

INDICATOR 2 QUESTIONNAIRE – CHARACTERISTICS OF PRACTICE

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

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 No consultations in the past two years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No consultation in the past two years.
Level 2 Occasional consultations , but the quality of consultation is not sufficient (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations normally occur once a year on select development policies. ➤ The government invites some selected CSOs to the consultation. ➤ The government sets content for consultation on policies and strategies at the end of the policy making process. ➤ The format is one-directional and does not allow for dialogue, with no space for feedback or inputs (e.g. informative meeting, survey).
Level 3 Frequent consultations of mixed quality (with reference to full diversity of participation, agreed content, format allowing dialogue).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations occur more than once a year, on many but not all major development policies. ➤ The government invites a wide number of CSOs to the consultation but selection criteria are not clear. ➤ Some CSO/s may have been consulted in defining the themes for consultation and the latter take place at stages of decision-making processes where change in policy directions is possible. ➤ The format allows for dialogue and provision of feedback.
Level 4 Regular and institutionalised consultations of consistent good quality (with reference to full inclusive participation, agreed content, adequate format allowing dialogue and feedback).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations occur more than once a year and include the full range of major national development policies. ➤ Institutionalised processes are regular, predictable and transparent. ➤ Criteria for CSO participation are open and transparent, with no restrictions. ➤ The content of the consultation is set in co-operation with CSOs at stages of the decision-making process where change in policy directions is possible. ➤ The format allows for dialogue and provision of feedback.

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>A consultation around the SDGs has not started in the country yet.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No consultation around the SDGs has taken place in the country. ➤ The government may not have started a process of SDG mainstreaming yet.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Some selected CSOs are occasionally being consulted around SDG mainstreaming or around SDG implementation and monitoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no institutional space and/or an established process that facilitates CSOs participation in consultations around SDGs. ➤ The government has been carrying out ad hoc and occasional consultations with select CSOs around SDGs. These CSOs are not consulted across different phases of SDG process (e.g. determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➤ If the country undertakes a Voluntary National Review (VNR), selected CSOs are only invited to review meetings.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>A diversity of CSOs are being consulted in ad hoc processes around SDG mainstreaming, implementation, and monitoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no institutional space and/or an established process that facilitates CSO participation in consultations around SDGs. ➤ The government has been carrying out regular consultations around SDGs with stakeholders, including with a diversity of CSOs, which have been consulted in several but not all phases of SDG process (determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➤ If the country undertakes a Voluntary National Review, a diversity of CSOs is invited to attend review meetings and contribute to the VNR report with data and evidence.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>A diversity of CSOs are being formally consulted around SDG mainstreaming, prioritisation, implementation, and regular SDG monitoring as part of an institutionalised process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The government has established formal procedures to consult a diversity of CSOs throughout different phases of the SDGs process (determination of priorities, mainstreaming into national policies or programmes, implementation, monitoring). ➤ There is a multi-stakeholder partnership to advance implementation of SDGs that include CSOs. ➤ If the country undertakes a Voluntary National Review, a diversity of CSOs is invited to attend review meetings, contributes to draft the VNR report with data and evidence and is represented in the national delegation at the HLPF. ➤ Data and evidence from CSOs are used as inputs to monitor and reporting on SDG implementation.

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>No legal framework exists for access to information and CSOs have little or no access to information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no policy or right to information legislation in the country. ➤ Access to information on proposed legislation is not available or very difficult.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Right to access may exist in law, but there are very significant limitations in the law and/or in its implementation, excluding CSO access to most relevant information in practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a policy or right to information legislation in the country but there are significant limitations, limiting the access in practice and usefulness of the information (cost, broad secrecy laws, lengthy non transparent processes). ➤ Practices to access information differ among government departments. ➤ Information is not disclosed and disseminated in a timely manner. ➤ Information disclosed is not comprehensive and the language is extremely technical.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Law exit, but CSOs have mixed experience in timely access to relevant and comprehensive information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a policy or right to information legislation in the country with transparent procedures for accessing detailed information. ➤ Comprehensive information disclosure is mixed and may not be released in a timely manner for the purposes of CSOs roles. ➤ The language of most government documents is accessible to non-technical audiences. ➤ Information is disclosed online and offline.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>CSOs have full access to relevant, comprehensive information, with sufficient time for CSOs to prepare related initiatives, including participation in consultations (2-4 weeks) – early draft of relevant documents, with the ability to request additional information if needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Law and regulations exist with transparent process for accessing or excluding information, with an appeal process for excluded documents. ➤ Information is disclosed and disseminated in a timely manner. ➤ Disclosed information is comprehensive and the language is accessible to non-technical audiences. ➤ The government generally attends to requests for additional information.

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>No consultation occurred in the past two years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In the past two years, the government has not organized any significant consultation with CSO around any national policies.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Indications that only minor comments provided by CSOs through consultations at best are taken into account in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations with CSOs take place, but only minor comments are normally taken on board or no advice taken on board. ➤ In general, it is particularly difficult to ascertain how much of the CSO recommendations were taken on board. ➤ No responses to CSO papers.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Indications that advice and evidence provided by CSOs through consultations is occasionally taken into account in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations with CSOs take place, and indications that some substantive elements of CSO advice and evidence are normally taken on board. ➤ There is not a clear government mechanism to provide consistent post-consultation feedback with reasons for accepting or rejecting CSO recommendations. Feedback is at the government's discretion. ➤ Occasional specific responses to CSO papers and recommendations
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Indications that advice and evidence provided by CSOs through consultations is consistently taken into account and reflected in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consultations with CSOs take place, and substantive elements of CSO advice and evidence are normally addressed at the end of the process. ➤ The government provides responses to major CSO recommendations, with explanations for accepting or rejecting the received recommendations. ➤ Government consistently provides responses to CSO papers and recommendations. ➤ The government reports on a regular basis on how citizens' recommendations are being used in decision-making processes.

MODULE 2: CSO DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Most domestic CSOs experience short term, often one-off, project relationships, which are sole expressions of the financing CSO programming interests.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Very short term partnerships based solely on domestic CSO implementation of financing CSO projects. ➤ Relationship defined by only fiduciary reporting requirements imposed by the financing CSO – which can be domestic or international.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Most domestic CSOs experience longer-term partnerships with financing CSOs, but still largely based on projects, which are defined by the financing CSO.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Partnerships can be longer-term through implementations of a series of projects designed by the financing CSO. ➤ Domestic CSOs respond to programmatic priorities of the financing CSO. ➤ Domestic CSOs must limit project activities that meet reporting requirements (log frames) set out by the financing CSO. ➤ Beyond fiduciary requirements and narrative reporting, partnership arrangement are characterized by periodic visits and oral discussions led by the financing CSO.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Most domestic CSOs have long-term programmatic partnerships with financing CSOs (3 to 5 years), which are based on discussions between the funded CSO and the financing CSO. The interests of the financial CSO define the elements of the partnerships relationship.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ While individual projects may form part of the partnership relationship, the latter is defined by shared goals and program priorities over the medium term (3 to 5 years). ➤ Shared goals and program priorities are still largely in response to the programmatic priorities of the financing CSO. ➤ Often there is a written partnership agreement, which establishes a specific schedule for reporting, but mainly based on the information needs, programming results and fiduciary requirements of the financing CSO. ➤ There is little attention to the priorities of the funded CSO, its mandate and accountability to its constituencies, and its needs for capacity development.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Most domestic CSOs have long-term partnership relationships (5 to 10 years) that are the results of deliberate negotiations and shared programming interests and solidarity between the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Long-term partnerships include programming activities involving both partners that are negotiated and periodically renewed over a 5 to 10 year period. ➤ Domestic funded CSOs take the leadership in defining the shared priorities of the partnership based on their reflection of country realities.

funded CSO and the financing CSO.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The partnership is reflected in a written partnership arrangement, which sets out space and opportunity for mutual decision-making, mutual learning, core institutional support, capacity development and iterative joint programming. ➤ Narrative and fiduciary reporting is based on the funded CSO program cycle (understanding the limitations for the financing CSO derived from official provider support for that CSO). ➤ Mutual responsibilities and accountabilities are explicitly set out. ➤ There is an explicit and clear process to address conflict that is mutually agreed by the partners.
-----------------------------------	--

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>No national platforms. CSO co-ordination mechanisms are largely ad hoc and have short-term project oriented goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No national CSO platforms through which government engages CSOs in policy or programmatic dialogue at national level. ➤ Local CSOs come together around development partner or government initiated projects. ➤ Dialogue with Government or development partners is through government/development partner-selected CSOs.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Weak CSO co-ordination. CSO co-ordination mechanisms exist in a few sectors, but are mainly sustained by the interests of development partners or national governments in these sectors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The motivation for and the creation of CSO platforms for sector co-ordination derive mainly from development partner/government-driven interests and not CSOs. ➤ Issue-specific national and sectoral co-ordination mechanisms may be initiated by CSOs, but are weak, often dominated by a few larger CSOs in the capital city. ➤ Several CSO platforms may compete with each other for participation in policy dialogue prioritised by government / development partners.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Not one inclusive, representative CSO-initiated platform, but different CSO-initiated co-ordination mechanisms exist at both sector level and national levels and are sustained by the interests of domestic CSOs to improve their development effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are several independent co-ordination mechanisms recognised by the government or development partners, but there is no one inclusive, representative national platform that is CSO- managed. ➤ CSO co-ordination mechanisms may be initiated by either domestic or international CSOs. ➤ The effectiveness of these co-ordination mechanisms can vary over time, due to weak CSO leadership, lack of internally generated resources or limited engagement by, and low accountability to domestic CSOs. ➤ Overall, CSO co-ordination mechanisms are inclusive and representative of the diversity of local/national CSO space and generate a cadre of national/local CSO leadership, but at the same time compete with each other.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Major national CSO-initiated platform. Inclusive national and sectoral CSO-initiated platforms co-ordinate many areas of CSO development and emergency responses and enable more effective CSO engagements in both national sectoral programming and national policy dialogue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Domestic CSOs have taken initiative to form inclusive, representative CSO platforms at both the national and sectoral level. ➤ The national platform engages with other CSO co-ordination mechanisms and provides leadership for, and accountability to, the whole CSO sector. ➤ The national platform is initiated by domestic CSOs and is widely acknowledged to be representative of CSOs by Government and/or development partners. ➤ The membership of co-ordination mechanisms contribute to their financial sustainability in addition to funding received from development partners. ➤ The national platform has established a code of ethics and good practice for CSOs (based on the Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness and codes for good humanitarian practice) to improve the quality of CSO development efforts.

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

Hint Box

A human rights based approach (HRBA) seeks to analyse the inequalities which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practises and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress. It does this by integrating human rights norms and principles into every area of development co-operation, including the process itself, and in every thematic area of work. This helps to promote the sustainability of development work, empowering people themselves - especially the most marginalized - to participate in policy formulation and hold accountable those who have a duty to act.

An HRBA implies that CSOs have initiated capacity development processes that empower their constituencies/communities to represent directly constituency/community interests in development. CSOs as independent development actors concretely participate in efforts to change the underlying conditions affecting progress in Agenda 2030's economic, social and environmental pillars. CSO initiatives take into account disaggregated programmatic objectives in relation to women's rights issues in their program planning and implementation, relevant to their mandate. CSOs are making specific efforts to take into account the interest of marginalized peoples and/or social movements in the context of their programmatic priorities (such as rural people, peoples' organizations, organizations lead by indigenous people, workers movements, movement of migrants and displaced people, organizations of people living with disabilities).

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 CSOs in the country generally do not have explicit policies aligned by international human right standards to guide their own development practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most CSOs working in the country do not have explicit policies intended to guide their own development practice based on human rights-based approaches. ➤ Most CSOs working in the country do not have explicit policies relating to women's & children's rights and the empowerment of women and girls, or other marginalized sectors, which are intended to guide their programming priorities and strategies.
Level 2 CSOs in the country generally have policies guided by international human rights standards , but the evidence of practice is minimal and only among a few large CSOs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In designing the necessary elements of their programs, few CSOs engage vulnerable constituencies and local partners in analysing and take account local power dynamics affecting their program goals. ➤ Few CSOs give priority to encouraging local engagement and/or participation in multi-stakeholder policy dialogues, where these opportunities exist or could exist. ➤ In designing and assessing their programs, most CSOs make few efforts to disaggregate needs based on gender relations and women's empowerment. ➤ CSOs do not develop or participate in regular training for their staff in programming skills related to human rights-based approaches or women's rights in their programs.
Level 3 CSOs generally have policies guided by international human rights standards , and there are significant efforts among some to ensure that these policies guide actual CSO practices .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some CSOs are working with local partnerships that strengthen the organizations of marginalized populations. ➤ Some CSOs have program activities that are strengthening vulnerable communities' capacities and leadership to engage local/national power holders to claim their rights (including direct participation in multi-stakeholder dialogues). ➤ Gender disaggregated data and women's empowerment approaches are regularly part of CSO programming practices. ➤ Staff from CSOs participates in periodic training programs to develop programming skills related to human rights-based approaches.

<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>CSOs generally have policies guided by international human rights standards, and there is evidence that most work in ways that institutionalize these policies to guide actual CSO practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs actively engage and take direction from locally inclusive leadership in vulnerable communities, including local women and women’s organizations, or other marginalized sectors, in determining program priorities and approaches. ➤ Most CSOs are working with local partnerships that strengthen the sustainability of organizations of marginalized populations, including their engagement with local power holders, and supporting human rights defenders. ➤ CSOs are supporting domestic CSO co-ordinating mechanisms and platforms to actively promoting human rights-based approaches and regular skill training in rights approaches with the CSO community. ➤ CSOs are deliberately opening space for vulnerable communities’ leadership, including women’s representatives and/or organisations, to participate in multi-stakeholder policy dialogue and actively address issues of shrinking CSO space.
--	---

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 There is no CSO-initiated and generally agreed code of conduct or accountability mechanism at country level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSO accountability is at the individual level and the minimal requirements of government law and regulations. ➤ CSO transparency is mainly the result of CSO program information available on their web site and any legal requirements to report to government. ➤ Accountability is largely driven by fiduciary obligations to development partners.
Level 2 CSO accountability mechanisms are under discussion through a representative CSO platform. Individual CSOs maintain accountability through their linkages with global CSO networks and International NGOs codes and mechanisms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Individual CSO accountability to constituencies is voluntary, episodic and self-managed. ➤ Agreement on CSO standards and codes for accountability mechanisms is difficult due to divisions among domestic CSOs. ➤ Some influential national CSOs are associated with global CSO-managed standards and their respective accountability mechanisms and processes. ➤ CSOs regularly report to Government, and these reports are accessible to the public virtually/via web.
Level 3 Broadly representative CSO-initiated standards/codes exist for accountability mechanisms through CSO platforms, but no formal procedures to certify adherence or develop new capacities consistent with the standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ National CSO standards and codes inform accountability mechanisms set out expectations of ethical practices in the internal management of the CSO, basic requirements for transparency, as well as good practices in programmatic relationships/partnerships. ➤ A condition of membership in a CSO platform is adherence to the platform's standards or code, but there are no formal processes to certify adherence. ➤ Most CSOs with web sites make available the constitutive organisational documents and policies, including where feasible the names of board members. ➤ CSOs report regularly to Government and these reports are accessible to the public.
Level 4 There are CSO-initiated and managed accountability mechanisms , guided by standards and codes of conduct, through representative platforms. A majority of the domestic CSOs are associated to these platforms, which actively certify good practices within the CSO community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most CSOs across sectors are associated with national CSO managed accountability mechanisms with their respective standards and codes. ➤ National accountability mechanisms generally have formal processes to confirm their adherence to the standards / code of conduct, which must be renewed periodically. ➤ National /sectoral platforms promote their codes of conduct with their constituencies, and carry out capacity development programs with national/local CSOs. ➤ In general, CSOs make accessible to the public constitutive organisational information and program information including through national CSO platforms and/or publishing to the IATI transparency Standard.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is an open and accessible government country level information platform for disclosure of CSO information on CSO reported development activities. ➤ CSOs pro-actively provide relevant organisational information to partners as part of the partnership relationship, and have a transparent complaints mechanism.
--	--

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>There is no country-level information platform for CSOs to share information about their contribution to development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are limited reporting requirements for CSOs to disclose basic information regularly to government and the public. ➤ Very few CSOs disclose information about their activities and results. ➤ When disclosed, the information is normally presented scattered and not in an aggregate form.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>There is a country-level information platform for CSOs to share aggregated information about their contributions to development but use is still limited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are some government reporting requirements for CSOs to report basic information regularly to government and the public. ➤ Some CSOs disclose information about their activities and results, either because they are mandated to do so (e.g. receiving public funding) or by own will, usually on reports or their websites. ➤ When disclosed, the information is presented in an aggregate form.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>There is a country-level information platform for CSOs to share aggregated information about their contributions to development increasingly used by CSOs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are significant government reporting requirements for CSOs to report relevant information, and there is good compliance with these requirements. ➤ Most CSOs disclose information about their activities and results, usually on their web site. ➤ The disclosed information is normally presented in an aggregated manner.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>There is a country-level information platform for CSOs to share aggregated and disaggregated information about their contributions to development <i>being used by most CSOs</i>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are significant government reporting requirements for CSOs to report relevant information, and there is good compliance with these requirements. ➤ There is an open and accessible country-level information platform or disclose information on development activities, including information on CSO contributions. ➤ Most CSOs disclose information about their activities and results. ➤ The disclosed information is typically presented in a disaggregated manner, reporting on supported sectors or programmes, sources of financing, beneficiaries, results achieved and so on.

MODULE 3: DEVELOPMENT PARTNER SUPPORT FOR CSO ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>No opportunities for CSOs to engage with development partners in the past two years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development partners have no explicit policies guiding consultations with CSOs. ➤ There are no consultations with CSOs on the design, implementation and monitoring of development co-operation policies and programmes. ➤ Development partners have no explicit process to consult with CSOs.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Consultations with CSOs are occasional and limited to some individual development partners and selected CSOs and focus only on the implementation of donor programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development partners generally have a policy guiding consultations with CSOs, but it is not systematically implemented or assessed. ➤ Opportunities for CSOs to engage on the design, implementation and monitoring of development co-operation policies and programmes are unpredictable and episodic. ➤ There is no co-ordinated process for development partners to consult with a diversity of CSOs. ➤ The content for consultation is largely set by development partners and focuses on pre-determined provider policies and priorities.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Consultations with a diversity of CSOs are frequent and co-ordinated among development partners, focusing not only on the implementation of donor programmes. However, the agenda is largely set by the development partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development partners generally have comprehensive policies guiding consultations with CSOs and they are implemented. ➤ There is a co-ordinated process for development partners to consult with CSOs, but selection criteria for CSOs participation are not transparent. ➤ Consultations with CSOs take place at a stage in development partner decision making when change may still be possible. ➤ Consultations at the country level are mainly on pre-determined development partner programs and priorities and seldom focus on their overarching policies (both sector and institutional policies).
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Consultations with a diversity of CSOs are regular, institutionalised and co-ordinated among development partners, focusing not only on the implementation of policies and programs, but also on determining development partner's priorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are regular and planned opportunities for CSOs to engage with development partners on their overarching policies, country programs and priorities, program implementation and assessment. ➤ Consultations are with a diversity of CSOs and the selection criteria for CSOs participation is open and transparent. ➤ A comprehensive CSO consultation policy is being implemented. ➤ Consultations with CSOs take place at a stage in development partner decision making when change may still be possible, with feedback to CSOs following consultations. ➤ The content of the consultation is set in co-operation with CSOs and can include development partner's institutional policies and priorities & guidance in implementing provider-determined programming. ➤ Consultations are structured for dialogue and feedback of CSO views on government policies and their implementation.

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Development partners don't include an enabling environment agenda as an item in their policy dialogue with the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Issues affecting a diverse civil society are not addressed in the policy dialogue between development partners and the government.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Some development partners occasionally include some elements of the enabling environment agenda as an item in their policy dialogue with the government, particularly if CSOs lobby on specific issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSO enabling environment are not a regular part of the development partner's policy areas in dialogues with the partner government. ➤ Development partners do not regularly monitor issues for CSO enabling environment in main programming countries. ➤ Development partner may respond to CSO lobbying on specific issues.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Most development partners include the enabling environment agenda as an item in their policy dialogue with the government, make remedial proposals but often based on specific issues, and not in a systematic way with follow up.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSO enabling environment issues are raised routinely with partner governments in policy dialogue. ➤ Development partners have independent ways to monitor issues affecting the CSO enabling environment and pro-actively bring these issues into policy dialogue. ➤ Development partner may work with like-minded development partners to raise particular areas of concern for the CSO enabling environment with partner country governments. ➤ Development partners may be engaged in global and regional initiatives on enabling environment issues (e.g. Working Group for the Community of Democracies).
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Most development partners systematically include the enabling environment agenda, with remedial proposals in their policy dialogue with the government, and engage with domestic CSOs in monitoring the enabling environment and following up their dialogue with government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development partners' policies call for systematic monitoring of CSO enabling environment issues at the country level and their inclusion in policy dialogues with government. ➤ Development partners may create opportunities for CSOs to engage their government on enabling environment issues. ➤ Development partners engage domestic civil society in monitoring enabling environment issues and are responsive to their concerns and inform CSOs about their dialogue with government. ➤ Development partners are actively engaged in global and regional initiatives that address enabling environment issue, and are systematically responsive to urgent situations for civil society.

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Most development partners do not make available information about their support to CSOs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For most development partners, information on development partner support to international and domestic CSOs working in the country is not available.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Some development partners make available aggregate information on their support to CSOs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most development partners report to international online databases, such as those managed by IATI or the OECD but this information is not easily accessible or usable by partner countries for development planning, budgeting, execution and monitoring and evaluation. ➤ Some development partners are making available aggregate information on their support to CSOs at country level (through reports on their web sites), which may include geographical or sector/thematic information, but not activity level or beneficiary level information.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Most development partners make available aggregate information on their support to CSOs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most major development partners disclose aggregate information on their support to CSOs at country level, which may include geographical or sector/thematic information, but not activity level or beneficiary level information. ➤ The information is accessible at country level (e.g. through development partner or government reports or websites).
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Most development partners make available disaggregated information (sectors, programmes, objectives, financing, results) on their support to CSOs, with appropriate safeguards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most major development partners disclose disaggregated information on their support to CSOs at country level, which may include detailed geographical, sectoral, thematic, beneficiaries and activity level information (with appropriate safeguards to protect vulnerable individuals or communities). ➤ The information is broadly accessible at country level, through one or more accessible mechanisms, including aid management platforms, transparency portals, or development partner reports or websites.

MODULE 4: LEGAL, REGULATORY AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

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

(a) Freedom of Assembly

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Most peaceful Assemblies are prohibited in law or practice. Any formation of assemblies is swiftly dissolved with force.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organizers are always required to obtain advance permission, even for gatherings of a few individuals, which are usually denied. ➤ Vague prohibitions—such as assemblies that are “political” and that disturb “public works”— have been used against those promoting views unfavourable to the government. ➤ Public assemblies in many key public locations are banned and particular social groups targeted, including the use of disproportionate force against participants, human rights defenders or journalists monitoring the assembly. ➤ Assembly organisers are responsible for the cost of public services related to the assembly (e.g. police, clean-up, or medical care).
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Many peaceful assemblies are prohibited in law or practice, with severe restrictions on assemblies which can take place only in government designated areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some assemblies may be allowed, but any formation of assemblies, seen to be illegal, is swiftly dissolved with force. ➤ While advance permission (or “advance notification” procedure) is required, gatherings of a few individuals may be tolerated. ➤ Vague prohibitions—such as assemblies that are “political” are used against those promoting views unfavourable to the government. ➤ Public assemblies in many key public locations are severely restricted and often not allowed, and appeal processes are generally futile (not prompt or fair). ➤ Law enforcement often uses disproportionate physical means leading to serious injuries to participants, including widespread arrests.
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Most peaceful assemblies are allowed in law and practice, although some issues or groups may be subject to discriminatory decision-making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Peaceful assemblies are allowed, but are subject to a notification procedure with a few days’ advance notice and most spontaneous assemblies, except for small groups are not allowed. ➤ The law provides some blanket time and location restrictions, such as working hours in front of the parliament and other key government buildings. ➤ Regulatory authorities typically provide reasons for restrictions, and organisers can appeal them through an administrative (not necessarily independent) procedure. <p>Law enforcement has an explicit legal obligation to protect participants of assemblies, but in practice do not actively distinguish between peaceful protesters and those promoting unrest and violence, sometimes with mass and targeted arrests.</p>
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Law and practice clearly recognise the right to peaceful assembly and most peaceful</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Only large assemblies or assemblies that may disrupt traffic require advance notification. ➤ Blanket restrictions on time and location of assemblies are few or non-existent.

<p>assemblies are allowed in practice, regardless of the issue being raised or the groups participating.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Regulatory authorities promptly provide reasons for any restrictions, and organisers can quickly appeal them (within a few days) through an independent court. ➤ Law enforcement has an explicit legal obligation to protect participants of assemblies, including assemblies occurring at the same time and place and counter-demonstrations, with approaches to de-escalate violence.
---	--

(b) Freedom of Expression

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are fully controlled by government. CSO staff, journalists are often threatened, arbitrarily arrested, attacked, abducted, tortured, or killed for exercising their freedom of expression. Government apparatus conducts mass illegal surveillance and interception of communications.</p>	<p>The right to seek and receive information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alternative media that criticises politics or culture is swiftly shut down and CSOs/individuals are unable to publicly share information that is prohibited by the government. <p>The right to share information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Threats, attacks and other actions against the voices of CSOs, individuals and journalists are condoned and rarely investigated. ➤ The law provides various broad restrictions that are commonly used to censor criticism of the government or other sensitive topics, creating a strong culture of self-censorship and fear of reprisal. <p>Right to privacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The government conducts mass surveillance and data collection, and the law provides no effective safeguards against such practice.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Government control of news, internet media and expression by CSOs is extensive, but some alternative media exist. Arbitrary arrests, threats and other actions against non-state actors are sometimes investigated. Laws and/or practice provide few effective safeguards against arbitrary surveillance.</p>	<p>The right to seek and receive information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alternative media exist but are often disrupted or shut down. ➤ Independent journalists can be detained, prosecuted and attacked or killed, which sometimes prompts an investigation. <p>The right to share information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The law provides some broad restrictions on expression that can be used to censor criticism of the government or other sensitive topics. ➤ Laws affecting the freedom of expression are applied inconsistently creating a strong self-censorship culture & fear of reprisal. <p>Right to privacy:</p> <p>The government conducts illegal surveillance and the law has broad grounds to justify surveillance, with no judicial approval needed.</p>
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are mostly free of control by the government, with some instance of government interference. Threats and arbitrary actions against CSOs, individuals and journalist are often investigated. Government apparatus conducts legal surveillance and interception of communications, but may also conducts illegal or questionable interceptions.</p>	<p>The right to seek and receive information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Although there are instances of government interference, the public can freely access foreign media and CSO information and a wide range of independent media that criticises politics or culture. ➤ Attacks on journalists, media and CSOs for their expression of views are investigated and not subject to impunity. <p>The right to share information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Restrictions on expression mainly related to national security, public safety, and respect for the rights of others resulting in some censorship regarding public policy, culture, or other sensitive topics. ➤ A culture of public sharing of information exists.

	<p>Right to privacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ While government apparatus often conducts legal surveillance, there are many reported suspected instances of illegal surveillance and personal data collection, with the law providing some safeguards.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>News, internet media, and expression by CSOs are generally free of control by the government. CSOs, individuals and journalists are rarely threatened or physically attacked; and the government apparatus generally conducts only legal surveillance and interception of communications and collection of personal data.</p>	<p>The right to seek and receive information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The public can freely access foreign media and a wide range of independent media and CSO voices that criticises politics or culture, with little government control of media. ➤ Physical attacks on CSOs, individuals or journalists for their expression of views is investigated without impunity. <p>The right to share information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Laws with narrow restrictions on the freedom of expression do not generally result in censorship regarding public policy, culture, or other sensitive topics. Due to law and practice, there is a very strong culture of political expression, including information critical of government. <p>Right to privacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The government apparatus generally conducts legal surveillance, with few reported instances of suspected illegal surveillance or data collection. ➤ Law and/or practice provide several effective safeguards against arbitrary surveillance, interception, or data collection.

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Registration is mandatory, difficult, lengthy and required periodically. The CSO law contains vague prohibitions that are clearly inappropriate under international law.</p>	<p>Formation/Registration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The registration process is unclear, lengthy (6 months to a year or more), burdensome, and often requiring personal or sensitive information (such as personal assets), or involving multiple authorities. Registration fees are high and CSOs often must pay bribes to registration officials. ➤ Unfavourable decisions, or no decisions, are common for advocacy-oriented CSOs or CSOs associated with marginalised groups. <p>Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Law and practice prevent and/or interfere with CSO activities; projects /programs are routinely delayed or hindered by permission requirements. ➤ The government regularly paints certain advocacy or human rights CSOs as undermining a country’s culture/religion, as national security threats or foreign agents—threatening them with serious reprisal. ➤ CSOs are subject to swift suspension or dissolution by the regulatory authority (as opposed to a court) for violating any provision of the governing law.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Registration is voluntary but remains a difficult process, especially for advocacy-oriented groups. Law and practice mainly hinder the activities of advocacy-oriented CSOs, but not service organisations working without foreign funding.</p>	<p>Formation/Registration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Registration is an unclear, lengthy (6 months to 1 year) process and lacks some basic protections against arbitrary decision-making (strict timelines for registration authorities’ responses, clear legal grounds for rejection, or any appeal processes). ➤ Registration processes might be costly due to high fees or costs related to travel or obtaining required documentation. ➤ In practice, certain groups, such as those that promote LGBTI rights or right of other marginalised groups encounter a high level of difficulty obtaining registration, or can’t register under existing law. <p>Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The CSO law contains vague prohibitions, such as on “political activity” or on “threatening national unity,” which are frequently applied against human rights organisations, foreign-funded organisations, and advocacy-oriented CSOs. ➤ Government officials have broad discretion to inspect the activities and finances of organisations and often have launched inspections on human rights organisations and foreign-funded CSOs. ➤ CSOs are subject to direct suspension or dissolution by the regulatory authority, with only an administrative appeals process provided.

<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>Registration is voluntary, a one-time process, and moderately difficult. With a few exceptions, law and practice do not hinder the activities of CSOs.</p>	<p>Formation/Registration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are some mechanisms to facilitate registration, such as registration units in several areas of the country, low fees, or only a few simple documents required. ➤ A few organisations may receive what appear to be arbitrary rejections, such as those seen as threats to “national security”, but have some protections through appeal processes. <p>Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs are generally allowed to operate freely. They may have notification requirements, such as notifying local officials of projects. Regulatory investigations have been conducted for some CSOs that are advocacy-oriented or receive foreign funding. ➤ Law and practice do not prevent CSO involvement in decision-making processes or government projects. ➤ The law provides clear, delineated powers for the government to interfere in internal CSO management and suspension or dissolution is based on law, with an appeal process provided.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>Registration is a voluntary one-time fast, fair and efficient procedure. Law and practice actively promotes the activities of CSOs, including advocacy and human rights groups.</p>	<p>Formation/Registration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Registration is not any more burdensome for a CSO than it is for businesses or other types of legal entities and cases of discrimination are the exception. ➤ The law and practice protects CSOs from arbitrary decision-making in the registration process (strict timelines for registration authorities’ responses, clear legal grounds for rejection, and judicial appeals processes). <p>Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs are generally allowed to operate freely, including human rights organizations and those critical of government. ➤ The law provides for involuntary suspension and dissolution only by the order of an independent court. Judicial appeal is available, and dissolution only occurs when all appeals have been exhausted. ➤ The law clearly defines the scope and powers of bodies regulating CSOs, including powers of inspection.

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

Hint Box

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1 CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups have no legal protections in practice and often experience severe discrimination and/or harassment from public authorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Legal, regulatory and policy protections do not exist to safeguard targeting marginalized groups. ➤ Government harassment is widespread through suspension/dissolution of organizations, public labelling of organizations and leaders as threats against national unity, stability or security, etc. ➤ The activities of CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups are monitored by security agents. ➤ There is a broad culture of impunity for illegal threats and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups.
Level 2 CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups have some legal protection, but these are applied inconsistently, with few if any administrative or juridical recourses .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Legal, regulatory and policy protections exist to safeguard against targeting marginalized populations, but recourse does not exist in practice. ➤ CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups are subject to harassment by public authorities, which can include freezing bank accounts, administrative hurdles, spreading misinformation, shutting down activities, etc. ➤ There is a broad culture of impunity for illegal threats and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at-risk groups.
Level 3 There is minimal discrimination and harassment in practice , but public authorities may scrutinise activities or harass specific organisations .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Laws, regulations and policies exist to safeguard CSOs working with at-risk populations, though at times some CSOs still experience harassment or discrimination. ➤ Administrative and judicial actions against discriminatory practices have been taken forward through legal due process, but are often not successful. ➤ There are domestic and international challenges to impunity for actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups.
Level 4 Laws, regulations and policies effectively safeguard CSOs working with marginalized populations and discriminatory actions are an exception.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Laws, regulations, and procedures are in place to safeguard CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups. ➤ No culture of impunity exists for those responsible for illegal threats and actions against CSOs working with marginalised populations and at risk groups. ➤ Government officials and law enforcement are trained in how to implement the laws and regulations fairly for all CSOs, particularly for those working with marginalized and at-risk populations.

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

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<p><i>Level 1</i></p> <p>Access to national and international resources is highly restricted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs receiving international resources are subject to one or more of the following situations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Must obtain special registration and receive case-by-case approval in order to access to funds. b) Subject to legal restrictions on their work, such as on advocacy or human rights activities. c) Often undergo regulatory or criminal investigation and are subject to media campaigns painting them as national threats. d) There are extensive measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs specifically and disproportionately. ➤ CSOs do not benefit from tax exemptions and individual/corporate donations receive no tax benefit. ➤ CSOs cannot legally or in practice access government grants and contracts. ➤ CSOs cannot earn income from goods and services; the law makes it illegal or not feasible.
<p><i>Level 2</i></p> <p>Access to either national or international resources is possible, but is subjected to government restrictions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs receiving international resources are subject to one or more of the following situations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Must register with a particular body to access resources, which monitors the flow of resources to CSOs. b) Subject to some legal restrictions on their work, such as on advocacy or human rights activities. c) Often undergo regulatory investigation (but not criminal investigation). d) There are extensive measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs specifically and disproportionately. ➤ Some government grants are tailored for CSOs, but only to carry out government projects in traditional service areas. ➤ CSOs are eligible for basic tax exemptions, but the process for receiving tax exemptions is unclear, lengthy, or onerous and there are no tax benefits for individual / corporate donations. ➤ The majority of CSOs cannot earn income from goods and services in practice; the law makes it not feasible (e.g. tax treatment of earnings).
<p><i>Level 3</i></p> <p>CSOs can access national and international resources but some formal and informal limitations exist.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs do not need to register or obtain government approval to access national and international resources. ➤ There are some measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing that target CSOs specifically and disproportionately. ➤ The process for receiving tax exemptions for CSOs is clear, not lengthy or onerous. ➤ Tax benefits for individual and/or corporate donations to not-for-profit CSOs exist, but with procedures that are unclear, lengthy, or onerous. ➤ CSOs have access to government contracts for service provision as well as government grants specifically for CSOs to engage in not-for-profit work, but are inconsistently implemented. Criteria and procedures for awarding contracts and/or grants are often unclear or perceived as unfair. ➤ A sizable segment of CSOs can earn income from goods and services.
<p><i>Level 4</i></p> <p>CSOs can access national and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSOs receiving international funding do not need to register this funding with government beyond reporting regulations for total revenue and rarely undergo regulatory investigation.

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
international resources with few or no restrictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Measures to mitigate risks of money laundering or terrorist financing apply to all individuals and legal entities, and do not target CSOs disproportionately. ➤ The process for receiving tax exemptions is clear, not lengthy or onerous. ➤ The law provides tax benefits for individual and/or corporate donations to not-for-profit CSOs with procedures that are generally straightforward. ➤ Multiple government grants are available to a diverse range of CSOs, with clear, open and transparent criteria and legally binding procedures for CSOs to access government grants and contracts.