EU ROADMAP FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY IN LIBERIA

GENERAL INFORMATION

Status: Public

Date of approval: 21 December 2017

Period covered: 2017-2020

Update of a previous Roadmap: No

Approved by: EU Delegation, Sweden, Germany, France and the United Kingdom

PART I – BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE CONTEXT AND PAST EU ENGAGEMENT

Since the end of the civil war in 2003, Liberia has steadily moved towards reconstituting its democratic institutions. Substantial efforts have been directed towards state building and stability. However, these accomplishments remain fragile, as acknowledged by the EU NIP for Liberia 2014-2020. The Ebola crisis had a deep social, economic and political impact that showed the major weaknesses in the state building process and evidenced main challenges that were overlooked by the authorities for a long time. The GDP growth rate fell from 8.7% in 2014 to -1.6 % in 2016, the health and medical care system collapsed and over one million children lost almost an entire year of school education. In fact, the epidemic outbreak made evident a number of shortcomings, namely the weak capacity of public institutions, the heavy concentration of political and economic power in a small elite, distanced from the rest of the population and the urban-rural gaps that persists in the country. According to the Corruption Perceptions Index reported by Transparency International, the Corruption Rank in Liberia averaged 102.27 from 2005 until 2016. In 2016 Liberia ranked the 7th poorest country in the world and had the highest proportion of children missing out on primary school education with nearly two-thirds of its children never stepping inside a classroom, according to UNICEF. Over half of the population has no education, which is far above the regional average of 34%.

Civil Society in Liberia is rich and diverse, consisting of over 1,500 formal organizations registered under the umbrella of the National Civil Society Council of Liberia (NCSCL), and countless informal organisations. Many CSOs are small community based service delivery organisations working on niche projects for their members at community level and a few larger organisations are active at sector level in governance and accountability. Its history can be traced back to the student movement in the 1970-1980s, and social justice engagement by the media, the church and private citizens. Cumulative efforts of collective engagement became more visible during the Liberian civil conflict and right afterwards, when Liberian CSOs played a very important role in fostering peace in the country. Women´s organisations played an important role during the peace process, laying a foundation which the Civil Society sector could build upon in its further development. CSOs also played a paramount role during the Ebola crisis, through the provision of basic services. Today, as the country shifts away from the humanitarian context and state institutions are progressively being built, Civil Society in Liberia is undergoing a period of development without precedent, in which women and youth organizations play a paramount role.

Yet CSOs are confronted with numerous challenges, of internal and external nature, including the need to redefine their mandates and roles as they shift to new development and governance approaches, which require a complete new set of skills (i.e. evidence-based research and advocacy, policy analysis and political dialogue, etc.). Another challenge is fragmentation which makes it difficult to establish collaboration with the donor community and has wider negative consequences for the sector's ability to accomplish its goals. It means that CSOs lose opportunities for sharing innovations and learning from one another, coordinating programs to make scarce resources go further, or joining forces to expand impacts and influence other actors, such as the Government, at a scale impossible for

any one of them working alone[1]. Collaboration with and strengthening of umbrella organisations like the National Civil Society Council of Liberia (NCSCL), or sector and geographical level coordination bodies, can address this. Going beyond the national level is important because constraints and opportunities are different at national, county and community level.

a. Enabling Environment

Liberian CSOs **enjoy a relatively favourable enabling environment**, which supports the ongoing state building process. Both legal and policy frameworks recognize the need and added value of CSO engagement. Articles 15 and 17 of the Liberian Constitution guarantee civic/political rights and freedoms (freedoms of speech, movement, association and assembly; privacy of the individual, protection of the individual from being a victim of power excesses of the state). Other key policy documents like the Liberia's Gender Policy (2009) and the National Youth Policy (2012-2017) foresee engagement with and strengthening of Liberian Civil Society.

The legal framework related to CSOs recognises two categories of CSOs in Liberia: mutual benefit organisations and public benefit organisations. While mutual benefit organisations are organisations whose purpose is to help their members, public benefit organisations intend to help specifically identified groups of people or the general population. Civic organisations, development and welfare CSOs, including watchdog organisations, are part of this last group.

Nevertheless, **the legal framework for CSOs is fragmented**, as laws are managed by different Ministries. Not-for-profit organisations are incorporated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning is responsible for accrediting them. This category groups most types of CSOs: NGOs, umbrella organisations, professional associations, youth and women's groups, networks and other interest groups. The Ministry of Agriculture is in charge of the cooperative societies and Trade and Labour Unions are registered with the Ministry of Labour. Finally, Unincorporated Associations (e.g. CBOs, neighbourhood welfare organisations) are regulated by a series of bylaws. The fragmented legal framework implies multiple and dispersed responsibilities that, combined with unclear CSO provisions, are causing confusion when registering CSOs. This situation tends to be solved by civil servants' discretional decision and several CSOs still manage themselves following customary rules and religious as well as traditional beliefs, which are often not in line with Human Rights Conventions and human rights-based approaches.

Specific roles are given to CSOs in oversight bodies such as the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC), the Independent National Commission on Human Rights (INCHR) and the Liberia Extractive Transparency Initiative (LEITI). For instance, the LACC Act foresees in consultation of Civil Society by the President when considering nominations of commissioners. This provides formalized opportunities for constructive engagements between CSOs and the Government and entry points for capacity building. However, the role given to CSOs in these bodies also adds to the fragmentation of the legal framework, e.g. the Act of 2008 establishing the LEITI under Section 1.2 (b) defines Civil Society as 'the entire segment of the Liberian population that is not in government'. Within this context, CSOs have not been able to work collectively to safeguard the space by claiming a policy and a single and clear regulatory framework. As result, **the space for CSOs remains 'vulnerable'**.

b. Participation of CSOs in domestic policies

In the absence of strong state institutions, CSOs in Liberia remain key actors in the provision of services in education, health, water and sanitation, as well as in agricultural extension and food security, filling gaps of weak or inexistent public services, particularly in locations far from the capital. Their engagement as governance actors is however still at an early stage of development.

Liberian CSOs have been deeply involved in the formulation and approval of the two key public policy strategies for reform and development in Liberia (the Agenda for Transformation (AfT) and the vision Liberia Rising 2030) and both documents highlight the role of local CSOs as "agents of change" in critical national processes.

---

[1] Brown, D. & Kalegaonkar, A. (1999). Addressing Civil Society's challenges: support organizations as emerging institutions. IDR Reports, 15(2).

This political commitment has been institutionalised with the signature of **a Memorandum of Understanding (known as the GoL-CSO Accord)** between the GoL, represented by the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, and CSOs, represented by the National Council of Civil Society in Liberia, NCSCL. Signed in 2016, this MoU is the main policy framework governing Government-CSO interactions for the CSO sector. Its implementation is however far from being effective, considering the lack of participation culture on both sides, the legitimacy and accountability challenges confronted by NCSCL, and in some cases the lack of will of public authorities to implement it. The result is that Civil Society involvement is still ad-hoc and very much differing across sectors. Development partners, including the EU and its member states, can play a role in advocating for Civil Society consultation and dialogue with Government, not at least to ensure that groups facing societal discrimination such as persons with disabilities, persons belonging to ethnic or religious minorities and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) community also have their voices heard.

Yet, progress needs to be noted, particularly through the involvement of CSOs in accountability of public policies at local level through engagement of CSOs in the Integrated Public Financial Management Reform Project (IPFMRP), which has created pressure on public officials and service providers in Liberia to improve service delivery. In the Education sector, CSOs are part of the tri-partite dialogue in the Education Sector Development Committee (ESDC). In addition, central roles are given to CSOs in monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the Liberia Gender Policy (2009) and the National Youth Policy (2012-2017).

In 2010, **the government of Liberia also adopted the Freedom of Information Act, which has increased the opportunity** for CSO participation in formulation and implementation of policies. The adhesion of Liberia to the Open Budget Initiative (OBI) has also reinforced access to information by making public financial management systems more transparent as well as involving CSOs in the implementation of the OBI plan. However, the implementation of the law faces multiple problems and access to information remains difficult and unequal. Another relevant challenge is CSOs' capacities to participate in policy dialogue and play voice and accountability roles, as they are still weak in this respect but developing.

c. Capacity of CSOs

Liberian Civil Society **capacity remains generally weak**, and **CSOs face a multiplicity of operational and institutional challenges that inhibit them in carrying out their missions and activities**. Civil Society actors' lack of a clear mandate, sufficient representativeness or strategies on how to strengthen the collective voice of rights-holders constitute real challenges, especially in relation to rural populations. This is even more acute today, as CSOs shift their approaches and leave behind their purely service delivery roles.

This lack of CSO capacities, combined with the absence of internal governance and transparency mechanisms, and corruption which persists within many CSOs, are some of the main factors undermining CSO development. This has a strong impact on the credibility and legitimacy of the Liberian Civil Society fabric to represent and defend citizens' rights[2]. Internal governance is further weakened by poor labour standards. Several studies point out that Liberian CSOs cannot provide regular salaries for staff and are highly dependent on donor funds, resulting in periods of little or no revenue between grants. Many CSO staff, and in some cases, entire staff of some CSOs go unpaid during periods between grants. Those who are able to pay a few core staff regularly must still rely on volunteers or interns. Finally, with limited technical capacity and weak institutional and financial systems, CSOs are unable to meet donor criteria and fulfil donor procedures for project funding.

With regard to networking and coordination, despite sustained efforts to strengthen the collective voice of the sector, fragmentation also continues to be a fundamental weakness. Due to the challenging funding environment (where most CSOs depend on international funds), CSOs compete in a rather limited and donor-driven arena for mostly small project- or activity-oriented funds. This competition, the establishment of many new CSOs that do not seek coordination with other Civil Society actors, and the lack of knowledge of what other actors actually do and achieve, create an atmosphere of mistrust[3].

---

[2] This problem of legitimacy of CSOs was already identified at the time of the Ebola outbreak. In a study done by International Alert, only half of respondents found Civil Society groups "trustworthy" during the outbreak, below the trustworthiness of international NGOs, journalists, religious leaders and community groups, among others.

[3] Review of the Swedish Civil Society Support in Liberia. SIDA Decentralised Evaluation. Final report. 2013

Formal coordination among CSOs in Liberia was given a boost in 2008 when the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supported the establishment of the National Civil Society Council of Liberia (NCSCL) as a coordinating body of the CSOs. Today the NCSCL is the largest umbrella organization in Liberia, acknowledged by donors, and mainly involved in policy dialogue activities, with a special emphasis on the AfT and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). However, its leadership has been subject to criticism by several CSOs who have demanded more internal democratic structures and transparency. Moreover, the structure of the NCSCL is still weak, not sufficiently autonomous and detached from political interests, and only relatively efficient. The same applies to other coordination and networking initiatives.

d. Lessons learnt from EU engagement so far

In a context of fragility and in the absence of strong state institutions, International NGOs together with International Organizations have been an important mechanism to channel emergency and development support. EU and member states funding for domestic CSOs has often been provided indirectly, as sub-grants managed by these INGOs/IOs. EU funding is often on a too large scale for domestic CSOs to make credible bids and they struggle to meet EU financial management requirements. At the same time, the EU Delegation and member states have limited resources to provide the more intensive support domestic CSOs need for direct grants to be successful. Nevertheless, where feasible the EU has funded domestic CSOs/INGOs working with local grassroots partners, particularly under the EIDHR and CSO-LA thematic budget lines. The specific role and the division of labour between the local CSOs and the INGOs will need to be further defined to avoid competition over space and voice.

Dialogue between CSOs and, the EU and member states has been ad hoc and varies between sectors and issues. There tends to be more engagement with CSOs receiving EU funding, even when that engagement is of a policy or political nature rather than project related. For example, CSOs receiving EU funding for land rights advocacy have briefed EU Ambassadors on the draft Land Rights law while quarterly meetings with CSOs receiving EIDHR funding have been used for policy discussions as well as to follow up on project concerns. A broader range of CSOs involved in democracy and human rights advocacy were consulted during the development of the Human Rights and Democracy Country Strategy (HRDCS), which includes building the capacity of Civil Society to demand human rights and good governance as a strategic priority for 2016-2020. The HRDCS also highlights the role of CSOs in achieving other priorities such as addressing SGBV and FGM, encouraging a more accountable Legislature and demanding improvements to the judicial system. Dialogue with CSOs in the context of the implementation of the HRDCS can continue and can be extended to issues like LGBTI, right to safe abortion and protection of human rights defenders. The EU is already contributing to the latter by the use of specific EIDHR funds.

Prior to the Ebola crisis initial efforts were made to develop a more structured dialogue at the national level. Attempts to revive this post-Ebola have been unsuccessful for a number of reasons, including: the limitations of the NCSCL as a counterpart; the disparate nature and priorities of CSO members of the NCSCL, which makes it difficult to identify a focused agenda; the tendency of many CSOs to regard the EU and its member states as a source of finance rather than a political actor and to discount the value of dialogue unless it comes with the prospect of concrete funding. However, as CSOs shift from direct service provision to advocacy for improved Government policy, delivery and accountability, renewed dialogue between CSOs and the EU can play an important role in supporting this transition.

The end of the Ebola crisis, and more than a decade of political and economic stability, has encouraged the EU to shift the focus of its support towards State building, and reconsider the role for CSOs. A number of lessons can be drawn from the engagement thus far with CSOs:

- Capacity constraints and disparate agendas **limit the usefulness to both sides of structured dialogue at the national level**. The experience of engagement with human rights CSOs may offer a more workable model in the short term of regular engagement with CSOs in priority sectors. Over time, this can be expanded as coordination among CSOs improves.

- In a context of nascent state-building, **development partners need to assess carefully the feasibility and opportunity of supporting CSO involvement in certain sectors.** For example, while collective action and mobilization may be opportune and feasible to lobby the government to ensure basic service delivery and reduce corruption, the same level of collective actions could lead to safety concerns and conflict in other sectors such as mining and/or land. Therefore, it is important that development partners assess the risks and define sector-based approaches by applying the principle of **'do no harm'**. Sweden is considering to conduct a power analysis exercise that can guide the EU, member states and partners to understand the forms of power that

reinforce poverty and marginalization and to identify the positive kinds of power that can be mobilized to fight poverty and inequality. Such a power analysis could potentially guide the support to CSOs in certain sectors.

- **The involvement of CSOs in public financial management** processes through the Public Finance Management Reform Project (IPFMRP) **has created pressure** on public officials and service providers in Liberia to improve service delivery. However, these accomplishments may not be sustained due to the weak capacity of the CSO secretariat to enhance the capacity of CSOs to serve as critical watchdogs in public financial management, monitor results and ensure impartiality in the selection of projects. It is therefore recommended that the Civil Society sub-component of the new IPFMRP II puts more emphasis on these issues.

- **The enhanced focus on the grassroots & community level, combined with a lack of donor coordination, risks creating duplication and overlapping of efforts, as well as overwhelming communities and eroding informal institutions and dynamics,** if they are not sufficiently accounted for**.** Today, key donors supporting Civil Society in Liberia (i.e. USAID, Sweden, UNDP and the EU) find themselves at the identification stage of their future interventions in favour of Civil Society development. Most of them (i.e. USAID, Sweden and UNDP to some extent) are targeting community based/grassroots organisations, including informal groups and plan to support them with institutional capacity development as well as financial support[4]. They are therefore not considering middle-level CSOs, which require tailored support to effectively shift towards new roles in the current state-building context.

- **T**here is also a need to **rethink donor support models to CSOs to reinforce CSO ownership and financial sustainability**. To date, donor support to CSOs has been for the most part project-based, service provision oriented, channelled through intermediary organisation (INGOs) and largely driven by donor agendas.

- **CSOs experience common challenges across the 11th EDF focal sectors of cooperation.** Although each sector is different and CSOs have their own dynamics (e.g. CSOs are highly engaged in education and resource management, limited in PFM), CSOs experience similar challenges across the sectors. They include: poor governance structures; limited or no capacities in evidence based research, data analysis (i.e. statistics), budget analysis, monitoring, advocacy, lobbying, among others; and lack of cooperation due to competition. As a result, most local CSOs are incapable of managing large budgets and are not eligible for donor funding.

- **Adapted support is required for networks and platforms as well as CSOs,** which have difficulties in raising funds and often compete with their members for funding at the risk of becoming project implementing bodies rather than serving their members and the network. A limited number of networks, such as WONGOSOL (Women's NGO Secretariat of Liberia), have gained trust among donors, and the support that the secretariat received from the Swedish Embassy includes support to develop the service for the members. Furthermore, financial sustainability of Liberian CSOs also requires enhancing local fundraising approaches and initiatives.

- **Capacity development requires an integrated approach using different instruments and frameworks in a coordinated manner**, focusing not just on the individual technical capacity of Civil Society staff and of organisations, but also on the institutional development of CSOs, their interactions with other CSOs and with State institutions and the environment in which CSOs operate. CSOs need to be strengthened according to a strategic and long-term approach. The EU has a number of existing frameworks and tools that can be used for capacity building in this integrated approach. Direct dialogue with the sector is possible through the structured dialogue while CSO dialogue with the Government can be supported through the EU's own political dialogue as well as the policy dialogue in the context of the budget support. Technical assistance and operational support can be provided through the EDF, the EIDHR and CSO-LA budget lines as well as bilateral projects with member states.

- Finally, **there is a need to acknowledge and duly address the prevailing gap between** the CSOs based in Monrovia and those registered in other parts of the country. There is a need to strengthen local linkages between the organizations based in Monrovia and those based in the rural areas.

---

[4] Financial support will target actions at community level around allocation and disbursement of County and Social funds (in the case of USAID and Sweden) and the rule of law (in the case of UNDP). Geographic areas are yet to be defined but USAID and Sweden have similar approaches and target similar beneficiaries

PART II – EU STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN TO ENGAGE WITH CSOs

AREA	KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITITIES	PRIORITIES FOR EU ENGAGEMENT	ACTIONS (analysis, policy dialogue, operational support)	MEANS (programmes / instruments, etc.)
1. Promotion of the Enabling environment	1.1. The context of fragility undermines respect for Human Rights, Democracy and Gender Equality.	1.1. Contribute to the promotion of Human Rights, Democracy and Gender Equality, particularly in the priority areas identified in the HRDCS.	Political and policy dialogues: HR, democracy and gender equality included in annual Art. 8 political dialogue with the government and in all sectoral Art. 8 meetings. Operational support The EU will support promotion of Human Rights, Democracy and Gender Equality.	EUD: Use of thematic lines: EIDHR and CSO- LA Member States: Embassy of Sweden: UNDP Rule of Law Project, informal groups jointly with USAID Irish Aid: UNDP Rule of Law project, IRC
2. Enhance the engagement of Liberian CSOs in domestic policies	2.1. Liberian CSOs find themselves in a transition phase shifting from pure service delivery towards a role more focused on policy dialogue and accountability.	2.1. Strengthen CSOs' participation in policy formulation and implementation in EU 11th EDF focal sectors.	Political and policy dialogues: 1) Include participation of CSOs in policy sector dialogue in the context of budget support. 2) EUD facilitates CSOs participation through political dialogue. 3) Regular EUD/MS dialogue with CSOs (minimum twice a year) in each focal sector (including human rights) improves EU understanding of CSO perspective and ability to act as effective multiplier for CSO voices; encourages CSOs to focus on policy dialogue and accountability Operational support: The EU will support the strengthening of CSOs' advocacy role in the relevant public reforms that are underway in EU cooperation focal sectors	EUD: 11th EDF: Civil Society support programme and EDF Contribution to basket fund managed by the World Bank to implement IPFMRP – Non-State Actor project Member States: GIZ: Awareness in mining sector

	2.2. CSOs in Liberia continue to play a key role in the provision of basic services in line with the GoL medium-term development strategy and contributing to strengthened state institutions.	2.2. To ensure the provision of basic services to populations in areas with limited service provision by state institutions.	Political and policy dialogues: The EU ensures involvement of the CSO sector in the dialogue with GoL on the further roll-out, quality and sustainability of deconcentrated services. Operational level: The EUD will support provision of services in Agriculture, food and nutrition, and Education (MS) through Non-State Actors.	EUD 1) 11th EDF 2) Use of thematic lines (if available): in the same sectors) Member States: Irish Aid: Oxfam, Concern, WaterAid and Tear fund. Embassy of Sweden: Mercy Corps project on Development Skills
3. Support the capacity development of CSOs	3.1. Weak technical and institutional capacities of Liberian CSOs to participate in public policy formulation and implementation.	3.1. Strengthen the technical knowledge and skills and improve Internal Control Systems of CSOs.	Operational level: The EUD will support technical and organisational capacity reinforcement.	EUD 1)11th EDF: Civil Society support programme Member States: 1) Swedish Embassy: ForumSyd and Kvinna till Kvinna
	3.2. Despite coordination and networking efforts, Civil Society in Liberia remains fragmented and its collective voice weak.	3.2. Enhance the collective voice of Liberian CSOs, through improved networking and coordination efforts.	Political and policy dialogues: The EUD will use engagement with CSOs in each focal sector to encourage improved coordination also in their engagement with other actors. Operational Level: 1) Facilitation for CSOs networking and Collective Action 2) Support CS collective action and the development of a common CS voice and agenda to hold public authorities accountable.	EUD 1) 11th EDF: Civil Society support programme

4. Enhance coordination among development partners	4.1 Lack of coordination among development partners on Civil Society support	4.1 Facilitate information sharing and coordination among development partners supporting Liberian Civil Society	Operational Level: (to be decided who (EU/MS) has capacity to conduct it) 1) Sectoral Mapping Studies and other relevant studies to deepen the knowledge of CS dynamics 2) Elaboration of a donor matrix	EUD & member states: Cooperation section & CSO focal points

PART III– FOLLOW-UP ON THE PROCESS AND STRATEGY

Process indicators		
INDICATOR	**TARGET**	**BASE LINE INFORMATION AND FURTHER COMMENTS**
Involvement of Member States in the RM.	**Member States present in the country are actively involved in the RM process.**	The draft Roadmap was shared with the Member States with a Representation in Liberia i.e. France, Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Sweden provided comments which have been incorporated in the final draft.
Level of consultations held with CSOs regarding the RM.	**The RM entails consultations with a broad range of local CSOs. Ultimately it leads to more permanent and structured dialogue.**	Three workshops (1 energy and agriculture; 1 education;1 Governance) were organised with CSOs in May 2017 to collect their views around their roles and capacities, in the framework of the identification and formulation of the 11th EDF Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP), which constitutes the backbone to the RM.
Complementarity of RM vis-à-vis related EU and other Donor partners' processes.	**RMs are complementary to related processes including human rights and democracy country strategies, the rights-based approach to development, gender action plans, etc.**	The RM is complementary to the Gender Action Plan II as well as the Human Rights and Democracy Country Strategy. The RM includes HR and Democracy priorities, including gender-related ones. Gender will be specifically targeted within the EDF CSSP.

Outcome indicators				
PRIORITIES	**INDICATORS**	**TARGET**	**BASELINE INFORMATION** (if available)	**SOURCES OF INFORMATION & MEANS OF VERIFICATION**
1.1. Contribute to the promotion of Human Rights, Democracy and Gender Equality, particularly in the priority areas identified in the HRDCS.	1) Level of CSO participation/engagement in drafting and implementation of general/thematic GoL Human rights policies 2) Number of CSO led initiatives in HRDCS priority areas supported by EU 3) Level and quality of the cooperation between CSOs and relevant public institutions (INCHR,	1) Systematic inclusion of CSOs in HR policy development and implementation 2) At least 3 campaigns are launched/supported by EU/MS in HRDCS priority areas 3) HR CSOs consulted by Government institutions on a regular basis	1) Legislators lack accountability and often appear to be motivated by personal interests 2) Civil Society lacks capacity to effectively advocate for human rights and democracy 3) Only ad hoc consultations are taking place	- EIDHR project reports - Annual HRDCS reports - UPR reports

	NEC, Legislature, etc).			
2.1. Strengthen CSOs participation in policy formulation and implementation in EU 11th EDF focal sectors	1) Number of CSOs acting as governance actors and capable of holding the government accountable 2) Level of engagement of CSOs/ NCSCL in the domestic public policy cycle (especially national/ sector/ country budget drafting and implementation), in particular in relation to the focal sectors of EU cooperation 3) Number of initiatives (local plans, sector plans, specific projects etc.) within targeted sectors where budgets and/or tax collection reports are elaborated through participatory methodologies with CSOs 4) Number of initiatives (local plans, sector plans, specific projects etc.) within targeted sectors where budgets and/or tax collection reports are elaborated through participatory methodologies with CSOs and are gender mainstreamed 5) Number of fora for dialogue set up in the targeted sectors	Realistic targets to be set during inception phase of EDF CSSP	Data to be collected during inception phase EDF CSSP	- EDF CSSP project narrative and financial reports - PFM and PEFA reports - Assessments of State Building Contracts tranche release - Open Budget Initiative reports

2.2. To ensure the provision of basic services to populations in areas with limited service provision by state institutions.	1) Access to basic services by Liberian citizens (education, food security & nutrition) 2)Number of PPP signed between the GoL and CSO for the provision of basic services	Realistic targets to be set during inception phase of EDF CSSP	1) Equal access to basic services is not ensured to all citizens 2) Data to be collected during inception phase EDF CSSP	- EDF CSSP project reports
3.1. Strengthen the technical knowledge and skills and improve Internal Control Systems of CSOs	1) Level of strength of Internal Control systems of the CSOs and of NCSCL	Realistic targets to be set during inception phase of EDF CSSP	Data to be collected during inception phase EDF CSSP	- EDF CSSP project narrative and financial reports - OCAT or similar institutional assessment reports - Public Surveys - Open Budget Initiative reports - Newspapers and other public media (for the last indicator)
3.2. Enhance the collective voice of Liberian CSOs, through improved networking and coordination efforts.	1) Number of CSO staff trained in networking and coordination techniques who demonstrate increased knowledge in the relevant areas 2) Number of CSOs provided with assistance that would allow reinforcing of their networking/ coordination 3) Level of coordination skills of the CSOs/NCSCL supported by the programme	Realistic targets to be set during inception phase of EDF CSSP	Data to be collected during inception phase EDF CSSP	-Project reports -TA reports
4.1 Facilitate information sharing and coordination among development partners supporting Liberian Civil Society	1) Number of meetings involving DPs active on CS issues 2) Level of knowledge, from DPs, on the CS actors involved in each sector	1) At least 1 meeting per year is convened by DPs supporting CSOs 2) At least 4 sectoral mappings and 3 other studies are launched	1) Development partners' coordination on support to CSOs does not function 2) There is no updated information about CSOs engaged in the target sectors, or about development	-Mapping reports -Minutes of the donor coordination meetings -Project reports

	3) Number of joint initiatives involving DPs in support of Liberian Civil Society	3) At least 1 joint initiative takes place per year	partners supporting CSOs in these sectors	
			3) Sweden, Ireland and EUD jointly provided support to Liberian CS indirectly through supported projects (elections, IPFMRP, decentralization)	