raised concerns over CSOs’ own accountability. However, a shared belief in the importance of civil society as development and aid actors, and the acknowledgement from all parties that there is room for improvement to maximize civil society’s full potential, have served to move the AG-CS’ position forward in a creative and constructive manner.

In parallel to the AG-CS process, CSOs launched the International CSO Steering Group (ISG) that developed a position paper of its own and is hosting a parallel forum in Accra prior to the HLF. The existence of this group is one factor that has allowed CSOs to work within the AG-CS, without abandoning the option of speaking with an independent voice.


---

**Box 14 ⇒ Mali’s National Consultations on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness (Recommendation 2)**

Mali organized a national consultation process from June to September 2007 as part of the international consultations sponsored by the AG-CS. Facilitated by Canada and France, and organized by a National Consultation Steering Committee comprised of the main CSO umbrella organizations, the process brought together 650 people in regional, district and national consultations, representing 292 separate CSO, government, and donor representatives.

The consultation process provided an opportunity for CSOs and donors to better coordinate their efforts and to raise government’s awareness of the vibrancy and diversity of Mali’s civil society. The Steering Committee intends to transform itself into a national umbrella organization for all CSOs in Mali in order to improve representation of civil society in the country.

For donors, the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Paris Declaration involved, among other things, the reorganization of its thematic groups. This included the creation of a 14-member Thematic Group on Civil Society, in February 2008. This group’s mandate is to coordinate and facilitate dialogue between government, donors and civil society and to coordinate and harmonize dialogue with and support for CSOs among the donors.

The consultations also created the momentum for greater tripartite dialogue among all partners. Although no new permanent mechanism was established for government-CSO dialogue beyond the annual consultations, there is an increased representation of CSOs, and more comprehensive inclusion of their concerns, in regular fora such as donor roundtables and PRSP reviews. A draft code of ethics for dialogue has been developed which sets out a permanent mechanism that includes annual meetings on global challenges, similar to the national consultations, for all CSOs and donors, and two to three meetings per
year on specific issues identified by the thematic groups. In addition, a tripartite commission has been struck to design and fund a capacity development program for CSOs.

Extracted from: “National Consultations on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness in Mali.” Case Study (2008).

55. Additional examples that illustrate space for CSO voice in international or regional-level forums are provided below.

**Box 15 - UNDP’s CSO Advisory Committee to the Administrator (Recommendation 2)**

UNDP’s CSO Advisory Committee to the Administrator was established in 2000. Its overarching purpose is to advise and guide the Administrator and senior management on the agency’s directions. It plays a role in monitoring policy implementation and advocacy efforts, as well as piloting CSO-UNDP initiatives. The committee provides a principal forum “for frank dialogue between civil society leaders and the Administrator and senior management on key development issues” (UNDP 2006, pg. 31). In addition to providing advice, committee members also participate in UNDP-led missions on substantive issues, such as one to Bangladesh on indigenous peoples, and co-sponsor events such as roundtables at the World Social Forums in 2002 and 2003.

*Based on: UNDP (2006).*

**Box 16 - The Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the African Union (Recommendation 2)**

Established under Articles 5 and 22 of the African Union’s Constitutive Act, the Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the African Union (ECOSOCC) – was launched in 2005 as a vehicle for building a strong partnership between governments and all segments of African civil society. Its Statute defines it as an advisory organ of the African Union composed of different social and professional groups of the Member States [Assembly/AU/Dec.42 (III)]. Its composition is intended to include African social groups, professional groups, NGOs, and cultural organizations. ECOSOCC elects one hundred and fifty CSOs from national, regional and Diaspora bodies to its General Assembly.

Observers from African civil society laud the council as “a historical opportunity for the formulation of a new social contract between African Governments and their people…a positive move and…a way of involving ordinary citizens of Africa in decision and policy-making processes of issues that concern their daily lives” (Mutasa, no date).

*Based on: African Union (no date), Mutasa (no date).*

**Box 17 - The GAVI Alliance and Civil Society (Recommendation 2)**

The GAVI Alliance is a global partnership of public and private sector organizations to improve health in the poorest countries by extending the reach and quality of immunization coverage and strengthening health services, while providing long-term, predictable support.

CSOs have had a seat on GAVI’s Board since its inception, and they are also represented in a number of GAVI task teams and advisory bodies. CSOs are increasingly consulted as part of the policy dialogue and when deciding on new investments. To strengthen the voice of civil society in the Alliance and to have a more representative input, the Alliance is currently in the process of building a civil society constituency. This work is guided by GAVI's civil society task team, which includes CSOs involved in both advocacy and service provision at global and national levels.

At country level, CSOs play key advocacy and service provision roles, and CSOS are often involved in the implementation of GAVI supported initiatives. To support CSOs in these roles, the GAVI Board has decided to invest US$ 30 million in CSO support. Funds are available to strengthen coordination and
representation of CSOs in each of the 72 countries currently eligible for GAVI support, and for civil society involvement in health system strengthening. More details are available at: http://www.gavi alliance.org/support/how/guidelines/index.php. The first disbursement of CSO support was made in early 2008, and GAVI aims to learn from experiences to further develop support for civil society.


56. The World Bank, subject to no small amount of civil society critique and protests over the years, has also given thought to how it can engage more effectively with CSOs. The Bank has organized forums for staff to learn about the roles, nature and perspective of CSOs and constructive ways to engage with them and a World Bank document proposes joint training with CSOs, staff exchanges and secondments as ways of “building mutual understanding and more constructive relations” (World Bank 2005, pg. 32). However, the experience of some CSOs suggests a shortage of serious commitment to engage, particularly with CSOs that challenge the Bank’s policy influence in developing countries.

57. Policy dialogue spaces that are conducive to effective CSO participation feature a few key characteristics. Guidance from the literature suggests that such spaces:

- are regular and systematic, to allow all those engaged in the dialogue to have adequate advance notice of upcoming dialogue to sufficiently prepare their analysis and positions;
- cover all stages of the policy process from issue identification to agenda setting, policy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- are designed in a transparent, inclusive, manner that is responsive to CSO methods and capabilities, so that all stakeholders are clear on the rationale for the dialogue process, including the process for selecting CSO participants;
- begin with the establishment of shared principles, including recognition of the value of each stakeholder group’s voice, mutual respect, inclusiveness, accessibility, clarity, transparency, responsibility, and accountability (VSI 2002);
- are accessible to and inclusive of a broad range of CSOs;
- have internal and external feedback mechanisms, to inform CSO participants and those inside the agencies responsible for policy-making whether and how CSOs’ inputs influenced policy development; and
- are adequately resourced for both policy-makers and CSOs, with incentives for outcomes reflecting a multi-stakeholder position.

58. Our emphasis so far has been on formal spaces for CSO engagement in policy dialogue. However, there are many other avenues through which CSOs articulate their voices to influence policy. CSOs are “policy entrepreneurs” whose voices derive not only from advocacy, but also from their work as service providers from which they often gain legitimacy to articulate their views (Najam 1999). An example of CSOs’ voice being heard outside of formal structured spaces for dialogue is provided from Indonesia.
Box 18 - Farmers’ Lobby for Smallholder Debt Relief in Indonesia (Recommendation 2)

*Marhendi – Serikat Tani Bengkulu* was an Asian Development Bank (ADB)-funded rubber cultivation initiative involving small landholders in Indonesia. In the project, the government committed itself to providing high quality crops to the farmers for planting and care, while the farmers were required to sign a debt contract with their land certificates as collateral. Farmers were also provided with fertilizer, guidance and drainage over the seven years of the project between 2000 and 2007. The initiative was financed through a loan agreement between the government and the ADB.

Issues arose during the project’s implementation that put the farmers’ livelihoods at risk. Instead of being provided with high quality crops, the farmers received local rubber plants with false certification labels. A myriad of other issues of mismanagement arose, and two of the project heads were jailed in 2002.

In that same year, the farmer’s union filed a complaint with the Department of Agriculture. A strategic alliance was forged including farmers, the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Bengkulu, and the governor of the province, to elaborate recommendations backed by research and analysis. In addition to attempts at dialogue with the government, the farmers and CSOs frequently resorted to demonstrations to advance the cause. In 2006, farmers went to the capital to push the Department of Agriculture and the Minister for Finance to respond to their requests. The farmers were eventually successful in lobbying for the government to respond to their three recommendations for return of their land certificates, payback of Rp 15 million per family, and debt cancellation.


**RECOMMENDATION 3A – F: MORE WORK SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN BY ALL STAKEHOLDERS TO DEFINE THE CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR THE VOICE OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO BE EFFECTIVE AND TO MAXIMIZE THE VALUE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLICY DIALOGUE.**

59. A considerable body of case study literature has been produced on the conditions of successful CSO engagement in policy dialogue. Key success factors that emerge from these studies affirm that CSO effectiveness in policy dialogue is a combination of CSOs’ own attitudes and practices as well as the attitudes and practices of those with whom CSOs seek to engage, along with other factors having to do with the political context, cultural influences, and the socio-economic environment (Young 2006).

60. Two examples of CSO attempts to influence policy at the international level are described here: the Jubilee 2000 campaign and the World Commission on Dams (WCD).

Box 19 - The Global Jubilee 2000 Campaign (Recommendation 3a-f)

Jubilee 2000 was a global campaign launched in the UK in the early 1990s. A decentralized country-based coalition of development NGOs, faith-based organizations and labour groups, the Jubilee 2000 campaign was extraordinarily successful in its call for debt cancellation to make more resources available for poverty reduction in debt-burdened countries. As a case in point, the Jubilee 2000 campaign in Uganda, not only saw results in terms of debt cancellation for that country; it also carved out a role for CSOs in the dialogue on budget priorities and monitoring of government spending of the newly freed-up financial resources.

Key success factors identified by CSO activists engaged in the campaign include:

- expertise and sophistication of policy analysis and proposals;
- use of the Internet to facilitate extensive, inexpensive and timely communications;
- popularization of a complex issue, and use of moral claims;
The campaign is noted for its broad base and deep reach internationally, including CSOs in developing countries. Still, one of Jubilee 2000’s key challenges has been to address the imbalance between Northern and Southern CSO members in terms of access to resources, information and decision-makers.


Box 20 - The World Commission on Dams (Recommendation 3a-f)

The creation of the World Commission on Dams was arguably the most innovative success story to emerge from campaigns to reform the World Bank, the centrepiece of which was the efforts of a transnational alliance of civil society actors to transform big dam building practices. As part of the broader multilateral aid reform campaigns of the 1980s and 1990s, these groups compelled the Bank (which was the main international aid agency promoting big dam construction as a development strategy from the 1950s through the 1980s) to quite dramatically alter its lending for these projects and to adopt new policies and mechanisms on resettlement, indigenous peoples, environmental management, information disclosure, monitoring and grievance appeals.

The World Bank did not conduct a systematic self-assessment of its own support for big dam building until the mid-1990s, and then again only as a result of the pressure from transnationally allied civil society groups. The coordinated and sophisticated criticism of that self-assessment from CSOs led, in 1998, to the creation of an independent multi-stakeholder body, the World Commission on Dams.

Challenges were ultimately faced in terms of the World Bank taking up the consensus-based recommendations of the WCD (Ebrahim and Herz 2007). However, the establishment of the WCD was the first time that civil society groups directly engaged the issue of big dam building in the context of sustainable water resources development alongside governments, international organizations, and other stakeholders.


61. Some of the factors emerging from the literature on the condition of effectiveness of CSOs’ voice in policy dialogue include the following:

- clarity on where opportunities for negotiation exist and a willingness to be flexible as the goalposts change and understanding evolves;
- a diversity of approaches, recognizing that there is no single best strategy or tactic. Much depends on context and on the diverse views and experiences of different CSOs engaged in the process. A combination of “inside the tent” and “outside the tent” tactics helps to cover the range of less to more transformative positions (Khagram 2008);
- strategic alliances that include vertical links between local, national, regional and international levels, and horizontal links between CSOs and other actors;
- sound evidence and analysis that includes the voices of those the policy will impact;
- alternative proposals that are positive and creative; and
- CSO legitimacy to speak for the people they claim to serve or represent (adapted from Gaventa 2001, Khagram 2008).

62. Two of the most oft-cited challenges for CSOs in their efforts to effectively influence policy are their capacity to do so, and perceptions of their representative legitimacy.
**Enriching and Implementing the Paris Principles**

63. The AG-CS over-arching recommendations on the subject of enriching and implementing the Paris principles are that all stakeholders should:

**Recommendation 4A: Recognize the character of the Paris Declaration as a historic agreement between donors and developing countries at a particular point in time, to address a particular set of issues and mutual obligations;**

**Recommendation 4B: Deepen understanding and application of the Paris Declaration principles in ways that emphasize local and democratic ownership, social diversity, gender equality, and accountability for achieving results of benefit to poor and marginalized populations as essential conditions of effectiveness.**

64. This approach is of course, the one that the AG-CS itself has adopted. However, it is also the approach adopted by other groups as part of the preparatory discussions for Accra. Such an approach has informed reflections on the pertinence of the Paris Declaration principles for vertical or global funds (World Bank, 2006), discussions in Dublin and London on crosscutting issues, and the work of the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development among others.

**Local and Democratic Ownership**

**Recommendation 5: A return to basics regarding the ownership principle, including a change of vocabulary away from the commonly used expression “country ownership”, which the AG-CS considers misleading. More accurate would be an expression such as “local and democratic ownership” which emphasizes ownership not just by central government agencies, but also by parliaments, local governments, citizens, communities and CSOs.**

**Recommendation 6A: Significantly broadening the range of stakeholders engaged in the design, implementation and assessment of development strategies, programs and initiatives, including parliaments, local governments, citizens, communities and CSOs.**

65. The examples available to us focus primarily on recommendation 6a. We seek to answer the following question:

**How does the respect and promotion of “local and democratic ownership” manifest itself in different cases involving CSOs?**

66. We focus first on civil society engagement in what have been government-led national development plans, as embodied in PRSPs (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers) and accompanying sector strategies.

67. According to a seven-country study of African PRSPs, processes of public engagement in PRSP development have, on the whole, opened democratic space for domestic policy dialogue (Booth 2003). Yet various civil society critiques of PRSP processes suggest that more progress is needed in this regard (e.g. Christian Aid 2001, Whaites 2002). The World Bank has acknowledged that “significant constraints to meaningful participation remain in many countries” (World Bank 2005, pg. 26).

68. A challenge in broadening national development agendas is how to make this policy development process inclusive of a broad range of CSOs, from national and sub-national levels,
as well as representatives from traditionally marginalized sectors such as women’s groups, and social movements. Networks and coalitions can play a role in harnessing and synthesizing the inputs of many stakeholders, but further exploration is required to identify effective methods to tap into the voice of a broad range of civil society actors.

69. The example of FEMNET below shows how a CSO coalition representing women’s rights organizations was able to engage in the PRSP process in Kenya, bringing to bear some influence and as such, increasing their constituency’s ownership of the PRSP. Additional examples of CSO and citizen engagement, ownership and influence are provided at the sector level in education in Burkina Faso, in Senegal’s *Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale du Sénégal*, in the UNDP-led ART Initiative, and in World Vision’s Fight TB program in Indonesia.

**Box 21 ⇒ Women’s Organizations, Gender Equality and Kenya’s Poverty Reduction Strategy (Recommendation 6a)**

In response to lobbying from women’s organizations as part of the PRSP process in Kenya, the government established the Gender Thematic Group (GTG) with participation from FEMNET and other actors. The aim of the GTG was to ensure that gender concerns were clearly and adequately addressed in the PRSP and Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) through women's effective participation.

The group managed to influence the PRSP both in process and content. For the first time in Kenya, gender issues were identified as crosscutting, and concerted efforts were made to engage women and women’s organizations in the dialogue. The GTG mobilized women’s participation in Sector Working Groups, at the district-level and at the community level. Participatory poverty assessments (PPAs) were carried out in 10 districts, with guidelines to strive for equal participation of women and men. The PPA reports captured the voices of poor women and their experiences of poverty, particularly lack of access to and control of land, resources and benefits accruing from land, and included a section on gender.

Overall, the role played by CSOs in the consultative process, including at grassroots level, added value and legitimacy to the exercise, and contributed significantly to its eventual success and broader ownership of the PRS, although women’s organizations have drawn attention to the need for greater effort in future to involve women and their organizations from the initial stages of such a process rather than as an add-on. They also draw attention to the need for capacity development both of women’s organizations in monitoring and evaluation of the budget, and of government officials in integrating gender. At the policy level, they call for adoption and implementation of a national gender and development policy to provide the legal framework for the integration of gender perspectives in all government policy and planning.

*Extracted from: “Integrating Gender in the PRS Process in Kenya.” Case Study (2008).*

**Box 22 - CSO Coalition for Basic Education in Burkina Faso (Recommendation 6a)**

In Burkina Faso, CSOs were initially marginalized in policy discussions that led to the formulation of the education sector plan in 2002. Teachers’ unions in particular were excluded, because of their opposition to aspects of the plan. Burkina Faso has since developed a national education CSO coalition, the *Cadre de Concertation en Education de Base*, which is relatively cohesive and effective. The coalition is especially active at the regional level, which is where much education decision-making now resides. Its members work cooperatively to speak for civil society on issues such as gender, curricular reform, and regional planning. CSO consultation at the national and regional levels in Burkina Faso is now routine, with the coalition playing a role in linking regional and national levels of decision-making.

In contrast to many other civil society coalitions, the coalition has not made universal free access to primary education a central part of its mobilization efforts. Some critics thus argue that CSO participation
is a form of co-optation because it has essentially strengthened the legitimacy of educational policies that have been determined by central government and a cohort of international donor agencies. Still, there is evidence that through the formal and informal mechanisms that have been put in place since the education strategy was launched in 2002, the role of civil society in educational governance is gradually increasing. A unique feature of the Burkina sector program has been the formalization of space for CSO initiative through the establishment of a CSO-government governed pooled fund for non-formal education projects.

The coalition faces some challenges, such as limited capacity for monitoring national educational quality and equity issues, and a limited ability to engage a wider public on education issues, but they, along with other CSOs, are able to articulate demands that may have a long-run influence on education policy.

Extracted from: Education SWAps in Africa: Lessons for CSOs Case Study (2008).

Box 23 ⇒ Public Consultations on Senegal’s 2004 Agro-sylvo-pastoral Act (Recommendation 6a)

The Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale du Sénégal (LOASP) was designed on the basis of a broad-based consultative process. In March 2003, the government made public a first version of the legislation, which met considerable opposition. In response, the government put in place a consultative process designed to elaborate a policy engaging rural and peasant organizations, NGOs, elected officials and donors. To help inform this process, the Conseil National de Concertation et Coopération des Ruraux (CNCR), a CSO of Senegalese agriculturalists, organized consultations with its members involving 3,000 agricultural producers in all regions of the country over a four-month period. Their goal was to develop a counter-proposal to the draft legislation.

While the legislation has yet to be implemented, there is evidence that through their counter-proposal and ongoing participation in the consultation process, the CNCR and others engaged in the process were able to influence the revised legislation. Among the changes secured in the legislation were the following:

- The land tenure component of the legislation was removed, to become part of a separate consultation.
- Agricultural reform is more explicitly focused on food security.
- All rural economic activities are addressed in the legislation, not simply agriculture.
- Small-scale household economic activities, such as animal husbandry, are fully addressed.

The participatory manner in which LOASP was developed represents a first in West Africa. Other countries, Mali and Burkina Faso in particular, have followed suit. Of note in the CNCR’s approach was the extensive, nation-wide nature of their consultation process. They began with village level meetings at which representatives were appointed to participate in departmental meetings, where representatives were in turn selected to attend regional meetings and then proceeded up to the national committee.

The large-scale mobilization and consultation in rural areas has reinforced the power of this sector of the population, and the legitimacy of the CNCR as “porte-parole des paysans”. The government has benefited from a participatory process inclusive of more than simply the representatives of CSOs, networks, and donors.

Box 24 - Defining a Shared Vision for Local Development (Recommendation 6a)

The ART Initiative is a multilateral cooperation initiative that brings together programs and activities of several United Nations Agencies and other donors in selected countries (Albania, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lebanon, Morocco, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Sri Lanka, and Uruguay, with preparations under way for implementation in Bolivia, Mozambique, Senegal and Serbia). The country programs associated with ART adhere to a vision of ownership which goes beyond that of national governments to include a wide democratic and public process that includes national and local governments, and CSOs, which ART refers to as “social actors.”

A key element of the initiative is the creation of an operational mechanism for planning in which local institutions and all social actors present in a given territory (a municipality, district or province) come together to define a shared vision of their territory and set the priorities that the program will address locally. As part of this process, the ART program helps put in place a participatory methodology to analyze needs, potential resources, problems and priorities involving even the most marginalized people. Several tools are used for this, including community needs mapping and resource mapping (www.yorku.ca/hdnet). This analysis leads to the identification of priorities for international cooperation as a complement to other public policy processes.

As priorities are articulated, they are reflected in a “territorial marketing document.” This document then serves as a basis for UNDP and its partners to facilitate contacts with potential development partners, which include other municipalities or regional government and elected bodies, or CSOs. In this way, the developing country partner has the opportunity to learn about different ways of addressing a specific challenge they are facing, and are able to establish a wide range of partners to resolve these challenges.

Extracted from: “The ART Initiative (UNDP and other participating UN agencies).” Case Study (2008).

Box 25 - World Vision’s Fight TB Program in Indonesia (Recommendation 6a)

Tuberculosis control was a component of the government’s health strategy in Indonesia, but free TB services available through the local government health centres were not being used due to a lack of public trust in them. World Vision began to sensitize communities and found them receptive to learning about TB and treatment as part of it Fight TB program. The organization thus set up a system of “treatment partners,” with two volunteers from TB-affected communities who were paired, through the local Ministry of Health, with newly detected TB patients to ensure they followed treatment correctly.

Over time, with sensitization and increasingly successful incidence of treatment, community members’ confidence in the government’s TB services grew, and in some ways, so did their ownership of it. Fewer patients with full-blown TB were being seen in hospitals. Instead, they were receiving treatment from community health clinics.

World Vision’s observation from the Fight TB program is that “ownership must be simultaneously a top down and bottom up process”.

RECOMMENDATION 6B: RECOGNIZING THAT OWNERSHIP OF SPECIFIC INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS MAY INVOLVE LEADERSHIP BY DIFFERENT ACTORS, INCLUDING NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS, DECENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT BODIES, OR CSOS.

70. This recommendation suggests that the ownership principle can be applicable to civil society’s own initiatives. As an issue, ownership is fundamentally a good donorship issue, and one that CSOs have been leading on for many years. We can see this principle being applied for example in the Butoke and ForoSalud/CARE Peru cases cited earlier, in the Uniterra and MASAI-EILER cases that we will cover later in the paper, and indeed and in all of the cases reviewed involving Northern CSOs in a donor capacity as part of a larger partnership effort, including the ORAP and BRAC cases. We thus refer readers to any of those cases, without spending too much time on them here, except to note that this principle is of clear relevance to CSOs and is being applied by CSOs, but obviously not in the narrow sense of the Paris Declaration.

RECOMMENDATION 6C: REINFORCING DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS’ CAPACITY TO EXERCISE OWNERSHIP THROUGH CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES AND SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES.

RECOMMENDATION 6D: A NEW APPROACH TO CONDITIONALITY IN WHICH DONORS EMPHASIZE THEIR ROLE IN FACILITATING POLICY OPTIONS THAT ARE DEMOCRATICALLY DEVELOPED AND DISCUSSED, AND INVEST IN STRENGTHENING THE CAPACITY OF GOVERNMENTS, PARLIAMENTS AND CSOS TO DEVELOP LOCALLY-OWNED POLICY SOLUTIONS.

71. These two recommendations are closely related, since both involve recommendations for investment in capacity development. Several examples specific to capacity development of civil society to pursue local and democratic ownership are provided here, while other examples are found elsewhere in the paper, such as the ForoSalud/CARE Peru case previously seen, or of Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government featured in the section on accountability.

72. We have included several cases of capacity development for CSOs under the title of Capacity Development in the Good Donorship section later in this paper, including the Ghana Resource Centre initiative, PRIA’s capacity development work in India, and CHF’s capacity development work in Guyana, although these cases are no less relevant to recommendation 6c. However, there are important lessons about good donorship to be drawn from those cases, that we preferred to include in that section.

73. One area in need of further exploration is that of reinforcing government capacity to facilitate CSOs’ pursuit of local and democratic ownership. In much of the world, the relationship between government and civil society is dynamic, wavering between suspicion and collaboration, and often characterized by pragmatic acceptance rather than commitment to true inclusion. Reinforcing government capacity thus requires attention not only to systems and processes but also to understanding and attitudes with regard to CSOs’ roles and voice.
Box 26 - The Rights and Voices Initiative in Ghana (Recommendation 6c)

Ghana’s Rights and Voices Initiative (RAVI) is a five-year DFID-funded granting program that brings together grantees for mutual training and learning. The initiative is targeted at strengthening the voices of people living in poverty and marginalization to engage with government on human rights issues. It supports CSOs that work with these populations to advocate and dialogue with government with confidence.

RAVI does this by providing financial resources and capacity building support to CSOs. Both large and small CSOs are eligible for support, but small community-based organizations are reached and supported through larger intermediary organizations. It works with its grant partners on a wide range of rights-based capacity building needs in financial accountability and planning, rights-based approaches, monitoring and evaluation, people-centred advocacy, and citizen-government engagement.


Box 27 - Access to Information for Strengthening Civil Society’s Capacity to Influence Policy with Pact Tanzania (Recommendation 6c)

Pact is a US NGO focused on strengthening the capacity of local organizations and leaders to address critical social and economic needs of vulnerable groups. One component of their work in Tanzania is on access to information as a way to increase CSOs’ organizational effectiveness. Through this initiative, Pact produces a number of plain-language user-friendly resources, such as the Legislative Roadmap: A Guide for Civil Society Organizations in Tanzania. The guide, produced in collaboration with their partner, the Lawyers’ Environmental Action Team, addresses many aspects of the policy and legislative framework in the country, such as the distinction between civil and criminal law, rights and responsibilities enshrined in the constitution, and the policy-making process. Another example is their Media Guide: A Handbook for Tanzanian Civil Society, developed in collaboration with the Tanzania Media Women’s Association, which aims to enable CSOs to understand the media and its channels in order to better promote the visibility of their work and bring out their public voice.

Extracted from: Pact (no date a), Pact Tanzania (no date). For more information visit: http://www.pactworld.org/cs/institutional_strengthening

Box 28 - Macroeconomic Policy Capacity Building in Africa (Recommendation 6d)

The AG-CS recommendation 6d advocating a new approach to conditionality is not, in fact, a very radical one in principle, since donors have worked for years to further the capacity of developing countries to develop their own policy options through research and support for independent or government affiliated think tanks, in Africa most notably, through the African Economic Research Consortium, the African Capacity Development Foundation, and support for independent research centers through the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa. The think tanks mentioned earlier in this paper and many others have all considerable support from donors.

These various efforts have created a solid base upon which it is possible to build. KY Amoako (2008) argues in the African context that “We are at a point where good governance and the collaboration between governments and civil society organizations can accelerate growth and reduce poverty. This transformation to sustainable development will not be possible if the work of governments and civil society organizations is not mutually supportive… For too long, Africa has relied on external advice, through international technical assistance or donor programs. More and more we need to apply home-grown solutions. Unlike 30, 20 or even 10 years ago, African professionals have broad experience and solid reputations as policymakers at the national level, as senior staff in international organizations and as
first-class academics. It is time to seriously harness these existing domestic, regional, and continental capacities. It is time to mobilize both our domestic talent and the African Diaspora in developing civil societies that can help our governments push our transformation to another level. One cannot imagine these dramatic changes without think tanks and civil society organizations.”

Based on: Amoako (2008) and other sources.

ALIGNMENT

RECOMMENDATION 7: THAT ALIGNMENT BE UNDERSTOOD BROADLY TO MEAN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PRIORITIES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRY COUNTERPARTS AND EMPHASIS ON THE USE AND STRENGTHENING OF COUNTRY SYSTEMS BROADLY UNDERSTOOD. EFFORTS TO DEVELOP AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS SHOULD EXTEND BEYOND CENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT MECHANISMS TO OTHER PARTS OF GOVERNMENT, DECENTRALIZED AUTHORITIES, AND CSOs.

74. This recommendation follows from those on the subject of local and democratic ownership. It suggests that governments and donors need to align their efforts with a broader base of counterpart priorities, including those of CSOs and their constituents, and that “country systems” should be interpreted to include the management systems of CSO counterparts in developing countries.

75. In this section we seek to answer the question:

How does the respect and promotion of alignment broadly understood manifest itself in different cases involving CSOs?

76. The rationale for alignment with CSO priorities is evident in some of the cases already reviewed. Consider for example the gender equality message that FEMNET brought to the PRSP dialogue in Kenya. This message was not among the government’s initial priorities, but was aligned with the priorities of FEMNET’s membership. It added value to the PRS development process and to the substance of the final document, increasing its likelihood of targeting development results to women and children. In another example, the Jubilee 2000 campaign’s debt cancellation message was not likely to have been among donor country priorities. Though it may well have been a topic of priority interest to aid recipient countries, they may not have felt in a position to pursue the message in such a forthright manner as their CSO allies. Similarly, grassroots organizations such as Butoke successfully address locally-identified needs, and do so from a strategic perspective, some aspects of which may or may not align with the government’s PRS priorities. In each of these cases, the key feature of alignment is with priorities identified by CSOs distinct from, though not necessarily in contradiction with those of the national government.

77. Examples abound also of alignment to developing country systems. We cite two cases here from Mozambique, one involving alignment, the other illustrating the consequences of inadequate alignment.

Box 29 ⇒ CSOs and Education in Mozambique: Issues of Alignment and Complementarity (Recommendation 7)

The case of CSOs in the Mozambique education sector-wide approach (SWAp) that is included in the Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book illustrates two aspects of alignment – CSO alignment with government systems and priorities, and a Northern CSO’s alignment in partnership with the priorities and systems of a Southern partner.
This case involves a partnership between Progresso in Mozambique, and CODE, a Canadian NGO specialized in the promotion of quality primary education. Progresso and CODE have been working to increase the quality of education in the two Northern provinces of Mozambique for over 15 years. The activities included in their joint program strategy, Promotion of a Literate Environment in Mozambique (PLEM), includes the provision of reading and learning materials in Portuguese and local languages, skills development for primary teachers and adult literacy agents, and training of education officers on planning, in-service training and monitoring of teaching/learning. Progresso and CODE work in close cooperation with the Mozambican Ministry of Education and Culture at the national and provincial levels, and PLEM is aligned with the Government of Mozambique’s first and second Education Sector Strategic Plans. However, because the government’s capacity and structure does not allow the flexibility required to experiment with new education approaches, PLEM is funded through a bilateral agreement between CODE and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Progresso and CODE work with communities and government to design and implement interventions that build on the identified needs and the institutional priorities and capacities of the government. They do so in a way that is adapted to local needs and realities, drawing from their experience, knowledge base and skills in the education sector and in the region.

The division of labour between Progresso and CODE is adapted to the comparative advantages of each partner. CODE’s responsibility for the management of the contract with CIDA allows Progresso to focus on reporting and planning with its Mozambican partners, while Progresso is responsible for most activities in the field. CODE’s long-term commitment to education and support of Progresso’s education initiative, and its ability to secure funds through CIDA’s different funding mechanisms, has allowed it to develop solid experience and to build up long-term relationships in Mozambique.


Box 30 - The Cost of Misalignment in the Fight against HIV/AIDS in Mozambique (Recommendation 7)

Salama, a local public health NGO in Mozambique addressing HIV and AIDS, has developed a national reputation for innovative awareness-raising programs using theatre, skits, debates and films pertaining to HIV and AIDS in neighbourhoods and schools, radio programs designed by teenagers for youth, and talks at schools or during halftime at soccer games. SALAMA also runs a homecare program that trains local people as volunteer caregivers to build the capacity of families to look after chronically ill family members.

Unfortunately, SALAMA and other similar NGOs with extensive local knowledge were not included in a meaningful way in the country’s national health programming. The approach taken has marginalized Mozambican public health NGOs with specialized local knowledge and experience. A significant result has been failure to read the local context and culture and thus not correctly diagnosing a key driver behind HIV transmission, that of long-term concurrency (i.e. maintaining a small number of simultaneous, long-term partners). This has resulted in less effective programs and campaigns, that provide confusing messages, and complicate the work of local NGOs whose messaging is based on an understanding of the moral rules of the game in Mozambique rather than associating the transmission of HIV with ‘reckless’ behaviour (beer drinking, prostitution).

This case argues that donors and governments would get greater traction in the AIDS struggle by aligning their efforts with more locally-designed and controlled programs run by indigenous NGOs such as SALAMA.

COORDINATION AND HARMONIZATION

RECOMMENDATION 8: A BALANCED APPROACH TO COORDINATION AND HARMONIZATION THAT EMPHASIZES THE VALUE OF MORE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING, WHILE ALSO ACKNOWLEDGING THE VALUE OF DIVERSITY AND INNOVATION.

78. This over-arching recommendation is multi-faceted with five specific sub-recommendations as follows:

RECOMMENDATION 9A: RECOGNITION BY ALL ACTORS OF THE COMPLEMENTARY ROLES PLAYED BY GOVERNMENTS AND CSOs AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FOR ENHANCED COORDINATION AND HARMONIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AND CSO EFFORTS;

RECOMMENDATION 9B: GREATER EFFORTS BY GOVERNMENTS ANDDONORS TO SUPPORT THE PARTICIPATION OF CSOS IN GOVERNMENT-LED SECTOR PROGRAMS (INDEPENDENTLY OR UNDER CONTRACT), AND GREATER EFFORTS BY CSOS THEMSELVES TO ENGAGE IN THESE PROGRAMS;

RECOMMENDATION 9C: GREATER EFFORTS BY CSOS TO COORDINATE AND HARMONIZE THEIR ACTIVITIES WITH THOSE OF OTHER CSOs;

RECOMMENDATION 9D: RECOGNITION OF CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING AS AN OBJECTIVE THAT IS ITSELF WORTH PURSUING IN A MORE COMPREHENSIVE WAY BY ALL DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDERS;

RECOMMENDATION 9E: RECOGNITION THAT RESPONSIVE FUNDING FORMULAS CONTINUE TO HAVE AN IMPORTANT ROLE TO PLAY FOR TAPPING INTO THE ENERGY AND INNOVATIVE IDEAS OF CITIZENS AND CSOS AS AGENTS OF CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT.

79. The emphasis of this section is primarily on recommendations 9a and 9b. Recommendations 9c to 9e overlap with recommendations 13 and 14 in the CSO effectiveness section, and will be dealt with in that section. In this section we focus on the following questions:

What are some examples of governments and CSOs engaging together in program-based initiatives? Are there cases that illustrate the combination of more programmatic approaches with approaches that encourage diversity, innovation, and bottom-up initiative?

80. Central to these questions is the potential complementarity of government and CSO programs in particular sectors. We saw earlier the case of the Progresso/CODE initiative in Mozambique’s education sector, where a complementary approach was clearly evident and successful. We also saw the case of insufficient complementarity in different approaches to HIV/AIDS in the same country. In the next box, below, we will look at yet another case in Mozambique – the work of the Aga Khan Foundation Canada (AKFC) in agriculture and rural development and how it complements the government’s own efforts.

81. Both the Progresso/CODE and AKFC initiatives are CIDA funded, reflecting an explicit CIDA strategy to invest in “a balanced combination of contributions to pooled funds with other donors, and support to decentralized projects that target the most vulnerable” (CIDA 2004 in AKFC 2007: 2). This approach allows a donor like CIDA to support CSO-led initiatives that are outside of, but complementary, to government-led program-based approaches (PBAs), creating synergies between different aid delivery channels and actors. Both the Progresso/CODE and AKFC examples also demonstrate the value of being responsive to CSOs’ program ideas in keeping with recommendation 9e.
82. We have seen additional examples of CSO engagement in government-led PBAs in the case of the CSO coalition for basic education in Burkina Faso, and that of World Vision’s Fight TB program in Indonesia. While not all of civil society’s programming can or should be aligned with government’s PBA plans, when CSOs are working in a sector covered by government, it is important that they be aware of those plans, and share information and coordinate with government where relevant and possible.

Box 31 ⇒ Aga Khan Foundation’s Coastal Rural Support Program in Mozambique (Recommendations 9a & b)

In the late 90s, the Aga Khan Foundation Canada (AKFC), in collaboration with the government of Mozambique, launched a rural development program in the northern region of Mozambique, called the Coastal Rural Support Program (CRSP). Funding for this program was first provided by CIDA’s Canadian Partnership Branch in response to a proposal from AKFC. Based on strong results and support from Mozambique officials, this initiative became the basis for a six-year AKFC program funded by CIDA’s Mozambique program and other donors.

CRSP takes a long-term, multi-sectoral approach to address the many dimensions and causes of acute rural poverty at the household and community levels in the region. The program contributes to the government’s poverty reduction strategy and to relevant SWAps by building government capacity at provincial and district levels, supporting government’s efforts to enhance service delivery, developing the capacity of grass roots civil society structures and linking them to local government, and supporting program and policy reforms.

The program is aligned with country priorities and furthermore allows government to extend the reach and depth of its programs in ways that are aligned with the needs and realities of local communities. The program has fostered an array of innovative models, from community-managed early childhood development, to block farming aimed at improving farming practices and preventing animal attacks. The AKFC distils lessons from CRSP and disseminates them to key stakeholders, to inform policy and positively influence practices of government, other civil society actors, and donors.

In these ways, the program harnesses the best of government and civil society initiative to enhance the effectiveness and deepen the impact of aid.


83. The Microfinance Investment Support Facility in Afghanistan (MISFA) offers another example, distinguished in this case by the fact that CSOs are working under contract to implement a PBA on behalf of government. MISFA was established under the Government of Afghanistan’s Ministry for Rural Rehabilitation and Development as a vehicle through which the government and donors channel technical assistance and funding to build up microfinance at the lower end of the financial sector (MISFA Case Study 2008).

Box 32 - Pooled Funding for Microfinance in Afghanistan (Recommendations 9a & b)

The Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan is a multi-stakeholder national program launched by the Government of Afghanistan in June 2003. MISFA is now one of the world’s largest microfinance programs, and is incorporated as a government-owned company. It is a wholesale facility enabling donors to pool their resources to build the micro-finance sector of Afghanistan by involving international, regional and local civil society and private sector organizations acting as microfinance institutions.
MISFA now has over 400,000 active clients, 70% of whom are women, across 23 of the 34 provinces in Afghanistan. Research results indicate that the microfinance sector in Afghanistan has led to increased business activity, as well as improved socio-economic status for women in particular. The program’s success can be attributed to many factors. These include:

- strong leadership by the government in the beginning, evolving to arms’ length involvement;
- high quality staff;
- a flexible, pooled donor funding mechanism that offers capacity building support and funding for microfinance institutions;
- close alignment with local and national priorities; and
- growing local Afghan involvement.

The role of local civil society and private sector organizations as delivery agents, and agents of change, is noteworthy, in that they are successfully assisting the poor to access financial services to better their lives.


MANAGING FOR RESULTS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

84. The AG-CS makes seven specific recommendations on results management and accountability that can be divided into three groups: results management models (recommendations 10a and b); systems of accountability, emphasizing accountability to beneficiaries (recommendations 10c to e); and standards of openness, transparency and access to information regarding aid flows (recommendations 11a and b). We will divide those into two groups for purposes of presentation here, dealing separately with recommendations 10a and 10b.

RECOMMENDATION 10A: ADOPTION OF RESULTS-BASED APPROACHES AND RESULTS-MONITORING MECHANISMS INTENDED AS MANAGEMENT TOOLS TO PROMOTE ITERATIVE LEARNING AND ADAPTATION, WHILE EMPOWERING THE ULTIMATE BENEFICIARIES OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS;

RECOMMENDATION 10B: ADOPTION OF A MORE MEANINGFUL APPROACH TO RESULTS THAT INCLUDES GREATER ATTENTION TO INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE AND TO SEX-DISAGGREGATED DATA OF IMPORTANCE TO CSOS OPERATING AS AGENTS OF CHANGE.

85. Here we seek to answer the question:

What are the features of “alternative” approaches to results-based management, and how well do they work? What examples can be cited of efforts by each stakeholder group to promote greater accountability to beneficiaries?

86. CSOs have adopted a range of results-based approaches. Some have found ways to make conventional approaches based on the use of the logical framework methodology work for them. Others have turned to alternative or complementary approaches. We look here at three approaches considered well adapted to the needs of CSOs. The first is an approach called “outcome mapping” developed by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in collaboration with partners in West Africa, India and Latin America. The emphasis of outcome mapping is on behavioural change, in recognition of the fact that development is ultimately “done by and for people” (CCIC 2008b, pg. 5). An application of outcome mapping in Zimbabwe is featured in the box below. This is followed by a description of approaches to monitoring used by the World Conservation Union in Asia, and a text box on methods used by Keystone, which emphasizes impact planning and learning, and comparative constituency feedback.
Box 33 - Outcome Mapping in Zimbabwe (Recommendations 10a & b)

The Secondary Teacher Training Environmental Education Program in Zimbabwe began in 2003 with the aim of integrating environmental education into teacher training. As with most international development programs, the original proposal and planning, monitoring and evaluation strategies were based on the logical framework approach (LFA). However, as the program progressed, it became clear that the LFA posed certain shortcomings and challenges:

- Accountability was directed mainly towards the head office.
- Planning, monitoring and evaluation seemed divorced from the program on the ground as local partners did not contribute their perspectives or participate in decision-making and planning.
- The LFA did not allow for the identification and reflection of many types of results that the program was seeking to achieve.
- The framework did not address the sustainability of the program.
- It was not conducive to collective learning.

In responding to these challenges, the program decided to supplement the LFA approach with that of outcome mapping, a framework based on self-assessment and team building, to better accommodate the complexity and specific content of the program. Although it took considerable effort to implement, outcome mapping has transformed the program’s approach to planning, monitoring and evaluation into something more endogenous, relevant, and transformative. The approach has been found to facilitate opportunities for incorporating emerging lessons and responses, examining intended and unintended results, and actively refining the program’s implementation strategies in response to new challenges and opportunities. Rather than focusing on inputs or activities, outcome mapping has drawn attention to behavioural change, and, most significantly, has encouraged participants to look beyond achievement of results to how the results have been achieved.

The program has integrated the two approaches, LFA and outcome mapping, using them in different ways. LFA is used mainly for accountability requirements, and outcome mapping for monitoring and evaluation at the operational level.


Box 34 - The World Conservation Union’s Parallel Capacity Monitoring Systems (Recommendations 10a & b)

The World Conversation Union in Asia has two capacity monitoring systems. A monitoring and learning officer manages the official system, which reports to donors. It is seen as the cost of doing business with the international community but is considered to provide little of interest or value to the management of the organization or to its planning for the future.

The unofficial system is managed by the executive director, who follows it closely. It is mainly informal, personal and collective, with a focus on what is going right and what needs fixing. It also includes spaces for learning where power relationships are suspended – regular management and program reviews, retreats to examine and self-evaluate programs and financial achievements, and regional program coordinators’ meetings.

All of these subsystems feed into collective strategic thinking and into the real decision-making processes of the organization. The various mechanisms in the unofficial system help both to build the capabilities of managers to address issues and to encourage their ‘buy-in’ to decisions made. They create capacity through an upwardly rising spiral that benefits from interplay among activities.

Box 35 ⇒ Keystone's Approach to Impact Planning and Learning through Constituency Voice
(Recommendations 10a and 10b)

Keystone works with a wide range of funders, other CSOs, and social enterprises to design new ways of planning, measuring, learning, and communicating social change to foster accountability and learning. It emphasizes two major techniques:

- Impact Planning and Learning System Design, which includes mechanisms for developing a shared theory of change, identifying impact indicators, gathering evidence of success and learning from it, public reporting of lessons learned, and strategic reassessment; and

- Comparative Constituency Feedback, which involves anonymous surveys that capture the perceptions of an organization’s work by its constituents. This enables organizations to compare the quality of their relationships and their performance over time and against other similar organizations.

The approach is seen to broaden local and democratic ownership by creating a system where those most affected can meaningfully influence planning and measurement. Basing indicators of success on a shared theory of change promotes an approach to results that is sensitive to complex change processes, while Comparative Constituency Feedback emphasizes a rebalancing of accountability for results in favour of beneficiaries.

The approach enriches the information basis upon which social investment decisions are made with the addition of the voices of constituents. It is possible to imagine an international system where feedback loops are generated from the primary constituent level through to international NGOs and networks, and all the way up to those who hold the resources.

Extracted from: "Impact Planning and Learning through Constituency Voice." in the Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book (2008).

87. Another approach worth mentioning is the “most significant change method”, which emphasizes testimonials of change from people directly involved in development programs. It can be implemented without the need for advanced technical capabilities in data collection and analysis. By giving people a role in defining the changes that occur and their significance to them, this method “helps organizations to understand the effects emerging from their activities, and how and why they are occurring” (Morgan and Baser 2008, pg. 103)

88. We note, finally, the usefulness of systematic attention to data disaggregation as a tool for work on social exclusion. The example of data-disaggregation in Nepal is provided below.

Box 36 - Capturing Social Exclusion through Data Disaggregation in Nepal (Recommendation 10b)

In Nepal, a World Bank-DFID initiative on social exclusion identified six categories of data disaggregation that capture the key elements of differentiation in Nepal. DFID is now cooperating with line ministries in Nepal to apply the disaggregation framework to monitoring results in different sectors.

Features of good practice that have emerged from this exercise include:

- investment in research to identify appropriate, feasible, and relevant categories for disaggregation;
- long-term commitment on the part of funders and implementers; and
- capacity development from the high-level managers overseeing implementation to the ground-level staff gathering data.

89. A review of these cases and of the literature suggests the following guidelines on alternative or complementary approaches to results-based management (CCIC 2005, Lavergne 2002, Baser and Morgan 2008):

- The costs of data collection need to be balanced against the benefits. This requires sensitivity to local workloads and timeframes, and to the place of the initiative relative to people’s other tasks and priorities;
- Special attention is required to stories and indicators of qualitative results associated with institutional and social change. This requires a long-term perspective.
- Participatory, inclusive approaches have intrinsic value for promoting ownership and accountability, and generate information on results that are valued by participants.
- The LFA is only a tool of results based management and needs to be complemented with other tools. Results based management is an approach the sound application of which should allow for uncertainty, iterative learning, and non-linear forms of causality that are not easily captured by the LFA.

90. The AG-CS also recommends:

- **RECOMMENDATION 10C: AN APPROACH TO ACCOUNTABILITY THAT EMPHASIZES A REBALANCING OF ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS IN FAVOUR OF BENEFICIARIES;**
- **RECOMMENDATION 10D: REINFORCEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS IN COUNTRY FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT ACTORS (DONORS, GOVERNMENTS, CSOS);**
- **RECOMMENDATION 10E: A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION THAT INCLUDES THE EFFECTIVE AND TIMELY ENGAGEMENT OF CSOS AND BENEFICIARY POPULATIONS, INCLUDING REPRESENTATION FROM WOMEN’S RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER SOCIALLY MARGINALIZED GROUPS;**
- **RECOMMENDATION 11A: ALL STAKEHOLDERS SHOULD ADOPT THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE STANDARDS OF OPENNESS, TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION: DONORS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SHOULD COMMIT TO DELIVERING TIMELY AND MEANINGFUL INFORMATION TO OTHER STAKEHOLDERS ON THEIR AID FLOWS AND POLICIES, INCLUDING ODA FLOWS TO CSOS;**
- **RECOMMENDATION 11B: DEVELOPING COUNTRY GOVERNMENTS SHOULD WORK WITH ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES AND CSOS ON HOW TO ACHIEVE INCREASED TRANSPARENCY OF BOTH OFFICIAL AND NON-OFFICIAL AID FLOWS AND IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS.**

91. These recommendations are inter-related. Rebalancing accountability in favour of beneficiaries and greater openness and transparency are necessary for reinforcing accountability systems, as is a multi-stakeholder approach to monitoring and evaluation. Similarly, the results management approaches featured above offer ways in which this set of recommendations on accountability can begin to be implemented in the context of programs and projects.

92. There have been a number of innovative developments in recent years in the field of “social accountability” that tend to be used by governments and CSOs to strengthen accountability to beneficiaries in the spirit of openness and transparency. These include participatory budgeting, gender budgeting, public expenditure tracking, citizen monitoring, and evaluation of government service delivery.

93. Evidence of how social accounting can influence the behaviour of local authorities and government officials can be seen from the right-to-information movement in India.
Box 37 - The Right to Information Movement and Accountability in India (Recommendations 10c, 10d, 10e, 11a, and 11b)

*Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan*, a CSO in the state of Rajasthan, took up the issue of state failure to enforce the minimum wage on drought relief work projects, or to ensure the availability of commodities through the Public Distribution System, among a number of other issues of citizen concern related to corruption, diversion and inefficiency. This CSO found the means to obtain and analyze official expenditure information, and held public hearings at which local people gave testimony to highlight discrepancies between the official records and their experiences. Due to the success of a number of similar initiatives, CSOs in India ultimately pressured the government to instate a *Right to Information Act* featured in the Enabling Environment section of this paper.

*Based on: Jenkins and Goetz (1999).*

94. Several examples of accountability mechanisms are featured below, including three cases having to do with CSO engagement in PRSP and budgeting processes that are summarized in more detail in the *Case Book*: Ghana’s Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Watch initiative, South Africa’s Budget Information Service, and One World Action’s Just Budgets program.

Box 38 ⇒ Holding the Government Accountable: The Ghana HIPC Watch Initiative (Recommendations 10c, d, and e)

In 2001, the Government of Ghana challenged CSOs to serve as watchdogs with respect to the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS). Ghana HIPC Watch was launched in response to this invitation. In 2002, the initiative covered the 24 poorest districts; by 2005, this was scaled up to 42 districts.

The initiative uses Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation to promote good governance, accountability and equity in the implementation of the GPRS. The approach involves three components:

- **Economic literacy and training**, which focuses on civil society groups and District Assemblies and addresses the core principles of the GPRS: partnership, participation, good governance, and equity.
- **Monitoring and evaluation projects**, implemented at the local level with HIPC funds. At the end of each district-level workshop, a multi-stakeholder District HIPC Monitoring Committee was elected, representing farmers, women, youth, persons with disability, and local government. Members were trained on how to conduct Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.
- **Advocacy**, whereby the findings and the policy recommendations generated by the monitoring and evaluation activities are used by lobby teams to influence Parliament, ministries, donors, and international NGOs. The lobby teams are organized in three groups: women, persons with disability and Northern Ghana. Lobby events are planned and conducted for each of these groups once every year. Activities include television appearances, radio programs, newspaper articles and face-to-face meetings.

As a result of this initiative, civil society and government collaboration has been institutionalized at district and regional levels for the first time. The approach has also democratized the implementation of the GPRS, by involving previously excluded groups. By 2004, HIPC Watch was a recognized civil society voice in the GPRS process championing accountability and transparency.

*Extracted from: “Ghana HIPC Watch: Holding Government Accountable to Poverty Reduction Strategies.” Case Study (2008).*
Box 39 ⇒ Budgets for the Poor: IDASA’s Budget Information Service in South Africa (Recommendations 10c, d & e)

The Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) works to support the consolidation of democracy in South Africa by building up civil society and governance institutions. Its Budget Information Service was established in 1995 in order to provide timely and accessible public policy information on the impact of the budget on poor South Africans. The Service is divided into Units covering Children, Women, AIDS, Sectors (covering health, welfare, and education budgets), and the Africa Budget.

The Women’s Budget Initiative works on the link between gender, poverty, and budgets, by differentiating the impact that government expenditures have on women and men, girls and boys. In operation since 1995, this project has encouraged the creation of similar initiatives in over 50 other countries.

The Budget Information Service is one of the most experienced budget groups around the world. It has contributed substantial methodological and conceptual innovations to the field and has served as an inspiration and source of advice and support for many other groups.


Box 40 ⇒ Just Budgets: Gender-responsive Budgeting in Africa (Recommendations 10c, d & e)

Involving a partnership with CSOs in four African countries, One World Action’s Just Budgets program supports CSOs, developing country governments, and donors to track their commitment to gender equality through gender-responsive budgeting. Gender-responsive budgeting analyzes the implications of public spending and taxation for women relative to men and can support advocacy for adjustments in public expenditure to match gender policy commitments.

Preliminary research suggests that while new aid modalities such as budget support can serve as entry points to promote effective gender analysis and mainstreaming, there is a lack of follow-through in design, implementation and performance monitoring.

The Just Budgets initiative has identified key components of a framework to ensure that gender analysis is systematically integrated into budget planning processes. The framework identifies a series of key questions or actions that donors and CSOs should consider.

Extracted from: “Just Budgets: Increasing Accountability and Aid Effectiveness through Gender Budget Analysis.” Case Study (2008).

95. A second category of social accountability mechanisms focuses on monitoring and audit functions after the fact. This includes the use of Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS), and social accounting mechanisms, as illustrated in the next two boxes.

Box 41 - Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (Recommendations 10c, d & e)

Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys are a mechanism for pursuing transparency and accountability from governments. These surveys track the flow of public funds and material resources from the central government, through the administrative hierarchy, and out to the frontline service providers. The aim is to improve the quality of service delivery at the local level. The key question that a survey sets out to answer is whether public funds and materials end up where they are supposed to, and if they don’t, why not. In Uganda, PETS formed part of a larger initiative involving the publication of financial transfers to local government in newspapers, awareness-raising campaigns, and capacity development of local-level stakeholders to understand their rights and empower them to demand them.
In Tanzania, the implementation of PETS was not part of such a comprehensive initiative, and due to the absence of political-level acceptance of the findings, CSOs and communities have been limited in their ability to use the results to pursue improved services.

*Based on: Sundet (2007).*

**Box 42 - Monitoring Infrastructure Projects in the Philippines (Recommendation 10c, d & e)**

Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government monitors government infrastructure projects in Abra Province, Philippines. It was formed in 1987, in response to the new government policy to increase community participation in development programs and received training from the government’s National Economic Development Authority. The organization works from government documentation, including approved plans and drawings, work programs, financial information and technical specifications, and holds community meetings to inform citizens about projects in their area. Using local volunteers, experts and staff, Concerned Citizens of Abra visits construction sites and documents progress, which is compared against reports submitted by the contractor on project completion. They then submit an audit report and recommendations to the appropriate authorities. Government responses have included ordering a contractor to replace poorly constructed sections of a roadbed at his own expense, and recovering overpayment from another contractor.

Concerned Citizens of Abra’s growing expertise in monitoring led to a partnership with the National Commission on Audit in 2001 to conduct participatory audits. They assessed road repair projects, interviewing project officials, examining available records, making site visits, and holding group discussions with local residents. Community involvement played a key role in verifying the accuracy of expenditures and they were able to prove that early completion of work on one project was due to poor quality construction. The Commission incorporated lessons from the audit process into its *Manual on the Conduct of Participatory Audits*, including the use of social impact analysis. Unfortunately, the participatory audit exercise was terminated after a change in the Commission’s administration.

*Extracted from: Ramkumar (2008).*

96. Further work is required to document cases that specifically address AG-CS recommendations 11a and b with respect to the transparency of aid flows. There may be lessons to learn from a database that Sida has put in place to track and make public their funding to and through Swedish CSOs (http://www.sida.se/ngodatabase), which provides information on the country or region of the CSOs’ work, what projects CSOs are running by sector or theme, who their local partners are, and total project budget figures.

**Box 43 ⇒ NGO Transparency and Accountability: Building Public Trust in Colombia (Recommendation 11b)**

At the country level, *ONG por la Transparencia* (Transparency and Accountability of NGOs) is an initiative led by NGO associations and networks to develop and implement minimum standards of information sharing with the public, individually and on a common web page. Through this initiative, described in greater detail in the *Case Book*, NGOs describe who they are, what they do, how they do it, what resources they use, who the beneficiaries of their actions are, and what they are achieving.

This transparency and accountability exercises has been very effective in highlighting lessons learned and continuing challenges faced by CSOs in Colombia. This information has provided the incentive to continue improving CSO effectiveness as well as building democracy in the country.

An important lesson learned is that it is easier for CSOs to submit to public scrutiny as part of a collective initiative like a federation or association. Nevertheless, in a country where the discovery of hidden ties
between individuals and institutions with illegal groups has become a common occurrence, the fact that there is a group of CSOs that voluntarily subject themselves to public scrutiny has had a positive impact on public perceptions and confidence.


97. Improved accountability for results as called for in recommendations 10d and 11b poses special challenges when it comes to support provided for CSOs. Donors note the need for “effective, institution-wide, outcome-based monitoring and evaluation systems” in relation to their engagement with CSOs, but little experience is documented on how this can be implemented (World Bank 2005, pg. 14). The challenge arises in part due to the tendency for CSO funding to be relatively small-scale and often project-based. Yet even when a donor’s support to CSOs is more program-based, the aggregation of results is a consistent difficulty, because even program-based support may in fact support a series of activities in project format of short duration, the collective results of which are not easy to pull together to demonstrate such a program’s outcomes. Further work and experimentation is needed to identify means for aggregating the results of civil society initiatives, building on the AG-CS recommendations on managing for results in terms of measuring social and institutional change, in an iterative and learning manner that empowers the ultimate beneficiaries of aid.

98. The following text box describes the efforts of Care Peru to increase its own accountability to recipients. This case is covered in greater depth in the Case Book.

Box 44 ⇒ Accountability to Beneficiaries in CARE Peru’s 2007 Earthquake Response (Recommendations 10c &d)

CARE Peru put accountability towards disaster-affected people into practice following the earthquake of August 15, 2007. They developed an accountability framework, which set out principles and standards, the purpose (to help strengthen the consistent quality of CARE’s response) and the desired outcomes (to contribute to the well-being, empowerment and protection of the rights of women, men and children affected by the earthquake). An accountability system evolved with four linked components:

- public information including through direct communication by CARE staff in one-on-one meetings, public meetings and workshops, national and local radio, flyers and posters;
- mechanisms for participation of affected people in decision-making;
- mechanisms for systematic feedback from affected communities, including through a free telephone line, and adaptation of CARE’s response accordingly; and
- application of Sphere humanitarian standards in their program.

All these aspects helped to ensure that the response was based on genuine needs as expressed by the affected populations.

That CARE Peru was able to establish this system was facilitated by the fact that DFID has incorporated a section on ‘accountability to beneficiaries’ into its humanitarian funding guidelines. This gave CARE Peru an entry point for explaining accountability and justifying the costs. Donors can support organizations to become responsive organizations, but budget flexibility is needed in order to incorporate the costs of accountability mechanisms, such as the use of communications and monitoring and evaluation line items. Flexibility is also needed to respond to suggestions raised by beneficiaries.

Extracted from: “Making Accountability to Disaster Affected People a Reality.” Case Study (2008).
CSO Effectiveness

99. This section focuses specifically on the issue of CSO effectiveness, asking what is required in order for the contributions of CSOs as development and aid actors to reach their full potential. Following the AG-CS Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations, we deal with the subject under three thematic headings: the enabling environment, good donorship, and CSO partnerships. Each of these involves challenges for developing country governments, donors and CSOs alike.

Understanding the CSO landscape

100. An important first step for all stakeholders is to understand the civil society landscape in particular countries or internationally. To date, most such work has been done at the level of individual countries. A distinction can be made between three forms of civil society “mapping,” the parameters of which depend on how civil society is defined: by organizational form, by function, or by the space they occupy. Mapping has mostly been used by Northern CSOs and by official donors to make programming choices, and can be used as well for baseline and assessment purposes (INTRAC 2008).

101. When the main purpose of civil society mapping is to identify potential CSO partners, an inventory approach is often used to produce a list of CSOs active in different geographic areas and sectors, their activities, and capacities. The UNDP, for example, has undertaken inventory exercises in collaboration with national-level Civil Society Advisory Committees (UNDP 2006). USAID has developed an NGO Sustainability Index, used primarily to assess the results of their own civil society programming. This index looks at CSO organizational capacity, financial viability, advocacy, service provision, infrastructure, public image, and the legal environment (INTRAC 2008).

102. More comprehensive approaches to understanding the civil society landscape require coverage of a whole range of aspects, including:

- formal and informal linkages between CSOs and with international or regional counterparts;
- linkages with government and the private sector;
- the enabling environment, including attitudes toward civil society;
- the history of civil society; and
- local incarnations of civil society, including informal groupings of individuals or organizations that form in response to specific issues and needs.

103. One of the premier sources of information on the characteristics and status of civil society in different countries today is the growing body of work under the CIVICUS Civil Society Index project, described in detail in the following text box.

Box 45 ⇒ The CIVICUS Civil Society Index (Recommendations 12a – c, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17a – b)

Since 2003, CIVICUS has developed and piloted a Civil Society Index (CSI) to provide assessments of the state of civil society in particular countries. This approach also allows for cross-country comparability of findings. As an action-research tool, the CSI can be used to assemble information that can be easily translated into policy recommendations and action by civil society stakeholders. The approach uses 74 indicators that measure important aspects of the civil society landscape. These are grouped into four categories: structure, environment, values and impact.
The project aims to enhance and strengthen civil society ownership in identifying and developing strategies for its own development. Work is led by a national coordinating organization which forms a National Index Team with two other partners to help carry out the main tasks of the project, with support from the CIVICUS project team. This Team is encouraged to adapt and modify the toolkit provided to better reflect their local context, with the help of a National Advisory Group composed of stakeholders from civil society, government, the media, academia, donors, and the private sector.

CSI has been implemented in over 50 countries with 48 country reports already published. These reports provide all stakeholders with a comprehensive and inclusive picture of the civil society landscape, and are generating impetus among CSOs, donors and governments to take action to strengthen civil society and enhance CSO effectiveness. Examples of how the reports are being used include the following:

- In Ghana, the knowledge and the sense of ownership amongst civil society stakeholders generated by the CSI project helped to motivate the establishment of a Resource Centre that contributes to civil society capacity development in the country.
- In Uganda, through the CSI consultative process, civil society stakeholders mobilized and collectively developed proposals to change government policy on legitimacy, transparency, and accountability.
- In Fiji, the CSI initiative contributed to the establishment of the “Social Leadership Training Institute” by bringing civil society stakeholders together to find solutions to address the leadership gap in Fijian civil society.
- The European Union in Cyprus is drawing from the CSI findings in developing a framework for their engagement with civil society.
- In Ukraine, the CSI strengthened relations between civil society and the government and media in regards to the CSI report. It also facilitated the development and adoption of the Concept of Government and Civil Society Cooperation in the Ukraine.
- In Bulgaria, CSI partner organizations and other CSOs lobbied government to implement a 1% tax law to secure greater financial sustainability for CSOs.

Extracted from: “CIVICUS Civil Society Index” Case Study (2008), and communication from Sue Le-Ba, Research Fellow, CIVICUS (2008).

**ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR CIVIL SOCIETY)**

**RECOMMENDATION 12A: RECOGNITION THAT THE CREATION OF AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR VIBRANT, DEMOCRATIC, AND DIVERSE CIVIL SOCIETY IS A BASIC REQUIREMENT FOR CSO EFFECTIVENESS.**

**RECOMMENDATION 12B: SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF THE ENABLING CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR CIVIL SOCIETY TO MEET ITS POTENTIAL IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES, WITH A VIEW TO IMPLEMENTING IMPROVED PRACTICES BY ALL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS.**

**RECOMMENDATION 12C: MEASURES BE PUT IN PLACE BY ALL DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDERS TO ENSURE THAT CSOs ARE TRANSPARENT AND ACCOUNTABLE FIRST AND FOREMOST TO THEIR CONSTITUENCIES AND STAKEHOLDERS, WHILE ACCOUNTING TO DONORS AND GOVERNMENTS FOR THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.**

104. In this section we seek to answer the question:

What examples can be cited of good enabling environments for civil society or of efforts to improve the enabling environment?

105. The subject of the enabling environment draws our attention to the state of civil society in specific developing countries – although in principle one can also speak of the enabling
environment also in donor countries and internationally. Here we focus on the state of civil society at the country level.

106. Recall that the enabling environment is multi-dimensional. It includes a number of conditions having to do with the general character of governance in a country, including:

- the opportunity that may or may not exist for dialogue and collaboration between CSOs and local governments;
- the vitality of democratic parliamentary systems and resultant opportunities for alliance building between CSOs and Members of Parliament to advance agendas of joint interest; and
- the quality of the legal and judicial system which can provide the assurance and means for just settlement of conflicts arising from within CSOs, or between CSOs and the state.

107. Other aspects of the enabling environment include the following:

- mechanisms to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights including the rights to expression, peaceful assembly and association, and access to information;
- structures and processes for multi-stakeholder dialogue between and among CSOs, government, elected representatives, donors, and the private sector;
- CSO-specific policies and legislation;
- taxation regulations, including charitable status provisions and tax benefits to promote individual or corporate philanthropy; and
- regulations and norms to promote CSO transparency and accountability to their constituencies.

**Legal and judicial systems and the promotion and protection of human rights**

108. In what follows, we look at examples of different conditions affecting the enabling environment for CSOs, beginning with the legal and judicial environment. An enabling legal and judicial system is one that can function with efficiency, is impartial, and to which all members of society have access. The legal and judicial system is often used by CSOs to pursue human rights contained in international law and further enshrined in domestic policy, as seen in the text box below from South Africa. Other enabling means for the promotion and protection of rights include bodies such as human rights commissions and ombudsman’s offices.

**Box 46 – Court Action and Human Rights in South Africa (Recommendation 12b)**

In 2002 in South Africa, the legal system was able to process a case of public interest litigation pitting the Treatment Action Coalition against the Ministry of Health. In a court challenge targeting the government’s health policy, the CSO coalition referred to rights enshrined in the country’s constitution to assert the right to anti-retrovirals (ARVs) for pregnant women. The coalition’s position was that the government, in limiting ARVs for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission to only 18 pilot sites, was being “unreasonably prohibitive”, and argued further fault in the absence of a comprehensive national program to address mother-to-child transmission of HIV. The High Court and Constitutional Court found that the government was not complying with its constitutional obligations, and ordered the government to roll out a nation-wide program.

*Based on: Ferguson (2008, pg. 31).*

109. One of the critical features of an enabling environment for CSO effectiveness is the right of access to information, which is enshrined in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, the
International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, and in various charters such as the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights. The recent United Nations Convention against Corruption “calls on all states to ensure that the public has effective access to information” (Carter Center 2007, pg.1). Some states have gone the distance in enacting policies and backing legislation concerning the right to information, such as India’s Right to Information Act, described in the following text box.

Box 47 - India’s Right to Information Act (Recommendation 12b)

Influenced by the demands and innovations of CSOs over two decades, the government of India enacted the Right to Information Act in 2005. Civil society observers note that this Act is one of the most significant laws enacted by the Parliament of India and enables the establishment of an unprecedented regime for the right to information by citizens of India.

The Act gives citizens of India access to records of central government and state governments. Under the provisions of the Act, any citizen may request information from a "public authority (a body of Government or "instrumentality of State"), which is required to reply expeditiously or within thirty days. The Act also requires every public authority to computerize their records for wide dissemination and to proactively publish certain categories of information so that the citizens need minimum recourse to request for information formally. Information disclosure in India was hitherto restricted by the Official Secrets Act 1923 and various other special laws, which the new Act now relaxes.

The Act has been unevenly applied across the country. Consequently, the Indian CSO PRIA has launched a study of its implementation in 12 states and is raising citizens’ awareness of the Act (PRIA 2008b).

Based on PRIA (2008b) and Wikipedia (2008). For more information see the Right to Information Community Portal of India at http://www.rtiindia.org/

110. There is increasing evidence of the link between press freedom, popular participation and political pluralism (M’boge and Gbaydee Doe 2007). South Africa and Ghana are two examples of countries where press freedom is guaranteed in legislation and upheld in practice, with a high incidence of active, independent media bodies. The following text box provides a few details in the Ghanaian case.

Box 48 - Freedom of the Press in Ghana (Recommendation 12b)

The Ghanaian constitution guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression, including for the press and other media, with an additional chapter dedicated to media freedom and independence. A National Media Commission has been established, made of up various representatives from civil society, the private sector, parliamentary appointees and two presidential appointees. Established by an Act of Parliament, its mandate is to ensure that the media’s constitutional rights are fulfilled.

Based on: M’boge and Gbaydee Doe (2007).

Structures and processes for multi-stakeholder dialogue

111. Another component of the enabling environment is in policies and institutions that governments put in place to foster citizen participation in policy making and program planning. Senegal, for example, has had a system of elected communauté rurale (CR) councils responsible for development programs in rural villages in place since the early 1970s (M’boge and Gbaydee Doe 2007). However, it is said that these CRs have come to be dominated by local elites, especially those linked to the ruling party, and thus are not as inclusive as they could be (ibid).
112. South Africa again provides a positive example, as illustrated in the following text box.

**Box 49 - Multi-stakeholder Dialogue in South Africa (Recommendation 12 b)**

The closeness of the African National Congress to CSOs during the apartheid struggle and the movement of key civil society leaders to the African National Congress government make civil society participation in public affairs a natural process in South Africa. Indeed, the constitution makes provisions on how public participation in the National Assembly, the National Council of Provinces, and the provincial legislatures must be facilitated.

South Africa has a national fund in place to support citizens’ participation. In addition, the government employs affirmative action to increase women’s participation in political affairs, and has various structures in place whose roles are to promote the advancement of their participation, such as the Parliamentary Committee on the Improvement of the Quality of Life and Status of Women, the Commission on Gender Equality, and the Office on the Status of Women.

*Extracted from: M’boge and Gbaydee Doe (2004).*

**CSO-specific policy and legislation**

113. Policy and legislation governing CSOs is considered by many as a double-edged sword. It can help secure basic rights for CSOs to exist and operate and can establish measures on registration, monitoring and reporting to help advance CSO transparency and accountability, but it can also be put in place to limit the independence of CSOs, particularly a risk in contexts where governments are resistant to CSO actions that challenge government policies (Mayhew 2005, Moore 2006). In the best of scenarios, legislation governing CSOs complements CSOs’ own regulations and norms for transparency and accountability to their constituencies, donors, and governments.

114. An example of an enabling CSO policy is that of Croatia’s *National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development*, previously referenced in the section on Recognition and Voice.

**Box 50 ⇒ Croatia’s National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development (Recommendation 12b)**

The *National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development from 2006 to 2011* was adopted by the Croatian Government in July, 2006. It delineates the policy framework for the development of the civil society sector in the Republic of Croatia, and represents a broad consensus on strategic priorities among civil society and government representatives.

The objective is to create conditions for community development in which citizens and CSOs participate with other sectors of society in building a society of well-being and equal opportunities for all. The strategy sets strategic priorities to improve the enabling environment including:

- strengthening the capacities and levels of participation of CSOs in the development and monitoring of public policies;
- improving mechanisms and standards for better multi-stakeholder consultation in policy processes, in line with EU standards;
- drafting and adopting a *Code of Good Practice on Consultation*; and
- establishing an Economic and Social Forum.

Planned improvements to the current legal framework include:
• adopting a new law on foundations,
• encouraging institutional, fiscal and social incentives for individual philanthropy and corporate investments in social development partnerships, and
• introducing public benefit status, by revisiting tax benefits regulations.


115. The Government of India’s NGO legislation offers another example of NGO policy.

Box 51 ⇒ India’s National Policy on the Voluntary Sector (Recommendation 12b)

In 2007 the Government of India, responded to calls to recognize CSOs as development actors in their own right and approved a National Policy on the Voluntary Sector. This policy was developed over a three-year period through a participatory process with representatives from various levels of government and civil society. It has provided much-needed legitimacy and voice to the voluntary sector, while ensuring autonomy and independence of voluntary organizations and CSOs.

In order to expand the reach and impact of the policy, state governments have been asked to prepare similar policies and state and central ministries dealing with the voluntary sector have been requested to take appropriate steps towards the national policy’s implementation.

CSOs recognize that while the passing of the legislation is an important milestone in the recognition of their roles, monitoring of implementation is required to assure its effectiveness. To that end, the Voluntary Action Network of India has organized state consultations of CSOs to disseminate the policy’s message and mobilize civil society efforts to impress upon respective state governments the need for similar policies.


116. Recent experience in India highlights that the enabling environment includes not just NGO policies but also regulations related to aid flows. India’s Foreign Contribution Regulation Act is currently undergoing amendment to address the government’s concern that funds are being used by some CSOs for purposes other than their stated objectives. From the CSO perspective, there are problems with the current legislation with regard to registration criteria and reporting requirements. CSOs have mobilized to review the Act and dialogue is ongoing.

117. Numerous publications have been produced by the International Centre for Not-For-Profit Law (ICNL), its European counterpart (ECNL), and the Open Society Institute that focus on the enabling legal environment required for civil society to flourish. This material, along with the ICNL’s 2004 Guidelines for Laws Affecting Civic Organizations and the Council of Europe’s Recommendation to member states on the legal status of NGOs in Europe (CoE 2007), suggests the following guidelines regarding the content and implementation of CSO legislation:

• Acknowledge CSOs’ independence to pursue their own objectives, “provided that both the objectives and the means employed are consistent with the requirements of a democratic society” (CoE 2007, pg. 2).
• Provide for independent and impartial decision-making for granting legal status to CSOs, with dedicated financial resources and expertise.
• Do not require frequent (or any) application to renew legal status.
• Allow for CSOs to solicit and receive funds from multiple sources not limited to “public bodies from their own state but also from institutional or individual donors, another state or
multilateral agencies, subject only to the laws generally applicable to customs, foreign exchange and money laundering and those on the funding of elections and political parties” (CoE 2007, pg. 5).

- Include allowance and mechanisms to assist CSOs in soliciting and receiving funds e.g. “exemption from income and other taxes or duties on membership fees, funds and goods received from donors or governmental and international agencies, income from investments, rent, royalties, economic activities and property transactions, as well as incentives for donations through income tax deductions or credits” (CoE 2007, pg. 6).
- Potentially require submission of reports on funds received and disbursed, but not necessarily.

118. A recent publication from the World Movement for Democracy and ICNL put forward six International Principles Protecting Civil Society, all of which are aligned with international human rights law:

- the right to entry (freedom of association),
- the right to operate free from unwarranted state interference,
- the right to freedom of expression,
- the right to communication and cooperation,
- the right to seek and secure resources, and
- state duty to protect (WMD/ICNL 2008).

**Taxation**

119. Tax regulations are a determinant of CSOs’ ability to maintain a level of financial sustainability. There are primarily three types of tax legislation that affect CSOs’ financial base and their ability to expand it: tax exemption for CSOs, tax benefits for contributors to CSOs, or designation of a percentage of taxes, such as the Hungarian, Polish, and Slovakian “1% provision,” described in the following text box, which allows individual or corporate taxpayers to designate a percentage share of their tax payments to non-profit organizations (ICNL 2003, pg. 36). Regulations can also be put in place to encourage volunteerism, such as tax exemption on reimbursement for volunteer expenses such as travel, shelter, and food (Hadzi-Miceva 2007).

**Box 52 - Tax Incentives in Eastern Europe: The One Percent Law (Recommendation 12b)**

The percentage tax allocation mechanism in Hungary provides a means through which the government can support CSOs, specifically their institutional or core costs. The mechanism was introduced in 1996 through the “one percent law,” which allows taxpayers to designate 1% of their income tax payments to a qualifying NGO, and another 1% to a church. Taxpayers make the anonymous designation on forms submitted with their tax return, and the tax authority transfers the amounts designated after the beneficiary proves its entitlement.

Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Romania have since enacted similar legislation.

The 1% mechanism is seen to have a number of advantages, as it:

- allows for de-politicized distribution of state funding to CSOs,
- enables local and small CSOs to access funds by mobilizing local support,
- creates competition among CSOs, increasing professionalism and communication with their constituencies, and
• raises awareness among taxpayers about the importance of CSOs and lets them decide which they would like to support.
While the percentage tax allocation has proven a useful mechanism since its instatement in Hungary, there are outstanding questions regarding the degree to which it meets its key objectives of a) increasing the pool of resources available to local CSOs and b) developing a philanthropic culture among taxpayers. In particular, the ceiling which is placed on the contribution amount renders the total funds available finite with the risk that these funds will end up in the hands of those CSOs with the best marketing campaigns. No comprehensive study has been undertaken to assess the mechanism’s influence on the culture of philanthropy

*Extracted from: Hadzi-Miceva (2007).*

**GOOD DONORSHIP**

120. Though not all of civil society funding comes from official donors, many CSOs are recipients of ODA, while CSOs are often donors of aid in their own right or act channels for ODA. The AG-CS’ recommendations on this subject are the following:

**RECOMMENDATION 13: BOTH OFFICIAL DONORS AND CSOS IN THEIR CAPACITY AS DONORS, RECIPIENTS AND CHANNELS OF AID SHOULD TAKE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE ENRICHED AID EFFECTIVENESS PRINCIPLES IDENTIFIED IN THE SECTION ON ENRICHING THE PARIS PRINCIPLES, INCLUDING:**

A) RESPECT FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNER OWNERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP;
B) ALIGNMENT WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNER PRIORITIES AND USE OF LOCAL SYSTEMS;
C) GREATER COORDINATION AND HARMONIZATION OF EFFORTS, WHILE RESPECTING DIVERSITY AND INNOVATION;
D) MANAGING FOR RESULTS IN A DYNAMIC, ITERATIVE WAY; AND
E) ENHANCED ACCOUNTABILITY, WITH EMPHASIS ON DOWNWARD ACCOUNTABILITY, AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN DONOR-Recipient CSO RELATIONSHIPS.

**RECOMMENDATION 14: THAT DONORS CONSIDER THE OVERALL STRENGTHENING OF CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE COUNTRY, REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS AS AN OBJECTIVE WORTH SUPPORTING IN ITS OWN RIGHT.**

**RECOMMENDATION 15: DONORS, INCLUDING Northern AND INTERNATIONAL CSOS SHOULD IDENTIFY AND IMPLEMENT A RANGE OF BETTER COORDINATED AND HARMONIZED SUPPORT MECHANISMS INCLUDING CORE OR PROGRAM SUPPORT, CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT, A LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE, RESPONSIVE FUNDING MECHANISMS OF VARIOUS Sorts, AND THE HARMONIZATION OF CONTRACTING, FUNDING AND REPORTING MODALITIES.**

**RECOMMENDATION 16: TO THE EXTENT THAT OFFICIAL DONORS CHANNEL FUNDS THROUGH Northern CSOS, DONOR PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS SHOULD BE PUT IN PLACE THAT ENABLE THESE CSOS TO TAKE ON THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE ENRICHED AID EFFECTIVENESS AGENDA AND RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED IN THE AG-CS SYNTHESIS.**

121. In this section, we address the question:

**What are some examples of good donorship in terms of its impact on CSO effectiveness?**
122. Because the above recommendations cover the gamut of the Paris principles, there is considerable potential for overlap between this section and previous ones. To avoid this, the cases represented here focus on the following cross-cutting topics:

- Donor policies and mechanisms for support to civil society
- Joint analysis and guidelines
- Funding models
- Capacity development and civil society strengthening

**Donor policies and mechanisms for support to civil society**

123. Within the context of the shift to more aid-effective bilateral investment modalities, and within the context of rising ODA and static operations and management budgets, many donors are investigating options to make their civil society support more effective and more efficient (Pratt and Wright 2008). Some of this work is taking place in the Nordic + group, the most active members at this time being Sida, Norway, the UK, and Canada.

124. A comprehensive donor policy with regard to civil society should include a number of elements, *inter alia* a general policy statement of recognition, an appropriate and balanced menu of funding mechanisms for various categories of CSOs, mechanisms of collaboration with other donors, and a well-defined approach for promoting the strengthening of civil society in developing countries. In the cases that follow in this subsection we look at the following:

- an example of a clear and explicit policy statement on civil society from Sida
- an example of the menu of options marshalled in support of civil society in Sida
- two other examples of support mechanisms from Norway and DFID

125. We end this subsection with a short discussion on the reasons why these donors channel as much of their support for CSOs through CSOs in the donor country.

**Box 53 ⇒ Sida’s Policy on Civil Society (Recommendations 1a, 1b, 1c, 14, & 15)**

In 2007, the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) adopted a policy to specify the objectives and modalities for cooperation with civil society, and to clarify Sida’s view of civil society. The aim of the policy is to serve as a guide for everyone at Sida working in this area, by providing a consistent, coordinated, and over-arching regulatory framework for different forms of Sida support to civil society. The policy’s objective is to promote the development of a vibrant and democratic civil society that improves the possibilities for poor people to improve their living conditions.

Within this context, the policy recognizes civil society as including both formal and informal CSOs, and as something that is dynamic, diverse, multi-faceted, and an expression of society's values, customs, needs and interests. Underlying the policy is an appreciation of the diversity within civil society, reflecting as it does different perspectives, ideologies and interests. This diversity is seen to provide constructive energy for change, development and poverty reduction.

The policy outlines two different ways of supporting civil society:

- directly through various types of contributions:
  - to CSOs as implementing agencies,
  - to strengthen CSO capacity, or
  - to organizations and networks to strengthen civil society as a whole as an arena for citizen engagement; and
• indirectly, by fostering a positive enabling environment, including promoting opportunities in
developing countries for CSOs to influence the design and implementation of poverty reduction
measures.

Sida’s support aims to strengthen civil society across the board, without undermining legitimate state and
democratic institutions.

Based on: Sida (2007); Brundin and Mast (2008); CIS (2007).

126. Most donors provide support for civil society through CSOs in their own countries as well
as directly in developing countries and have adapted to the diversity of CSO actors and situations
by adoption a wide range of support mechanisms. Existing analysis suggests that this sort of
diversity of mechanisms is appropriate (Wood 2004, Sida 2007, Nordic + 2007, Tjønneland and
Dube 2007). The following cases illustrate how three donors, Sweden, Norway, and the UK, are
maintaining a diversity of mechanisms, both in headquarters and in the field.

**Box 54 - A Range of Civil Society Support at Sida (Recommendations 14 & 15)**

In total, around 27% of Sida’s appropriation is channelled to and through NGOs. Sida co-funds
framework agreements with 14 Swedish NGOs, some of which go on to administer grants to smaller
organizations in addition to implementing their own programs. The philosophy behind Sida’s support to
its domestic NGOs is that they are well placed to support CSOs in the South based on common values
that they are deemed to share.

In addition to these framework agreements, Sida provides funding to Swedish, international, national, or
local CSOs via other funding envelopes – either through Swedish or international organizations, or
directly to local organizations, through its thematic or regional desks at Sida headquarters, through the
Division for Humanitarian Assistance, and from the Swedish embassies in cooperation countries. Most of
these contributions are approved within the framework of country and regional cooperation strategies and
are therefore subject to greater control by Sida than support provided under the framework agreements.
However there is no presumption that all bilateral aid must be narrowly aligned with government
programs in developing countries, since the complementarity of CSO and government roles is recognized.

In addition to direct support to civil society, Sida runs a Civil Society Center for Swedish CSOs and their
partners in the South and East that provides training and other resources focused on the role of civil
society in development issues. Sida manages a database of its support to Swedish NGOs through which
members of the public can obtain information about these organizations’ initiatives
(www.sida.se/ngodatabase).

Sida’s civil society programming in Kenya provides a snapshot of their mix of funding modalities.

• The Swedish embassy in Kenya has programs of support to human-rights based NGOs covering
gender equality and the rights of women, children, and the disabled. These programs are joint
initiatives with other donors and are implemented through intermediaries that include Swedish NGOs
and UN organizations.

• An example of this approach is the National Civic Education Program, which provides civic
education geared to enhancing human rights and good governance. Forty-two CSOs grouped around
four consortia are implementing the program. Eight international development partners provide
funding through a basket mechanism.

• In addition, a variety of Swedish CSOs from large frame organizations to small solidarity groups
carry out their own development programs in Kenya where their primary objective is to strengthen
relevant Kenyan efforts and local counterparts.
Based on: Sida (2007); Brundin and Mast (2008); Pratt (2006); Wamugo and Skadkaer Pedersen (2007); NCEP II (2008); Sida (2008a, b); Gunnarrson (2006).

Box 55 - Norway’s Civil Society Support Mechanisms (Recommendations 14 & 15)

Norway’s current support to Norwegian, international and developing country NGOs is being delivered through a complex system shared between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its development agency, Norad. The Ministry and Norad each manage 50% of the budget for NGO funding, which accounts for approximately 27% of Norway’s total bilateral assistance.

Norad is responsible for the Norwegian NGO support scheme for long-term development work. The approach is based on partnership principles and a rights-based approach. Activities are planned and implemented by local counterparts, with Norwegian partners playing support roles. Empowerment through participation in planning, implementation and evaluation, gender equality, environmental awareness, and conflict sensitivity characterize the work of Norwegian partners.

Norad’s Norwegian support scheme includes both multi-year framework agreements and individual agreements for smaller NGOs. Around 100 Norwegian NGOs receive support. Most resources are provided as core funding to around 30 Norwegian NGOs under multi-year frameworks of 3-5 years in duration. There are smaller grant schemes for Norwegian CSOs and a budget for NGOs working on information and development education in Norway. A small fund is set aside for projects by very small organizations without previous aid experience. Norad also supports around 30 international NGOs and networks, with preference for those with headquarters in the South. In addition, Norwegian embassies have strategic partnerships with Norwegian NGOs in support of country programs, and provide direct support to CSOs in partner countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs supports NGOs in the field of humanitarian work, peace building and reconciliation, and transitional assistance to bridge the gap between humanitarian and long-term development aid. Direct implementation by NGOs is more common in these program areas.

This system is under review, with a view to rationalizing the various modalities. It is expected that a new Norad strategy for support to civil society will be finalized by the end of 2008. It will emphasize local ownership where national social forces must take the lead in setting the action agenda for strengthening civil society, supported by international partners. Key elements will include better country analysis and greater emphasis on how CSOs can be more effective as change agents. The rights-based approach will remain fundamental, but more will be required from partners in terms of knowledge on poverty, working with vulnerable groups, links to grassroots-oriented social movements, and sustainability of their contributions to development. Meanwhile, NGOs are being encouraged to form umbrella organizations, harmonize and align their initiatives with both Norwegian and developing country priorities, and reduce the number of countries in which they work.

A separate initiative was taken by Norway in 2006 to improve mechanisms for providing support directly to CSOs in developing countries. As the lead member of a Nordic + Group, Norway undertook a comparative study of funding modalities in six partner countries, the results of which are described later in this paper.


Box 56 ⇒ DFID’s Partnership Programme Arrangements and Other Civil Society Envelopes (Recommendations 14 & 15)

DFID supports CSOs through country offices and headquarter-managed funds, including the Civil Society Challenge Fund, the Development Awareness Fund, and Partnership Programme Arrangements (PPAs). PPAs were established in 2000 to provide unrestricted funding to CSOs with which DFID has a
significant working relationship, a common ethos and vision, and matching priorities. PPAs typically run for six years. Currently, DFID has 26 PPAs running with UK and non-UK organizations.

The opportunity of accessing long-term unrestricted funding has been welcomed by PPA partners, as it allows them to focus on developmental impacts instead of constantly chasing funds. PPA funding can underpin many of the activities of the organization, including strengthening its own capacity and supporting learning and adaptation. It provides opportunities to increase developmental impacts on the ground, do research, take calculated risks and fund small community-based organizations to develop their own capacity and voice. Ultimately, this type of funding allows a more holistic approach to poverty reduction and achievement of the MDGs.

PPAs are true partnerships with DFID, which allow a better policy dialogue and exchange of ideas and sharing of information.

Entry to the PPA scheme is based on a range of criteria, including:

• sufficient consistency between CSO and DFID priorities,
• high standards of corporate governance,
• extensive ‘reach’ in poor countries or in the UK for building public support for development, and
• significant engagement in DFID policy formulation.


127. In all three of the cases presented above support is provided to and through donor countries’ domestic CSOs alongside their direct support to developing country CSOs. Studies suggest that the bulk of donors’ civil society funding goes to their domestic and international CSOs (Pratt 2006, CIS 2007). The benefits often cited by donors of working with their domestic CSOs include capacity to uphold accountability requirements, and the political constituency in support of ODA that domestic CSOs represent. Other donors cite a somewhat more developmental rationale, such as USAID’s stance that their CSOs are the principal actors in civil society strengthening given the experience and expertise gathered from long-standing relations with CSOs in aid-recipient countries (CIS 2007). The position of Nordic countries such as Norway tends to be that domestic CSOs “are firmly rooted in Norwegian tradition and social life, [and] are well qualified to communicate values fundamental to civil society building to CSOs in developing countries” (CIS 2007, pg. 26). DFID cites civil society as being “the public face of development and…a conduit for the UK public expression of solidarity and personal commitment to communities worldwide” (CIS 2007, pg. 20).

128. Donors are also beginning to support new formulas involving greater coordination by Northern CSOs working in alliance with each other. As we saw in the text box above, Norwegian NGOs are being encouraged to form umbrella organizations, harmonize and align their initiatives, and to reduce the number of countries in which they work. Similar tendencies can be observed in Canada.

129. The following text box illustrates an example of Canadian CSOs adopting a new approach with CIDA support through a coalition of Canadian organizations working on HIV/AIDS in Africa. This coalition is involved primarily in more service-oriented and capacity development activities. Its members have collectively been implementing a type of program-based approach involving coordination and collaboration among the member CSOs and the local CSOs with which they partnered.
Box 57 - The Canadian Coalition for Youth and HIV/AIDS (Recommendations 14, 15 & 17a)

The Canadian Coalition for Youth and HIV/AIDS in Africa was a coalition of four Canadian NGOs working collectively in four African countries. The focus of the alliance was on building the capacity of local community-based organizations, faith-based organizations and NGOs to engage in comprehensive HIV programming. Its goal was to strengthen capacity to reduce negative impacts of HIV/AIDS upon children and youth using a ‘continuum of care’, rights-based, and multi-sectoral approach. The coalition reached hundreds of CSOs and thousands of individuals living with HIV/AIDS, increasing access to services. It also increased levels of collaboration among participating community-based organizations, and helped raise understanding of and dialogue with governments regarding their responsibilities toward the population.

A number of lessons emerged from the coalition’s experience:

- A coalition can be an effective means of sharing knowledge, expertise and other resources.
- A coalition can be an effective platform for advocacy, e.g. for provision of ARVs.
- Shared interest is the key to success.
- Collaboration requires time and attention to process.
- Resources are required for effective information sharing.

Based on: Canadian Coalition (2008).

Joint analysis and guidelines

130. Donors are increasingly taking a holistic perspective on support to civil society at the country level that involves increased coordinating and harmonization of efforts.

131. At one end of the spectrum, the practice of information sharing among donors (including Northern CSOs) and governments with regard to civil society support could involve regular forums such as meetings or workshops, use of the media, and use of information technology to establish web-based information sites or databases. The World Bank/European Commission Donor Exchange, Coordination and Information Mechanism (DECIM) offers an example of information sharing to facilitate coordination.

Box 58 - Support to CSOs and Civil Society Strengthening: The DECIM initiative in Central and Eastern Europe (Recommendations 14 & 15)

The World Bank/European Commission-sponsored Donor Exchange, Coordination and Information Mechanism (DECIM) is a process that informally associates, on a voluntary basis, private and public actors who hold financial resources or expertise and analytical capacity, and who actively support the development of civil society in Central and Eastern Europe by working with CSOs or public sector entities that have an impact on civic space.

DECIM has four objectives:

- to share information on the operational programs of the respective DECIM participants;
- to identify synergies and joint initiatives at the country and sub-regional level involving other development actors;
- to engage other agencies and development partners in policy discussion on civil society development across Central and Eastern Europe; and
- to support joint initiatives to accelerate civil society development where opportunities arise.

132. Another interesting experience worth highlighting is the work that has been undertaken in Tanzania to develop guidelines to inform donor support to CSOs working to influence policy.

Box 59 ⇒ Good Donorship Guidelines for Civil Society Support in Tanzania (Recommendations 14 & 15)

Tanzania is a forerunner in implementing aid effectiveness principles. At the same time, donor support to civil society has been seen to wane relative to investments in government, and what funding is available has been seen as short-sighted, unpredictable, and unfocused, with a lack of transparency and information on strategies and funding modes.

In 2006, a number of CSOs requested a set of guidelines to help coordinate and make more transparent donors’ support to CSOs engaging in advocacy and policy work. The main result of this initiative to date has been the elaboration and endorsement of Guidelines for Support to Civil Society, and the establishment of a public database of support to civil society.

The latter is a web-based database for tracking participating donors’ funding to civil society, including such information as size of budget, geographic coverage and sector of operation (www.civilsocietysupport.net). The database is not quite comprehensive as it does not contain information on support to Tanzanian CSOs via their Northern CSO partners, but still has potential as an information sharing tool.

The Guidelines for Support to Civil Society have specific commitments that can serve to strengthen CSOs, through increased access to core funding and longer-term commitments, for example. While providing a basis for greater coordination, the guidelines are somewhat sensitive to the distinct nature of CSOs and their roles in development. One of the guideline’s twelve principles is to encourage diversity and transparency of funding strategies. Another calls for support modalities that encourage innovation, results, and learning, the latter both within CSOs and between CSOs and donors. Also noteworthy is the principle of mainstreaming civil society support in all programs through support to CSOs in the same sectors as donors are supporting governments, and integrating the theme of civil society issues into the broader donor-donor and donor-government dialogue.

Based on: Touchette (2008); Ingelstam and Karlstedt (2007).

133. A further initiative worth citing as an example of donor coordination and harmonization is the joint analysis undertaken in 2007 by a Nordic + group of donors, led by Norway, on country-based models of donor support to civil society. Members will begin piloting a set of criteria and principles resulting from this work in a selection of countries in 2008. Based on the study’s findings and lessons learned from the pilots, the group intends to elaborate joint guidelines for country-level civil society support. A key driver behind the initiative is to coordinate members’ civil society support through joint funding initiatives, but some of the principles and criteria that have emerged to guide the Nordic + forward demonstrate awareness of potential pitfalls in joint approaches.

134. Civil society support programs, particularly those looking to engage CSOs in advocacy and accountability, are often noted to be more accessible to “the usual suspects” of urban-based, professional CSOs. Increasing recognition of the diversity of civil society actors, and of the strength that lies in such pluralism, is thus leading donors like the Nordic + to express their intent to reach a wide range of civil society actors (Nordic + 2007 & 2008, DFID 2006), including membership organizations with a “natural constituency” (e.g. professional associations) (MFA Norway 2006). A bigger challenge still is the question of how to reach non-formal social movements or small-scale community organizations, when donors are administratively and
legally unable to fund them directly (O’Neil, Foresti and Hudson 2007). The only strategy for such outreach so far seems to be the use of intermediary organizations.

135. The following box outlines the principles emerging from the Nordic + study.

**Box 60 - Guiding Principles for Nordic + Support to Civil Society at Country Level (Recommendations 14 & 15)**

The guiding principles for Nordic + support to civil society in the South are:

- increase core/program support, joint support and indirect support/use of intermediaries while upholding requirements for mutual accountability, results achievement and transparency;
- increase donor coordination of country-based support to civil society in the South (i.e. at country level). A rights-based approach and poor people’s perspective will form the basis for the support;
- utilize existing aid effectiveness principles - the Paris Declaration, OECD/DAC criteria for work in fragile states and situations, Principles of Good Donorship - as the basis for country-based discussions geared towards strengthening relations and dialogue between Ministries of Foreign Affairs and donors/headquarters/embassies and civil society;
- operationalize the diversity principle through greater outreach and accessibility, in close dialogue with representatives of civil society; and
- include risk analysis and management as a central component throughout all phases.

Among the criteria for civil society support is the imperative to formulate clear strategic goals for support to civil society. These goals could be related to a strong and diverse civil society, or to other development objectives (poverty reduction, participatory democracy, non-discrimination, equitable distribution, conflict prevention, gender equality, environment and sustainability and rights-based development) to be achieved through civil society. Support channelled through CSOs must also be designed in such a way that civil society is strengthened.


**Funding models**

136. Financial support to CSOs and for civil society strengthening in developing countries take a number of forms. Increasingly, these involve partnership arrangements allowing the adoption of a more comprehensive approach than would otherwise be possible.

137. Pooled funding arrangement generally involve one of three options:

- pooled core funding to individual CSOs that responds to their organization’s strategic priorities (akin to direct budgetary support);
- pooled program funding (akin to sector-wide support) to individual CSOs that responds to the strategic priorities of one (or more) of their programs; and
- pooled basket funds that pay attention to outreach, accessibility and diversity and maintain flexibility and responsiveness to CSO priorities.

138. Other options include the provision of funding through CSO alliances and support through foundation-type arrangements.

139. As the examples below illustrate, donors are increasingly finding ways to pool their support to civil society using one of the above methods. In some cases, this is because CSOs themselves have been able to negotiate with donors to secure more favourable terms of support. As we saw earlier, even a small NGO such as Butoke has been able to secure program support from CIDA,
by working with a group of Canadian NGOs. At the other end of the spectrum is BRAC, one of the largest NGOs in the world, which secures most of its support from outside donors in the form of pooled, program-based funding, as described in the *Case Book*. The case of the Organization of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP), in the text box below, illustrates how program-based funding can enable the recipient organization to pursue its own self-defined mandate.

**Box 61 - Program-based Support for ORAP in Zimbabwe (Recommendations 14 & 15)**

ORAP was a grassroots cultural movement in Western Zimbabwe created in 1980. Its aim was to improve the quality of life of rural marginalized people and to establish support for rural communities to develop according to their own priorities. ORAP was a membership organization serving 1.5 million people, organized as a network of community-based associations.

In order to implement its programs more efficiently, ORAP decided to use a program-based approach and in 1990 called all its funders to a meeting to develop a memorandum of understanding. Seven Northern organizations, including official donors and Northern CSOs, pulled together funds to support an ORAP budget of approximately $5 million over three years. Each agency signed a separate memorandum of agreement with ORAP, but they all received the same report, which did not designate how the funds of the individual organization were spent. This was an early example of a program-based approach implemented by a Southern CSO.

*Extracted from: Nkomo (2002).*

140. Multi-donor pooled funds to support multiple CSO initiatives or civil society strengthening are increasingly being used. Examples can be found all over the world, including in:

- Tanzania (the Foundation for Civil Society),
- Bangladesh (the *Manusher Jonno* Foundation)
- Honduras (the *Agencias de Cooperación-PRSP (ACI-PRSP)* Fund), and
- Sierra Leone (ENCISS fund).

141. The Bangladesh and Honduras cases are described in some detail in the text boxes below and are selected because of how they combine both funding and capacity development objectives. Of particular interest with the Honduras case is the involvement of INGOs as contributing donors and members of the steering committee, suggesting new models of cooperation between Northern and Southern CSOs.

142. Another example is that of the Foundation for the Philippines Environment, the main interest of which resides in the institutional mechanisms that were adopted to guarantee local ownership of the initiative.
Box 62 - The Manusher Jonno Foundation in Bangladesh (Recommendations 14 & 15)

The *Manusher Jonno* Foundation started out as a DFID-funded project in 2002. Initially named Human Rights and Governance, it was deliberately designed as a local funding mechanism to support work on human rights and governance in Bangladesh. The fund was managed by a consortium led by CARE, and also included Deloitte and Touche and the Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust. In 2006, the Foundation became an independent, locally-led institution, and in 2007 it began to secure funds from additional donors (Royal Netherlands Embassy, Sweden, and Norway).

The Foundation aims to empower poor women, men and children to achieve their civil, political, economic and social rights and to improve their security and well-being, by working through NGO partners, through which it channels funding as an intermediary funding organization.

It also facilitates and provides technical support for networking and advocacy, monitors the human rights and governance situation in the country, and publishes information for public use. The Foundation combines a traditional donor or funding role with that of an NGO in capacity development and in mobilizing civil society toward specific development ends.

*Based on: Tembo and Wells (2007); Scanteam and ODI (2007); Wiseman (2007).*

Box 63 ⇒ Funding Arrangements for CSO Participation Honduras’ PRSP (Recommendations 14 & 15)

The *Agencias de Cooperación* - PRSP Fund in Honduras is a multi-donor initiative dedicated to strengthening the participation of civil society in pro-poor policy making, using the mechanism of the national poverty reduction strategy (PRSP). The fund has 13 donors, including bilateral and multilateral donors as well as INGOs. It represents a model of cooperation between Northern and Southern CSOs that is conducive to local ownership. The strategy consists of an operational structure that explicitly and actively involves a power sharing arrangement between INGOs and representatives of Honduran civil society in the joint management of the fund.

A key priority for the fund is the engagement of the poorest people and marginalized groups who have been excluded until now because of their lack of capacity, geographic isolation, or vulnerability. These include women, children, young people, ethnic groups and the disabled. Given that over 70% of the poor live in rural areas, there is a strong rural focus. The building of links is encouraged among civil society groups to develop alliances and share experiences, and between civil society and government at all levels — local, municipal, regional and national.

Among the lessons learned from the fund to date are that:

- Excluded groups are interested in and committed to becoming involved in political processes and citizen participation towards poverty reduction.
- It is possible for citizens to carry out social audits.
- Donors are interested in funding civil society and will do so if there are mechanisms in place.
- Local funding mechanisms can be designed so that the procedures themselves promote alliance building, solidarity and strengthened capacity within civil society.

*Extracted from: “ACI-PRSP multi-donor fund for strengthening participation of Honduran civil society in the national poverty reduction strategy.” Case Study (2008).*
Box 64 ⇒ Foundation for the Philippines Environment (Recommendation 14)

In the late 1980s, the Philippines experienced a marked increase in inflow of ODA funds that provided opportunities to develop grant mechanisms managed by Philippine NGOs. The Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE), founded in 1992, was one of these pioneer grant mechanisms. It was created using a “debt for nature” swap mechanism in which the World Wildlife Federation (WWF) and USAID bought back dept amounting to SUS 21M that was used to fund an endowment for the Foundation.

The FPE is considered the largest grant-making institution outside of the government for environmental and sustainable development in the Philippines. Its mission is to be a catalyst for biodiversity and sustainable development of communities in environmentally critical areas. It is currently focused in 18 priority sites.

334 Philippine NGOs and people’s organizations and 24 academic institutions were involved in the series of nationwide consultations leading up to establishment of the FPE. In the US, Filipino delegates from large environmental coalitions and networks of civil society as well as the government, together with US-based NGOs, lobbied at the US Congress for development assistance.

The Foundation is broadly represented by civil society groups and government, with a board of trustees acting as the sole policy-making body. It is composed of eleven members — six regional representatives, four elected “at large” elected on the basis of their national reputation, and a representative of WWF. A government representative also sits on the board in an ex-officio capacity.

Combining grant-making with capacity development helps advance sustainability. The FPE initiates, assists and funds biological conservation and sustainable development activities. In addition to financial resources, the Foundation also provides technical resources to strengthen the capacities of NGOs, peoples’ organizations, and local communities in pursuing biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.


143. While these examples illustrate some successes in establishing innovative new mechanisms for providing civil society support, observers from within and outside of civil society suggest caveats that need to be taken into consideration. A study commissioned by Swedish NGOs on consequences of the Paris agenda for civil society in Kenya states CSOs’ view that “the creation of thematic baskets was largely a donor-driven initiative. Lack of consultation was cited as a factor leading to delays in the implementation of these basket funds and in diluting overall ownership of the programme being funded through baskets” (Wamugo and Skadkaer Pedersen 2007, pg. 24).

144. Another study reflecting on the Enhancing Interaction and Interface Between Civil Society and the State to Improve Poor People’s Lives (ENCISS) fund in Sierra Leone points to heavy procedural arrangements, including complicated logical framework procedures (Eurodad 2008 and Hayes 2008). This case and other examples draw attention to the way in which these new pooled funding mechanisms are changing the donor-civil society relationship. ENCISS for instance, though a funding intermediary, is viewed by many donors as a CSO, resulting in reduced space for actual direct civil society engagement in dialogue with donors and governments. Concerns are also raised about the possibility of such pooled funds replacing donors’ other support mechanisms, potentially leaving those CSOs whose priorities or
performance standards do not meet the fund’s requirements “out in the cold” (ActionAid/CARE 2006.pg. 43).

**Capacity Development and Civil Society Strengthening**

145. Recommendation 14 calls for the strengthening of civil society in developing countries as an objective worth pursuing in its own right. It overlaps with recommendation 6, which also calls for capacity development of CSOs, and the cases below can thus be considered to cover both recommendations. We provide three cases below of programs explicitly targeting civil society strengthening as an objective.

**Box 65 – Civil Society Capacity Development in Ghana: The Civil Society Resource Centre (Recommendations 6 & 14)**

| In Ghana, the knowledge and sense of ownership amongst civil society stakeholders generated by the CIVICUS Civil Society Index project fed into a process of dialogue with UNDP that ultimately led to the establishment of a UNDP-funded Civil Society Resource Centre. |
| The Centre was established as a mechanism for capacity development of individual CSOs and of the sector as a whole. The rationale came in part from the UNDP’s studies of the sector alongside findings of the Civil Society Index, both of which identified general and specific gaps in civil society capacity. |
| The Resource Centre seeks to respond to CSOs’ information and capacity needs in several ways, including the provision of resource materials, access to computers and Internet, and access to a training and conference space. It also offers training services, organizes forums for exchange and collaboration among CSOs, and facilitates coordinated research on civil society issues. |
| The centre aims to provide a platform for coordination and collaboration among CSOs, including for the development of a common approach to codes of ethics and quality standards. |
| The process through which the centre was established demonstrates good practice in a number of ways: |
| • A UNDP team was dedicated to the planning and preparatory tasks with consultancy support. |
| • Considerable investment went into in planning and preparation of the centre, including a needs assessment and nationwide consultations with CSOs. Special efforts were made to reach out to rural-based grassroots CSOs based on the desire to create a bridge between these organizations, which often have the evidence needed to influence policy based on their constituents, and urban-based CSOs that tend to have the capacity and linkages to influence policy. |
| • Partnerships were established with NGO regional networks and the main umbrella organization which, from their strategic positions in the civil society community, assist the centre’s work such as with the selection of trainees and resource persons, and evaluation of the Centre’s activities. |
| • A Steering Committee of CSO representatives was established for the Centre. |
| Early intentions were to house the Centre in the offices of the country’s main NGO umbrella organization. However, capacity constraints made this inadvisable in the immediate term, so the Centre was housed in the relatively neutral location of the UN flats (versus the UNDP’s head office), while investing in capacity development of the umbrella. |

*Extracted from: “CIVICUS Civil Society Index.” Case Study (2008), CIVICUS (2007).*
Box 66 – PRIA and CSO Capacity Development in Bangladesh (Recommendations 6 & 14)

The growing importance of CSOs and citizens in catalyzing social change makes it imperative to strengthen the capacity of those CSOs. PRIA initiatives promote continuous and systematic organizational learning and reflection as the basis upon which new capacity building occurs. PRIA employs a wide variety of methods to enhance and strengthen capacity at the individual, institutional and sectoral levels, and seeks to play a leadership role in promoting innovative capacity building approaches and methods. By disseminating information about its capacity building efforts, PRIA aims to engage more and more people in such efforts. Information is disseminated through means of the Internet and through media, including print and electronic media, journals, conferences and academia.


Box 67 ⇒ CSO Capacity Development in Guyana (Recommendations 6 & 14)

The Canadian Hunger Foundation (CHF) sees partnerships as the foundation of its approach to strengthening the capacity of community organizations to design and deliver poverty reduction programs, and to engage in dialogue and collaboration with local government. In their Building Community Capacity project in Guyana, three main categories of capacity building support are used, particularly with rural and isolated Guyanese CSOs: technical assistance through training, study and exchange visits or other forms of learning; organizational support, which includes program and sub-project funding for learning-by-doing; and organizational development.

CHF has learned that successful partnerships for capacity development:

- Rely to the greatest extent possible on the capacities of the local organization and engaging local expertise including through peer learning.
- Understand that capacity building occurs with both partners.
- Use participatory methods to identify what type of capacity building assistance is needed.
- Use a coaching and mentoring approach rather than merely training.
- Cater to the organization so that capacity development is tailor-made rather than mass-delivered
- Balance short-term capacity development within the longer-term goals of project support.

CHF sees capacity enhancement derived by the Southern partner as an indicator of the effectiveness of North-South civil society partnerships and of the value-added of the Northern partner.

Extracted from: “Building Community Capacity: Key to Enhancing Southern Incipient CSO Performance in Delivering Effective Aid.” Case Study (2008).

146. Increasingly, practitioners and members of the donor community that support civil society capacity development stress that there is no single blueprint for good practice in capacity building (Hailey and James 2006, pg. 4 referencing UNDP 2006, DAC 2006, Lipson and Warren 2006, James and Wrigley 2006). Highlights from the literature offer a few additional guidelines for capacity development methodologies:

- Respond to capacity gaps identified by CSOs themselves, such as through organizational self-assessment tools.
- Start where the organization is at, including acknowledging and building on its strengths rather than merely addressing weaknesses (e.g. appreciative inquiry).
- Extend over time versus one-off so that the CSO has time to absorb the lessons learned into its organization, and can be supported to adjust to the changes, and to address emerging capacity needs that may result.
CSO PARTNERSHIPS

147. Central to CSOs’ effectiveness is the nature of the partnerships they forge – partnerships among CSOs, partnerships between Northern and Southern CSOs, and partnerships between CSOs and their primary constituents.

**RECOMMENDATION 17A:** CSOs should be supported in their efforts to coordinate their efforts through umbrella organizations, working groups, networks or coalitions.

**RECOMMENDATION 17B:** Northern and Southern CSOs should work together to define their respective areas of comparative advantage and appropriate division of labour to encourage Southern CSOs to thrive and strengthen their place in society over time.

148. In this section we seek to answer the question:

What are some examples and features of successful international or country-level CSO partnerships?

149. CSO partnerships can take a range of forms and can range from information sharing to the formation of umbrella organizations to CSO-led program-based approaches. Intra-CSO meetings and workshops can be used for the purposes of information sharing, as can web-based technologies. The case of Civil Society Inclusion in Food Security and Poverty Elimination Network (CIFPEN) in Vietnam provides an example of a relatively light mechanism for sharing information.

**Box 68 - Information sharing in Vietnam (Recommendation 9c)**

A coalition of CSOs in Vietnam, CIFPEN produces an e-newsletter in which information on funding and training opportunities, updates on policy developments in the country, and features on CSOs’ initiatives and approaches are all provided. In its early days, the intention had been to establish an inventory of CSO projects and programs in a web-based format. However, both network members and organizers were challenged to find sufficient time to feed and maintain the system in the face of competing priorities such as implementation of their activities and fundraising.

*Based on: Paterson (2007).*

150. We have already seen a number of examples of CSO umbrellas or coalitions throughout this paper, particularly in terms of coordinated efforts for policy dialogue such as with Jubilee 2000, the Global Campaign Against Poverty, the CSO coalition for basic education in Burkina Faso, and FEMNET in Kenya. We also saw the example of the Canadian Coalition for Youth and HIV/AIDS working in service delivery and capacity development.

**North-South Partnerships**

151. Recommendation 17a suggests that donors should support such initiatives. Resources are needed, and mechanisms need to be put in place so that donor procedures and regulations encourage rather than impeding CSO partnerships. CIDA’s support for the Uniterra Program in the following text box serves as an example both of donor support for a partnership arrangement and of how how Northern and Southern CSOs can effectively work together in partnership.
Uniterra is both a development program with operations in 13 African, Asian and Latin American countries, and a public engagement program in Canada. The program was designed and is being implemented by two Canadian NGOs: Centre d’étude et de coopération internationale (CECI) and World University Service Canada (WUSC). It is co-funded by CIDA’s Partnership branch, by the volunteers and partners, and by CECI and WUSC.

Uniterra’s goals are, on the one hand, to build the capacities of local development actors in targeted sectors and in gender equality. On the other hand, it aims to enhance the support of individual Canadians for development cooperation efforts, by informing the Canadian public through networks of partners and volunteers, and providing opportunities for tangible engagement in international solidarity work.

A five-year program, each year Uniterra mobilizes more than 400 Canadian and Southern volunteers to directly support over 120 local partners, who in turn strengthen the capacities of more than 800 grassroots organizations. The program also helps to bring together Canadian and Southern partners in relationships of mutual exchange and reciprocity.

Uniterra’s implementation strategy is based on the principles of aid effectiveness which it has adapted to take into account the perspectives and contributions of Southern and Northern civil society to development. Highlights include:

- Local ownership and coordination - A five-year sectoral action plan is developed by local program partners (5–10 organizations per sector/country). The plan lays out priority activities and methods for capacity building within the sector and the organizations. A sectoral program management committee is formed through which partners set annual goals and allocate program resources (volunteers, exchanges, sectoral funds) to attain these goals each year. The sectoral committee also monitors progress and reports on results with the support of Uniterra field staff and volunteers. The sectoral committee represents a genuine forum for dialogue and coordinated action between CSOs in a given sector, thus contributing to mutual capacity building and development of synergies. The committee members are supported in their analysis of the relevant policies and programs, and their capacity for policy dialogue is strengthened. In many cases, national authorities assist with and participate in the work of these committees.

- Managing for results - Uniterra has set up a performance measurement and reporting system based on quantitative and qualitative indicators to track its targeted development results (not, for example, volunteer placement targets). Uniterra is in a position to determine how many people developed skills; the types of organizational capacities developed (management, governance, marketing, advocacy, mobilization, etc.) and by how many organizations; and the number of women who benefit. Local partners are supported to measure the results of their activities for the populations they serve, making an effort to disaggregate the results by sex.


152. The next two cases help to further illustrate the characteristics of sound North-South CSO partnerships along the lines of recommendation 17b. Other cases already reviewed in previous sections of this paper include the case of ForoSalud-CARE Peru, the Jubilee 2000 coalition, Progresso-CODE, the ACI-PRSP Fund, and the CHF capacity development initiative in Guyana, amongst others. The discussion later in this section on principles and codes of conduct offers some further guidance.
Management Advancement Systems Association, Inc. (MASAI) and the Ecumenical Institute for Labor Education and Research (EILER) are Philippines service support organizations founded to work with NGOs, peoples’ organizations and workers.

In the 90s, they were able to pilot a new form of partnership with a Northern CSO, Cordaid. Through this partnership they spearheaded the establishment of funding mechanisms, coupled with capacity building of partner organizations. These mechanisms were managed by committees made up of representatives of local groups and other experts. MASAI had a similar relationship with Caritas-Neerlandica in the field of early childhood education in which much of the decision-making for the program was put in the hands of an Early Childhood Care and Development Committee. The Filipino CSOs took the lead in information sharing and coordination around the themes of the funds – children’s education and training for labour leaders.

This form of Philippines-based partnership arrangement provided many advantages to the Northern CSOs involved, in terms of more relevant programming, efficiency and accountability, including accountability towards constituents of the Filipino organizations.

The programs ran for many years but ended when the Northern CSO was no longer able to provide funding due to organizational changes and financial constraints. However, a number of initiatives launched under these programs carried on. For example, the Early Childhood Care and Development Committee had anticipated the change and had recommended that a sustainability plan be part of all the proposals submitted to it. This helped the implementers continue their programs after Northern CSO support had ceased.


The social and political changes in Indonesia over the last four decades have been influenced by cooperation between Northern and Indonesian CSOs.

CSOs in Indonesia emerged as part of the struggle against the colonizers. NGOs working on development and advocacy started during late 1960s when the military took power. While the military imposed a top-down economic development model, the main rationale for the emergence of NGOs in Indonesia was to promote alternative development models and practices. Donor countries and institutions officially supported what CSOs considered to be a repressive government, whereas the Northern NGOs began cooperating with their newly emerging NGO counterparts in Indonesia.

In the post-Suharto era, almost all Northern NGOs working in Indonesia were involved in democratization programs. Northern and Indonesian NGOs also contributed significant efforts to peace-building processes. With the emergence of a more stable political situation in Indonesia, many Northern NGOs have changed their approach, and have become implementing agencies, creating competition for funding with local NGOs.

Indonesian NGOs have suggested the need to consider how relationships have evolved to see if it is not possible to renew the sort of cooperation and solidarity that Northern and Indonesian NGOs enjoyed in the past when they jointly faced the dictatorship regime in the past.

153. As the examples above demonstrate, the concept of local ownership by Southern CSOs is a central element of successful North-South partnerships. Southern CSOs are increasingly demanding a rebalancing of the collaborative relationships with Northern CSO partners, so that features that they most value in their relationships with Northern CSOs can be reinforced, including the following:

- opportunities for networking and dialogue;
- information sharing and access to information not easily accessed by Southern CSOs;
- access of Southern CSO voices in policy dialogue in the North or internationally;
- bonds of solidarity, moral and political support;
- building awareness of development issues in the North;
- influencing development-relevant policy issues in the North;
- sharing specific competencies or information; and
- occasional policy work in the South when it may be difficult for local CSOs to speak (Chapman and Wendoh 2007, pg. 8).

**Codes of conduct**

154. A specific area of CSO collaboration and partnership involves the combining of efforts to enhance accountability to their constituencies and to donors and governments. Such efforts have been or are being pursued at country level and beyond. The case of the *ONG por la Transparencia*’s joint standards of information sharing in Colombia was featured in the discussion on Accountability. Internationally, we feature two cases below: the International NGO Charter, and the International Planned Parenthood’s approach to accountability through accreditation.

**Box 72 – The INGO Accountability Charter (Recommendations 10d, 12c & 17a)**

The INGO Accountability Charter is a voluntary charter signed by 17 international NGOs (INGOs). Among the Charter’s nine principles is transparency, whereby signatories commit to openness, transparency, and honesty about their structures, mission, policies, and activities, and to communicating actively to stakeholders about themselves, by making information publicly available. Some of the practical implications of this principle include:

- reporting – compliance with relevant governance, financial accounting, and reporting requirements in the countries in which they are based and operate, and annual reporting on activities, financial performance, and sources of funds;
- audit – compliance with relevant financial reporting and audit laws and practices; and
- accuracy of information – adherence to generally accepted standards of technical accuracy and honesty in presenting and interpreting data and research.

Another of the Charter’s principles is that of good governance, under which signatories commit to:

- a governance mechanism that includes structures for supervision and evaluation of the chief executive, and overseeing program and budget matters;
- written procedures defining the appointment, responsibilities and terms of members of the governing body, and regular general meeting to appoint and replace its members; and
- listening to stakeholders’ suggestions on how to improve the INGOs’ work, and encouraging input from people whose interests may be directly affected.
The charter also contains principles on ethical fundraising, professional management, non-discrimination, effective programs, responsible advocacy, independence, and respect for universal principles grounded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A suggestion that emerged as part of the AG-CS’ consultation process was that this charter could be expanded to address the increasing presence of large INGOs based in developing countries.


---

**Box 73 ⇒ Accountability Through Accreditation – The International Planned Parenthood Federation’s Approach (Recommendations 10d, 12c, 17a & b)**

The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), a global network of autonomous member associations, is one of the first INGOs to implement a process of accreditation. The accreditation system helps to ensure that IPPF’s mission, vision, and values are shared by all associations, and that agreed principles, policies and standards are respected and implemented consistently across the Federation, regardless of the national context in which they are working.

IPPF’s accreditation tool is used to assess and review the work of all its member associations. It embraces their diversity while ensuring that they uphold essential international standards and observe best practice. Importantly, this guarantee of excellence is consistent across the globe.

Accreditation offers a guarantee to external partners that the association adheres to internationally recognized transparent governance, management, financial and monitoring systems, making them partners who come with a guarantee that they adhere to the same principles as those highlighted in the Paris Declaration, from a civil society perspective.

With five years of experience, IPPF has emerged as a leader within civil society for accountability through accreditation, receiving visits and requests for information from Transparency International, the International HIV/AIDS Alliance and the Emergency Capacity Building Consortium of NGOs Project.

An interesting aspect of the IPPF case is that for CSOs that do not at first meet the standards, the organization will support and assist them to address areas needing to be strengthened.


---

155. Also noteworthy is the Code of Good Practice for NGOs Responding to HIV AIDS developed by NGOs to help guide their work by providing a framework to which they can commit and be held accountable. Drawing on 20 years of knowledge and experience, this code sets out key principles, practice and evidence base required for successful responses to HIV (extracted from http://www.hivcode.org/search-the-code/). Further examples of international agreements, charters, declarations on legitimacy, transparency and accountability adopted or recognized by CSOs in a specific country or worldwide is available via CIVICUS at http://www.civicus.org/lta/lta-guidelines/5/283-lta-guidelines.

156. At the country level, a number of civil society umbrella organizations in both developed and developing countries have put in place principles to guide their work with their civil society partners and the individuals and communities that make up their primary constituents. Principles are often accompanied by or form part of codes of conduct that address the practicalities of CSO behaviour in these partnerships. The establishment of Ethical Principles and Minimum Standards initiated by and for Cambodian CSOs is featured below. Also featured is the example of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation’s (CCIC) Partnership Principles designed to
guide its member CSOs in their relationships with their developing country partners, along with a *Code of Ethics* to which its members are bound.

**Box 74 – An NGO Code of Principles and Standards in Cambodia (Recommendations 10d, 12c & 17a)**

In 2004, the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia established the NGO Good Practice Project as a result of growing pressure from both within and outside the NGO sector for NGOs to be more accountable. A working group of representatives of the NGO community developed the *Code of Ethical Principles and Minimum Standards for NGOs in Cambodia* incorporating feedback from a wider audience of NGOs and other development stakeholders.

This code aims to maintain and enhance standards of good organizational practice and to ensure public trust in the integrity of the individuals and organizations that make up the NGO sector, and the effectiveness of NGO programs. Nine ethical principles were established: partnership, independence, cooperation, transparency, accountability, non-political affiliation, non-discrimination, non-violence, respect for human rights and communities.

The initiative is developing a system of self-certification and also provides opportunities for NGOs to come together to learn about best practices in accountability.

*Extracted from: Sothath (2008) and Cooperation Committee for Cambodia (2008).*

**Box 75 – CCIC’s Code of Ethics and Partnership Principles (Recommendations 10d, 12c, 17a & b)**

In the early 1990s, members of CCIC developed a membership-wide *Code of Ethics*. Ratified and adopted in 1995, the *Code of Ethics* delineates the minimum ethical standards that the organization’s members must observe in the areas of governance, organizational integrity, management/human resources, financial management, and communications for the purpose of raising funds. It is based on a philosophy of self-certification and peer accountability and supported by a broader ethics program.

In 2004, CCIC added a set of principles and standards regarding North-South partnerships to the code. While the topic of partnerships had been discussed for many years it was the new political climate following September 11th that pushed them to develop the principles, as new security legislation seemed to threaten many of traditional CCIC partnerships. The principles, developed over a two-year period through a process that included Southern CSO participation, address many issues, including unequal North-South power relations.

One of the principles states that “Partnerships should embody equity. Acknowledging that inequalities often exist as a result of power dynamics, especially in funding relations, partners should strive for equitable partnerships”. Another principle stresses that “Partnerships should be vehicles for long-term accompaniment that support the right of peoples to determine and carry out activities that further their own development options, through their CSOs” (CCIC 2008a, pg. 11).

CCIC supports its membership in implementing the code and principles through workshops on ethical practice and publication of supporting documentation on such issues as managing conflict of interest, and fundraising.

*Extracted from: CCIC (2008a) and [http://www.ccic.ca/e/002/ethics.shtml](http://www.ccic.ca/e/002/ethics.shtml)*
157. In June 2008, CSOs meeting in Paris announced the launch of their ambitious CSO-led global process to raise awareness and develop guidelines related to CSO effectiveness, and invited other stakeholders to engage with them in this process, under modalities to be developed (CONCORD 2008). The AG-CS proposes as part of the forward agenda that CSOs be encouraged in this process of dialogue and consensus building to develop CSO effectiveness principles, guidelines and good practices.

158. The AG-CS further recommends that each stakeholder group commit to individually and jointly explore, adapt and pilot the type of good practices presented here, and to track progress on these practices to inform ongoing learning and dialogue. Consideration is being given to the establishment of a multi-stakeholder reference group to help move such a process along between now and the next HLF in 2010/11. Until such a group is established, readers interested in participating in such a piloting exercise are invited to contact the authors to express their interest via the AG-CS extranet site or bilaterally with AG-CS members.

159. The purpose of this paper has been to point to some initiatives and directions for good practice. It is meant to serve as a reference document that can assist stakeholders to identify areas of good practice from which they may choose to learn, and points to resources that they can turn to for additional information.
CASE STUDIES CONSULTED

Cases submitted to the AG-CS, sorted by country. Cases marked with an arrow are included in the *Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness Case Book*. Additional cases included in the paper are mentioned in the bibliography.

Afghanistan: Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan (MISFA) – submitted by Afghanistan Task Force, CIDA

Africa: Education SWAps In Africa: Lessons for CSOs – submitted by OISE

- Africa: Just Budgets: Increasing Accountability and Aid Effectiveness through Gender Budget Analysis – submitted by One World Action

- Bangladesh: BRAC – no formal submission

Cambodia: NGO Accountability: Code of Ethical Principles and Minimum Standards – submitted by NGO Forum on Cambodia

Canada: *L’action communautaire : Une contribution essentielle à l’exercice de la citoyenneté et du développement social du Québec* – submitted by Government of Quebec

- Canada: Uniterpa Program - *Centre d’étude et de coopération internationale (CECI)* and World University Service Canada (WUSC) – submitted by CECI

- Colombia: London – Cartagena – Bogota Process – submitted by Government of Colombia

- Colombia: *ONG por la Transparencia* – Transparency and Accountability of NGOs – submitted by *ONG por la Transparencia Colombia*

- Croatia: National Strategy for Creating an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development – submitted by Government of Croatia

- Democratic Republic of Congo: Butoke: Grassroots Development with a Heart – submitted by Butoke

Democratic Republic of Congo: *L’efficacité de l’aide et la prise en charge démocratique : le rôle de la société civile et les avancées démocratiques en RDC*— submitted by *Développement et paix*
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➢ Ghana HIPC Watch – submitted by Social Enterprise Development Foundation of West Africa (SEND)

➢ Guyana: Building Community Capacity: Key to Enhancing Southern Incentive CSO Performance in Delivering Effective Aid – submitted by Canadian Hunger Foundation

➢ Honduras: ACI-PRSP Multi-donor Fund for Strengthening Participation of Honduran Civil Society in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy – submitted by Trocaire Ireland

➢ India’s National Policy on the Voluntary Sector – submitted by Government of India

Indonesia: Fight TB Program in Indonesia: (in Aid Effectiveness: The role of CSOs in making aid work for citizens: An Analysis based on World Vision’s Experience) – submitted by World Vision

Indonesia: North-South CSOs Cooperation: Indonesian Context – International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID) – submitted by IBON/Reality of Aid Network
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/6F72014425CFCB718525749E006C1A3E00OpenDocument

➢ International: CIVICUS Civil Society Index – submitted by CIVICUS

International: The GAVI Alliance – submitted by GAVI Alliance
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/4F790FB4EFA02167852574A4004DD05E0OpenDocument

➢ International / Africa: Impact Planning and Learning through Constituency Voice: Keystone’s Accountability Method Links Funders, Implementers and Primary Constituents – submitted by Keystone
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/85ADB41D0BAC878D852574740070C46D0OpenDocument

International: UNDP ART Initiative

➢ International: International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) Accreditation and Aid Effectiveness – submitted by IPPF
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/6D66E1A5C4F3B94852574420046612C7OpenDocument

Kenya: Integrating Gender in the PRS Process in Kenya – submitted by FEMNET

Mali: National Consultations on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness in Mali
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/46E4FECB0F437F38525749E0070C46D0OpenDocument

➢ Mali: Plate-forme des Droits économiques, sociaux et culturels au Mali (DESC) – submitted by Réseau IMPACT
Mozambique: Complementing Program-based Approaches Through Civil Society-led Projects: The Experience of the Coastal Rural Support Program (Mozambique) – submitted by Aga Khan Foundation Canada

Mozambique: Consequences of Public Health Policies on Aid Effectiveness and Civil Society Organizations in Mozambique: The Case Study of SALAMA – submitted by Primates World Relief and Development Fund (PWRDF), Cooperation Canada-Mozambique (COCAMO) and SALAMA Mozambique

Mozambique: Lessons of a CSO Project and the SWAP in Education in Mozambique: Case Study on Issues in Alignment with Government Sector Strategies for CSOs – submitted by Progresso/CODE

Nordic+ Study of Support Models for CSOs at Country Level – submitted by Norad

Peru: Improving the Health of the Poor: A Rights-Based Approach Program – submitted by CARE Peru

Peru: Making accountability to disaster affected people a reality: Learning about accountability in CARE Peru’s emergency response – submitted by CARE UK

Philippines: IBON Partnership in Education for Development (IPED) – submitted by IBON Foundation Philippines
http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/extranet/policy/ExtCivilSociety.nsf/vLUAllDocsbyidEn/722bd37412f00802852556b7b00592e47/8b79f3f5b01876a8525746f6050ca5?OpenDocument

Philippines: On CSO Accountability and CSO National Coordination – submitted by Management Advancement Systems Association, Inc. (MASAI) and Ecumenical Institute for Labor Education and Research (EILER) – Philippines

Philippines: The Masai-CARITAS Neerlandica Partnership: Where Communities Spearhead Early Childhood Care and Development Programs – submitted by MASAI

Senegal: Création d’un centre de recherche indépendant en analyse des politiques économiques et sociales – Consortium pour le recherche économique et sociale (CRES) Sénégal – submitted by CRES

Senegal: Processus national de définition et d’application d’une politique publique sectorielle: le cas de la Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale du Sénégal – submitted by Réseau IMPACT

UK: Partnership Program Arrangements – submitted by DFID, UK
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