

Analysis of six EU Country Roadmaps for Engagement with Civil Society and recommendations for the future

Contents

1. Introduction and Structure of the Analysis.....	1
2. Summary of findings of the analysis of six country roadmaps	2
3. Recommendations for implementation and review of the roadmaps	5
4. Findings per country (summary)	8
HONDURAS	8
KENYA.....	8
KYRGYZSTAN	10
PHILIPPINES	11
PALESTINE	12
SENEGAL	13

1. Introduction and Structure of the Analysis

Building on the findings of the [Mutual Engagement Report](#) regarding the EU Country Roadmaps For Engagement With Civil Society (referred to as roadmap or country roadmap in the present document), CONCORD decided to analyse six roadmaps in detail (Honduras, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Philippines, Palestine, Senegal)¹. The roadmaps were selected and analysed according to a specific set of criteria, via a desk analysis followed by consultation with a selected number of local NGO offices and partners who have been involved in the roadmap process.

The objectives of the analysis were:

1. Keep up the momentum around a very promising tool that aims to enhance engagement between the EU and CSOs in a strategic and structured manner.
2. Strengthen Concord's information, analysis and knowledge sharing around EU country roadmaps for engagement with civil society.

¹Lead of analysis per organization: ACT Alliance EU; AVSI; SOS Children's Villages International; Plan International; Care International; World Vision. For any questions, please contact: Karine Sohet (Concord EU delegations subgroup co-chair): karine.sohet@actalliance.eu

3. Analyse the quality of 3-5 of roadmaps available and complement the EC internal quality assessment in this regard.
4. Complement and also underpin the Concord Mutual Engagement Report recommendations.

During the analysis period (April-June 2015), the implementation of the roadmaps was in its early stages. The analysis therefore focused on the roadmap document and its action plan, and the role of civil society in its elaboration, rather than progress in its implementation.

A seminar gathering all Civil Society Focal Points of EU Delegations in Brussels at the end of June 2015 was the first opportunity for CONCORD to present the outcome of its assessment.

CONCORD has been actively involved in the EU Country Roadmap process since the beginning and is pleased to see increasing institutionalised dialogue between EU Delegations and civil society. EU Delegation's and CSOs efforts in this regard are very much welcomed. This desk analysis presents constructive recommendations to strengthen the roadmap as a tool for engagement with civil society.

2. Summary of findings of the analysis of six country roadmaps

2.1 Outreach and inclusiveness regarding the donor community:

- Inside the EU Delegation different levels of engagement were noted, with the best practice being when EU Heads of Cooperation, of Political Sections and of Mission all endorsed the roadmap.
- There are different levels of engagement from the donor community in EU country roadmaps.
 - o The best cases identified were when the roadmap is co-signed by some EU member states or when EU member states or national governments are mentioned as responsible for a specific action in the action plan of the roadmap.
 - o In one case (Burkina Faso roadmap) actors beyond the EU Delegation and EU member states (Canada and Switzerland) have endorsed the roadmap.
 - o From the 6 roadmaps analysed, for example in the roadmap of Palestine, the EU together with Norway and Switzerland engage to establish an EU coordination mechanism dedicated to civil society, which highlights concrete responsibilities of action and is therefore very positive.
 - o 4 out of 6 roadmaps mention other major donors in the country or donor coordination networks to involve in the roadmap.
 - o In 2 out of 6 there is no mention or no inclusion or endorsement of the broader donor community beyond the EU Delegation.
- Joint programming status and initiatives (which is dealt with in one section of the roadmap) is also treated very differently across the roadmaps analysed, either being well described or not described at all.

2.2 Outreach and inclusiveness regarding CSOs:

- In all cases (regardless of the structure of the roadmap), CSOs are mainstreamed into all sectors of intervention and their roles are praised and recognised in the analytical part.

- While some roadmaps mention CSO participation in the development of the roadmap, based on the desk analysis and roadmap text it is not always clear whether CSO inputs have been taken on board or not. However, when we asked our partners, they said that CSO inputs are largely reflected in the roadmaps. They also mentioned that issues highlighted in the roadmap were subject of discussion between the EU delegation and civil society organisations for a number of years already.
- The role of CSOs in the implementation of the roadmap's action plan needs to be further highlighted. Clearer, concrete actions that relate to all concerned actors, notably national public authorities, would have strengthened the implementation of the roadmap. In some instances, processes are on-going that were not mentioned in the roadmap. (see also points in tools and mechanisms).
- The roadmaps tend to focus on national rather than local level CSOs and platforms, in particular when looking at measures which aim to strengthen CSO capacity. Smaller, local CSOs are not sufficiently taken into account and support to grass-root organisations is rarely mentioned. This confirms the Mutual Engagement Report findings on the CSO roadmap development/consultation process.²

2.3 Tools and mechanism:

- The structure of the roadmaps follows the three CSO Communication (COM (2012) 492) priorities. In certain cases, the roadmap also lists the sectors of concentration of the national indicative programme (NIP) and/or mentions human rights as a separate priority in addition.
- The roadmaps also all reflect guidance and the template that was issued to EU Delegations from DG DEVCO. However, while all measures available have been used (analysis, policy dialogue, funding), it is not always in a balanced and most relevant way.
- The action plan is often not tangible enough, whilst we consider it the most important part/plan for the implementation of the roadmaps. This is in particular in relation to:
 - o the baseline information available in the analysis section of the roadmap. For example, when sectors of concentration are part of the action plan the baseline information is mostly missing or only very briefly available.
 - o Indicators are often too vague and broad. There is one example of good practice in the Senegal roadmap where different indicators are introduced for actions regarding the national government and CSOs.
 - o Actors that are responsible for the implementation of actions are sometimes mentioned but not always. In the Senegal roadmap actors are clearly mentioned for each action, which is a good practice.
 - o The timeline of implementation is often too vague or missing completely. In those cases where it is mentioned, it seems very ambitious.
 - o Country specific contexts are not sufficiently reflected in the action plan (even when they are available in the analytical sections).

² 65% of respondents to the underlying report survey stated that outreach and inclusiveness regarding CSO participation has improved with the roadmap but it is still not inclusive enough, notably regarding CSOs outside the capital or smaller local CSOs.

- The structure of the roadmap makes it difficult to identify whether issues stated in the analytical sections have been translated into the action plan or not – in some instances, needs identified in the analysis were not addressed in the action plan. More coherence between analysis, objectives, actions, results and indicators is recommended.
 - The action plan does not always identify financial envelopes to facilitate its implementation. When funding instruments, including EU member state funding envelopes, are mentioned for particular action areas, there is no mention of dedicated amounts.
- Certain country contexts can justify a decision not to publish the full roadmap. However, our analysis revealed an inconsistent approach to the publication of the roadmap - in some difficult political contexts the full text was available whilst in some less difficult contexts it was not. An overview of available roadmaps on capacity4dev, the European Commission knowledge sharing platform on development, is positive, however also other dissemination methods might prove more relevant and the roadmap should notably be available on EU delegation websites.

2.4 Content and quality:

- In general, there is a thorough analysis of the situation, in particular in relation to the enabling environment in the analytical parts of the roadmap. One notable exception is Kenya, which fails to mention the draft Statute Law Bill which would severely restrict CSO space.
- The three priority areas stated in the CSO Communication (conducive environment, structured participation, capacity building) are generally well reflected, and past and on-going EU Delegation work on the three areas is well described. This represents a great contribution to the CSO Communication objectives, and will lead to enhanced awareness for all actors involved.
- The roadmap is mostly used as a tool to map existing on-going processes and mechanisms that are relevant for CSOs, but does not yet constitute a comprehensive strategy.
- In certain roadmaps good practices regarding CSO participation in EU programming and monitoring exercises is reported. What is missing is a more detailed description of CSOs role and responsibilities in the implementation of EU sectoral priorities and details on EU and Member States' programmes that include a civil society component.
- Clearer measures on engagement/consultation/dialogue should be mainstreamed throughout the roadmap and action plan. In the area of enabling environment, in particular, dialogues must become more institutionalised. When human rights are identified as a priority in the action plan, an institutionalisation of structured dialogue with CSOs can be noted (for example Kyrgyzstan), but more explicit mention would be good and necessary so that also other sectors or action plan priority areas can learn by example.
- There seems to be a focus on national level. Local, regional and European/international level processes are either not tackled sufficiently or at all, even though it is clear from the guidelines that they should be.

3. Recommendations for implementation and review of the roadmaps

Bearing in mind that the process of developing, implementing and reviewing the roadmaps is as important as the roadmap document itself and building on the outcome of our analysis, we make the following recommendations:

3.1 Regarding the process

- **The roadmap as a tool is very promising and the process needs to be kept alive. It is important to ensure a regular dialogue with civil society on the implementation of the roadmap and on developments regarding enabling environment at national level.**
- This will also require an intensified attention on Roadmap's publication (when possible), including on EU Delegations' websites.
- **The spectrum of CSOs involved in the roadmap process could be enlarged and an effort should be made to better involve small local CSOs, including addressing their needs and expectations. Mechanisms that proved useful in certain countries could be replicated in others, for example in relation to online consultation.**
- For a meaningful and consistent engagement of CSOs in the process, it is important to make sure that their inputs and views are reflected in the roadmap and its action plan. Feedback should be provided to CSOs on how and why their inputs have been taken into account or otherwise.
- **Inclusiveness and participation of CSOs is also directly connected to accessibility and level of information provided on the roadmaps' process, which was often structured around ad hoc consultations. Simple and user friendly information about EU strategies and engagement with civil society should be made available, for example via the EU Delegation website. Posting a calendar for CSOs' consultations and related information on the EU Delegations' websites, including specific agendas, would favour inclusiveness, and make the process more effective and concrete.**
- To ensure consistency among different tools and mechanisms available, roadmap consultations could be more directly linked to CSOs and other stakeholders consultations on broader policy priorities, EU programming, the Gender Action Plan and Human Rights Strategies. This would also facilitate a more integrated approach and participation of a broader range of interlocutors at EU Delegations (people dealing with bilateral programmes and not only CSO focal points) and at CSO level.
- **The link with both national and thematic programming needs to be strengthened and the 2017 mid-term review offers an occasion to do so.** In particular it is important to understand how the roadmap action plan will be translated into practice, how it will be reflected in the priority sectors of the country Multiannual Indicative Programme, and whether EU bilateral programmes and thematic programmes will include civil society components. This point is also relevant for joint programming initiatives with EU member states and other donors.
- **Greater engagement and involvement of the EU Delegations Political section, different Cooperation Sections and Head of Delegation and Missions from Member States in the**

roadmap process is needed in order to maximise the impact of the roadmap and civil society engagement.

- Involvement in and endorsement of the roadmap by EU Member States and other institutional donors should be actively promoted in all countries.
- In order to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the tool and process, the implementation of the roadmaps (and updates) must be monitored and good practices shared. Annual updates (if undertaken) represent a good opportunity for a joint evaluation with all stakeholders.
- Quality assessment and feedback from EU Delegations, CSOs and other stakeholders should be taken into account in the revision of the roadmap template and guidelines for future review and/or the next generation of roadmaps.

3.2 Regarding the content

- **While roadmaps are useful in highlighting existing processes and tools regarding EU support to civil society, their strategic value could be enhanced by integrating more concrete and country specific objectives, indicators and actions.**
- Roadmaps focus almost exclusively on analysis and actions at national level. The role of civil society at local, regional, EU and international levels should also be addressed as foreseen in the guidelines.
- **Implementation needs to be process and context oriented which means that the roadmap action plan, while being as specific as possible, also needs flexibility and regular review and adaptation.**
- There should be more coherence between analysis, objectives, actions, results and indicators, and action plans should better address the issues identified in the analytical part.
- **The action plans should be more explicit about the roles and responsibilities of different actors including CSOs, local and governmental authorities and other donors.**
- **Integrating a section on risks and assumptions, a timeline for the implementation of the action plan and information on the financial means and tools at disposal would greatly improve the monitoring at implementation stage of the roadmap.**
- Indicators should be sharper, more actor and process-oriented, and specific enough to evaluate roadmaps' impact on the development of the three priority areas mentioned in the CSO Communication.
- **CSO consultation mechanisms (both existing and/or new) should be specifically introduced in all roadmap action plan priority areas. This would support institutionalisation, strategic direction and stronger CSO participation in the different priority areas.**

3.3. Regarding the implementation

- **Implementation should be subject to regular dialogue and joint decisions with CSOs and other actors involved in the process.**
- **The action plan should be subject to a joint reality check on capacities, interest and on-going initiatives from all sides – EU Delegation, CSOs, EU member states national government and local authorities – and risks and assumptions should be discussed and addressed.**
- **A joint monitoring process should be established** based on an agreed timeline and activity plans detailing the responsibilities of the different actors for the different objectives of the action plan. Progress and challenges should be discussed on a regular basis.
- Any difficulties EU Delegations have in terms of human resources, local knowledge, time and finance should be taken into account and addressed (e.g. with the roadmap facility) at implementation stage. The same is true for CSOs with peer support needed between INGOs, national level NGOs and networks, and grassroots organisations.
- **Activities in the area of capacity building should also address the needs of local and small CSOs and should take place at different levels and in different forms according to the needs and context.** Capacity building activities should be designed and implemented with the involvement of CSOs including those who will benefit and could include:
 - o Organisational development (eg. Leadership capacities),
 - o Coordination of actions with diverse CSO actors,
 - o Sectoral dialogues and advocacy,
 - o 'Learning by doing' rather than standard trainings
- Terms of Reference and outcomes of mappings that are frequently envisaged in the roadmap under action plan area A should be discussed with CSOs.
- **In general, EU Delegations should explore ways of facilitating civil society spaces for dialogue between CSOs and public authorities through the implementation of the roadmap.**

4. Findings per country (summary)

Full country analyses are available on concordnet or on request from CONCORD:
secretariat@concordeurope.org; Tel: +32 2 743 87 60

HONDURAS

The summary of the EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on [capacity4dev](http://capacity4dev.org).³

The full version of the Honduras roadmap is not publicly available upon demand of the EU Delegation. Therefore, only the summary version was analysed, limiting the scope of this analysis. While it is mentioned that the roadmap was built upon consultation with CSO, there is no mention of the involvement (or otherwise) of other donors – EU member states or others – present in the country.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis of the summary are:

What is good?

- Different EU processes/actions that are on-going and of interest for CSOs are included in the summary, in particular the ones related to: 1) dialogue on human rights; 2) the monitoring of the Association Agreement (addressing trade, cooperation and political dialogue); and 3) current sectoral dialogues in line with the country priorities.

What needs improvement?

- The indicators are too general and though they refer to the actions/activities to be undertaken in the implementation of the roadmap, there is no clarity on who, when and how these actions are going to be implemented.

KENYA

The summary of the EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on [capacity4dev](http://capacity4dev.org).⁴

The full text of the “Kenya EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society 2014-2017” has not been released by the EU Delegation. The analysis has therefore been undertaken on the basis of the simplified version which has been made public.

The main findings show that the structure of the Kenyan roadmap is technically well set: the priorities are in line with the EU general recommendations expressed in the official documents; the indicators are direct and measurable; the means of verification are relevant sources of information; the structure of the action table is in line with the EU guidance by including all the suggested measures; the structure of the dashboard reflects the one indicated by the EU guidelines.

³ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/honduras-hoja-de-ruta-para-el-compromiso-con-la-sociedad-civil>

⁴ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/kenya-roadmap-engagement-civil-society>

The main weakness of the roadmap is its technical attachment to the rules, without sufficient reference to the local context and to the current debate.

What is good?

- The priorities identified in the document are comprised in the three key areas of the EU engagement with CSOs, indicated in the official documents on the subject: the EU Communication of 12/09/2012 and the EU guidance 2013.
- The indicators are direct and specific.
- The means of verification are relevant sources of information.
- The structure of the action table is in line with that indicated in the EU guidance 2013 and it involves all the measures at the disposal of EU Delegation: analysis; policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation; and funding.
- Some funds available are recorded as key instruments for the engagement with CSOs.
- Within the broader priority to strengthen CSOs' capacity, emphasis is placed on partnerships, between all types of COS, to be supported by all the instruments available.
- The structure of the dashboard reflects the one indicated in the EU guidelines 2013.
- Goodwill is expressed in the dashboard to make the process of implementation as participatory as possible, by involving all the main stakeholders.

What needs improvement?

- An introductory section could be included, providing: scope and objectives of the roadmap; background information of CSOs environment in the country; and background information about EU engagement with CSOs.
- The roadmap could be endorsed by EU Member States and other relevant donors.
- Related to the legislative and regulatory framework, processes and current debates concerning the restriction of CSOs' room of manoeuvre should be addressed.
- The indicators are not adequate in number or type.
- The means of verification could be complemented by sources of information from CSOs.
- Concerning CSOs' participation in domestic policies, existing national platforms and mechanisms could be addressed.
- Concerning CSOs' participation in the programming exercise, information about existing mechanisms, set up by EU or other donors, could be added.
- In addressing CSOs capacity building, more attention could be given to local actors.
- Actions could be more precise in identifying concrete measures for the engagement with CSOs.
- Concerning funding mechanisms, all the geographic and thematic instruments available, and the related working modalities, could be included.
- The actions could be more specific in addressing key areas where CSOs participation needs to be strengthened or improved.
- Platforms and coordination mechanisms in place at national and county level, could be included
- The timeline for the period 2014-2020, for the implementation process and achievements by 2020 could be defined.
- In the dashboard, outcomes for the country priorities could be included.
- References could be made to the involvement of other actors, such as EU Member States and relevant donors, in the implementation of the roadmap.

KYRGYZSTAN

The EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on [capacity4dev](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/kyrgyzstan-roadmap-engagement-civil-society).⁵

The roadmap is also available on the website of the EU Delegation to the Kyrgyz Republic.

The Kyrgyzstan CSO roadmap gives a good overview of EU and CSO engagement areas in the country. According to partner feedback received, the priorities have been on-going for a number of years and the roadmap documents this well. However, actions are often too broad and general to be tangible and concrete, and many more actions than those stated in the document are already on-going involving multiple actors including national public authorities, which are often not mentioned in the roadmap. The priorities identified for the Kyrgyzstan roadmap go beyond the three CSO Communication priorities and list enabling environment (priority one – same as CSO Communication priority one), sectors of concentration (priority two and three) and also human rights (priority four), which is positive and in line with CSO priority areas. CSO participation in policy processes at all levels (CSO Communication priority two) and CSO capacity (CSO Communication priority three) are mainstreamed throughout.

What is good?

- The roadmap is a good first step towards a real strategy of engagement between the EU Delegation and CSOs.
- Different EU processes/actions that are on-going and that are relevant for CSOs are all described in one document.
- The roadmap structure is well thought through.
- The “mapping studies” proposed in three out of four priorities show a great willingness to understand and hopefully also address CSO needs and roles more effectively in the future.
- In particular, enabling environment considerations are well described and addressed in the action plan. A particular interest and willingness to enhance efforts in this area can be noted.
- The important roles that CSOs play in different sectors are mostly well described and addressed in the action plan,
- Dialogue with CSOs and CSO participation at national level is welcome and praised in the different sectors the roadmap is concerned with,
- Forecasts for calls for proposals under different funding instruments are shared, which is a good practice in terms of making funding opportunities more predictable.
- Important actors beyond the EU Delegation, such as EU Member States and a donor coordination network, were involved in the roadmap development.
- The roadmap is used to share some good practices and project examples.

What needs improvement?

The roadmap needs to be more tangible, particularly in regard to:

- Phrasing priorities and actions, which are mostly too broad and general;
- Baseline information (particularly on issues/actions that go beyond the enabling environment) to understand whether priorities and actions respond to identified needs in the different areas;
- The action plan structure, notably:
 - What the steps are to contribute to achieving the priority in the timeline proposed;

⁵ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/kyrgyzstan-roadmap-engagement-civil-society>

- A clearer reference to actors in the implementation of the action plan, notably CSOs and notably, how and when CSOs have a role to play in international, EU and national processes.
- CSO capacity and enhanced structuring and joint action is addressed in nearly all the priority indicators, which is positive, but there are no clear actions attached that go beyond the mapping of CSO needs in this area. There are also no next steps proposed after the mapping;
- The roadmap does not state when or how updates are foreseen;
- The roadmap seems put a focus at local and national level, with EU (e.g. programming cycle) and international processes insufficiently addressed;
- “Joint programming” and coordination between the EU Delegation and EU Member States and other donor community actors is not sufficiently addressed.

PHILIPPINES

The EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on [capacity4dev](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/philippines-roadmap-engagement-civil-society).⁶

What is good?

The Structure:

- The structure of the action table corresponds with the recommendations available in the EU guidance 2013 and uses all the measures at the disposal of EU Delegation: analysis, policy dialogue and funding.
- There is a real effort in presenting the country context and its specificities, which leads to a good understanding of the main challenges faced by local CSOs, and how the EU is aiming to address these challenges in coordination with other donors.
- The roadmap presents a section on lessons learnt which allows the identification of the main areas in need of more focus for future actions.

The Content:

- The priorities identified in the document are in line with the three key areas of the EU engagement with CSOs highlighted on the official documents on the subject: the Communication of 12/09/2012 and the EU Guidance 2013.
- Many donors' networks and groups active in country were involved in the roadmap process.
- The consultation process was inclusive through the organisation of online consultations to overcome the geographic obstacles.
- There is a thorough presentation of the six different priorities that are embedded within the country specific context.
- The indicators are clear and precise.
- The funding section in the action table presents the possible future call for proposals to address the described priorities under different funding instruments which is a positive initiative as it makes funding opportunities more predictable. Strong synergies between national policies and the EU projects supporting civil society work can be noted.

What needs improvement?

- There is no timeline provided.

⁶ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/philippines-roadmap-engagement-civil-society>

- The dashboard needs to have more consolidated information as we remain unclear on the achievements.

PALESTINE

The EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on [capacity4dev](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/palestine-roadmap-engagement-civil-society).⁷

The first EU roadmap for engagement with civil society in Palestine is a good example of concrete and effective use of this new tool by the West Bank and Gaza Strip Representation. The purpose of the roadmap to identify long-term objectives for EU cooperation with CSOs, as well as to develop a common strategic framework for the engagement of the EU with civil society at country level, is well reflected in the document. Although details on specific roles and responsibilities, implementation timeline and more coherence between objectives, proposed activities and expected results is recommended, the document is a good starting point to develop a comprehensive strategy for the EU engagement with CSOs

The document provides an extensive analysis of the enabling environment, the access to participation, the roles and capacities of local CSOs. There are clear references to gender equality, the role of youth, and inclusion of people with disabilities; however our partners suggest an increased attention to religious minorities and their integration.

The spectrum of NGOs involved in the roadmap process should be enlarged. The CONCORD survey on the consultation process shows that there was a limited involvement of CSOs such as Trade Unions and International NGOs.

What is good?

The Structure:

- Political and cooperation sections as well as Heads of Missions have been involved in the roadmap process. The roadmap has been endorsed by the EU Heads of Cooperation, EU Heads of Political Sections, and EU Heads of Mission.
- The final section includes reference to the roadmap process, and consultations' timeline. The Annual Civil Society Roadmap update is foreseen every January.

The Content:

- Policy dialogue with civil society takes place regularly to discuss relevant issues of the EU/PA Action Plan, the ENP package and, more importantly, to prepare the EU/PA sub-committees. After the EU/PA sub-committee, a debriefing with the civil society is organised to ensure follow-up.
- Contacts are also regularly maintained with CSOs to discuss specific policy issues (e.g. gender based violence)
- Since 2010, civil society has been associated to EU programming and monitoring exercises. The Single Strategic Framework mainstreams civil society into all sectors of intervention, including mainstreaming of the civil society programmes within two of the sectors of concentration.
- There is a clear reference to the support provided through the country allocation for European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and the thematic programme "Civil

⁷ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/palestine-roadmap-engagement-civil-society>

Society Organisations and Local Authorities”, including reference to coordination and synergies between these thematic programmes and bilateral cooperation.

- The roadmap also clearly refers to gender equality and related issues. Throughout 2013, pressure has been put by EU on the Palestinian Authority to ensure a gender mainstreamed participatory approach for the definition of the Palestinian National Development Plan (2014-2016).

What needs improvement?

The Structure:

- Instructions on how to fill in the template need to take into account the specificities of each country and therefore foresee certain flexibility. Many challenges for local CSOs are identified in the document. The majority of these challenges have been analysed and actions to address them have been identified. However, these actions do not always reflect the priorities and needs identified in the analysis. More coherence between analysis, objectives, actions, results and indicators is recommended.
- Paragraph four (The action) could be conceived in the form of a logical framework, in which objectives, results, activities and indicators will be presented following a more comprehensive structure. The template should include a section on factors ‘risks and assumption’ that may have a potential impact on the success or fail of the project.

The Content:

- The action plan does not always include details on the institution or actor leading the activity proposed.
- While civil society has been involved in EU programming and monitoring exercises, a more detailed description of CSOs role and responsibilities in the implementation of EC programmes (sectors of intervention) is recommended. Reference to the dialogue on programming and to specific programmes (details on EU thematic/bilateral and details on EU Member States’ programmes), including civil society components, should be added to this section.
- At the end of the document, the action plan follows the same structure as given in the DG DevCo guidance document, referring to priorities previously described, indicators and actions. However, the actions identified do not always reflect the priorities and needs identified in previous sections. Only a few of the issues previously identified are addressed through the actions proposed.

SENEGAL

The EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society can be found on capacity4dev.⁸

The full text of the roadmap is available on the website of the Delegation of the EU to the Republic of Senegal. The text refers to the consultation with civil society and a questionnaire was sent out by the EU Delegation to CSOs to provide inputs. A consultation meeting for CSOs was also organised, which a number organisation participated in.

From the analysis of the text of the roadmap for Senegal, the following conclusions can be drawn:

⁸ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-governance-civilsociety/document/senegal-feuille-de-route-pour-lengagement-avec-la-société-civile>

What is good?

- The priorities identified in the document are in line with the three key areas of the EU engagement with CSOs identified in the official documents on the subject: the Communication of 12/09/2012 and the EU Guidance 2013.
- There is a strong buy in from EU Member States present in country. The Senegal roadmap has been endorsed by six of them (Belgium, Spain, France, UK, Netherlands, Italy). There is also a clear repartition between the activities that will be carried out and/or funded between the EU Delegation and the EU Member States.
- Good practice to identify the outcomes that need to address the challenges of the civil society and the ones that need to support the Government.
- There is an obvious willingness to enter into practicalities and ensure that the expected outcomes will be reached with the development of a precise Action Plan including a dedicated sets of activities.
- The breakdown of the different work package between a) Mapping and analysis; b) Political dialogue and consultation; and c) funding for each priority is in line with what is recommended in the EU guidance 2013.
- There is quite a clear identification of the funding streams from the EU Delegation and the different EU Member States that will be mobilised for the implementation of each of the activities in the Action Plan.
- There are precise and accurate means of verification for each indicator identified.
- According to NGOs working on the field, the action plan seems largely feasible.
- The action plan seems to be based on a fairly thorough analysis of the situation and foresees some concrete actions, which, if realised, will clearly contribute to the overall goals of the roadmap (cf. the three priority areas: “conducive environment”, “structured participation” and “capacity building”).

What needs improvement?

- The timeline for the implementation of the roadmap is a little vague and definitely ambitious. It goes from October 2015 to June 2017 and there is no breakdown between the different set of activities.
- Even if the funding streams available for the implementation of each activity is identified, there is unfortunately no indication of the budget that would be available.
- The objectives that are targeting the government are in general weaker than the ones targeting the civil society in terms of activities, to make sure that the outcomes are reached. This is especially clear when looking at the priority of the roadmap that deals with the transparency of the public budgeting process where the indicators reads: “the level of transparency of the budgeting process ...” while “level” isn’t further specified, which results in the fact that the target is not clear.
- Some of the ambitious results have rather vague indicators.
- Sometimes the consistency between the activities and the link with the outcomes is difficult to make.