



European Commission

Framework Contract Commission 2011
EUROPEAID/129783/C/ SER/multi

Lot 1: Studies and technical assistance in all sectors

Letter of Contract No. 2014/351923

Roadmaps for EU engagement with Civil Society

**Taking stock of the RM process in upper middle
income and upper income countries**

Lessons learnt and good practices



This project is funded by



Project implemented by

Support facility to EU Delegations in the elaboration and follow up of Country Roadmaps for engagement with Civil Society Organisations

Extract from: The EU Roadmap process: taking stock
Capitalisation report

Authors of the Report:

Coordination, editing and main author: Beatriz Sanz Corella (TL)

Contributions from:

Key experts form the RM Facility: Juan Nicolás Adán (Key Expert 2) and Pamela van de Bunt (Communication expert)

Non-key experts: Susana El Kum Molina, Gemma Pinyol, Lydia van de Fliert-Bukman and Tine Veldkamp

Proofreading and editing: William Pringle, Paulina Toporek

Contractor name and address

EPRD Office for Economic Policy and Regional Development Ltd.

Szkolna 36A Street,
25–604 Kielce, Poland

Phone: +48-41-3453271

Fax: +48-41-3452587

E-Mail: eprd@eprd.pl

DISCLAIMER

This report has been prepared by the Roadmap Facility with the financial assistance of the European Commission. The views expressed herein are those of the experts and therefore in no way reflect the official opinion of the European Commission

1. Introduction

The EU's 2006 European Consensus on Development addresses the topic of aid to middle-income countries, making it clear that the least developed countries (LDCs) and other low-income countries (LICs) will be the priority for EU aid, especially if they are in Africa, and that the lower middle-income countries (LMICs) should be the focus of assistance to MICs. In 2011, the EU development commissioner announced plans to withdraw aid from many middle-income countries. However, international support to MICs, including financial aid, continues to play an important role in global development: as a catalyst for change and as an important contribution to the graduation process from aid dependence.

The upper-middle (UMIC) and high-income countries (HIC) were allocated approximately 5.3 per cent of the ODA budget for the 10th EDF national and regional indicative programmes envelope. For the 11th EDF, around €1.2 billion could potentially be freed up. The European Commission's proposed policy of 'differentiation' aims to recalibrate aid and development cooperation in middle-income countries. Differentiation is a key feature of the EU's new development strategy, An Agenda for Change – and will shape the future of EU development cooperation over its multi-year budget period (2014-2020)¹. Although poverty exists in MICs, they are considered sufficiently affluent to spend their own resources on development; it is therefore argued that in view of tight donor budgets, funds should be allocated to LIC and fragility states where they are most needed. Others, however, argue that aid is more than an attempt to eradicate poverty and should also support MICs in achieving the Millennium Development Goals².

In the Development Cooperation Instrument (the EU's main aid funding stream for South Africa, Latin America and Asia), 16 middle-income countries are set to become ineligible for bilateral assistance, including higher middle-income countries. Despite their upper-middle-income status, South Africa and Cuba remain eligible for bilateral aid through DCI, in addition to Ecuador, Peru and Colombia. Both EDF and the DCI's bilateral programs channel assistance mainly to governments of beneficiary countries in the form of budget support or programmed funding. To the relief of many CSOs, the more modest EU thematic aid programmes (the bulk of funding through civil society) have been spared further cuts.

CSOs from higher middle-income countries play strategically important roles in effective development cooperation and in demanding transparency and accountability around the aid that their own countries still receive. They are therefore not just recipients of cooperation, but also innovators, providers of services in different sectors and promoters of accountability.

A comparative analysis of the roadmaps (RMs) from HIC and UMIC demonstrates the particular role civil society has in strengthening democratic processes, providing services and promoting development in a wide variety of sectors. It also shows a general trend of some concern about lack of funding, slowly shrinking enabling environments and lack of implementation of policies.

This report is based on an assessment of two HICs (Barbados and Israel) and 14 UMICs (Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles and South Africa (Africa); Fiji (Asia & Pacific); Lebanon and Algeria (European Neighbourhood & Middle East); and Argentina, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Brazil, Colombia and Peru (from Latin America & Caribbean)). No access was available to the roadmaps and feedback forms of Botswana, Malaysia, Chile, Cuba, Suriname

¹What future for EU development cooperation for Middle Income Countries. The state of play of negotiations between EU institutions, BOND, ODI, Sian Herbert, 2013

² See also: Jonathan Glennie: The role of aid to middle-income countries: a contribution to evolving EU development policy, working paper 331, June 2011, ODI UK

and Uruguay.

Latin AM & Caribbean	8
Africa	4
ENI & Middle East	2
Asia and Pacific	1
Neighbourhood	1

The RM Facility (RMF) has provided in-country support to Mexico. Peru hired a local consultant to support the elaboration of the Roadmap and some initial remote support was offered to South Africa (a mission is foreseen in September 2015 to assist the EUD in the definition of the M&E mechanism), in addition to the support provided by ECDPM.

2. Country context and the three priorities for EU support

HIC and UMIC Country Contexts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive enabling environment for civil society • Important advances in democratisation, political participation, economic growth, participation and dialogue, coupled with significant disparities in socio-economic situation of citizens • Functioning legal frameworks in place that ensure space for civil society • Active CS in a wide variety of sectors (from providing services to increasing responsibilities in the field of developing public policies and monitoring local and national governments) • In some countries, vibrant civil society plays an innovative role • In several RMs, the need for strengthening structured dialogue mechanisms between CSOs and national and local governments is highlighted. <p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally declining respect for the important role of CSOs • Lack of compliance with international commitments and national legal frameworks • Rights-based CSOs in particular are increasingly monitored and face challenges in operating activities and securing funding (particularly in graduating countries) • Although CSOs in many countries have created networks and platforms, there is an identified need for more effective coordination and collaboration between organisations and sectors.
----------------------------------	---

2.1. The environment in which CSOs operate

A review of the HIC and UMIC EU Roadmaps for engagement with civil society demonstrates a number of parallels in the situation of the enabling environment in which civil society operates in the 16 countries of the cluster. Civil society has good space to operate and a rather supportive environment in 14 countries, but is more restricted in two (South Africa and Israel). In Israel the legal framework acknowledges the role of civil society and recognises the importance of consultation and dialogue with civil society actors; however, a clear framework for engagement between government institutions and civil society is missing and non-mainstream actors (i.e. Arab minority, socially disadvantaged groups, and social change organisations with a strong advocacy agenda) encounter difficulties and are often excluded from dialogue. In South Africa, the RM notes a declining respect for civic space, particularly

with regards to the right to peaceful assembly and freedom of expression (i.e. violent police interventions during demonstrations). The RM also highlights a decline in access to information, an arbitrary application of the registration law and the need to reform the tax system for CSOs in the country.

Generally, in all countries of this cluster, those CSOs involved in service provision encounter little or no opposition. They work with their governments to a greater or lesser extent, but generally can operate rather freely. This is not the case for those organisations that focus on human rights issues, democratisation, transparency and sometimes rights of indigenous peoples, minorities, women or LGBTI. One third of the roadmaps are concerned about a shrinking operating space for these organisations.

Another general feature of the enabling environment is the fact that in all the countries, legal and policy frameworks are more or less in place. Certainly, in a number of countries, policies should be further adjusted; generally, though, there is a rule of law situation that regulates the role of civil society in a balanced manner. However, with regards to implementation of policies, there is room for improvement in a majority of the countries.

Yet another issue that is common among most countries of this cluster is the fact that there is growing social inequality (this is not only a trend for HIC and UMIC but a world-wide trend) and a general decline in international funding coupled with limited financial sustainability of CSOs.

A good number of countries also have a well-functioning, pro-active and comparatively capable civil society (particularly in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Israel, Peru and South Africa). Some other countries (such as Seychelles and Mexico) need their civil society actors to multiply and become more actively engaged.

2.2. Civil Society involvement in public policies (national and international)

Most roadmaps of this cluster recognise that civil society involvement in developing, implementing and monitoring government policies is relatively high. CSOs have campaigned to improve policies, monitor implementation, engage in advocacy, implement government programmes or act in those sectors or geographical areas where the government has little or no influence. These activities do not necessarily result in high impact, but in most countries CSOs are well aware of legislative issues, policy gaps and space for civil society.

CS involvement in public policies is weaker in Mexico, Fiji, Israel and Barbados. While participation of Mexican civil society in areas of global discussion began a few decades ago, recently it has seen an intensification of activities linking Mexican CSOs to international debates. In the Caribbean there is good potential for civil society to strengthen activities in service delivery and entrepreneurship and further develop its influence on policy making, also at regional level (implementation of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) via the CARIFORUM-EU Consultative Committee). In Fiji, positive developments are noted in the health and environment sectors. Cooperation with the private sector is advancing and authorities have begun opening up for dialogue on sensitive matters. The UN Human Rights Council's UPR of Fiji in Geneva is an example of progress in dialogue with civil society on human rights issues. In areas such as education, governance, human rights and media, however, structured dialogue and engagement mechanisms are still not in place, with only ad-hoc consultations taking place at irregular intervals. The right to freedom of association has also been undermined by the Public Emergency Regulation (PER), which has restricted freedoms of assembly, expression and information. The Charitable Act reinforces traditional approaches (charity, welfare and relief) but is inadequate for civil society involved in advocacy work. Organisations that are regarded to be anti-government can be de-registered and prevented from conducting its activities. Following the 2006 military coup, the registration of new organisations has been hampered.

CSOs in all countries of the cluster engage in a wide variety of sectors, traditionally in the field of health, education, sanitation, nutrition, socially vulnerable groups (the disabled), development, research and also in gender, environment, development, minorities and indigenous peoples. As indicated in the former section, the latter activities are increasingly challenged by the government, and in some countries also by the media.

2.3. CSO capacity

As can be expected, coordination between CSOs in HICs and UMICs is relatively high. In most countries, umbrellas or networks are set up between sectors, at territorial or at national level. The quality of networking and cooperation between CSOs is still a challenge: both vertical and horizontal integration could benefit from further strengthening. In Barbados, for example, though local civil society benefits from the national NSA Panel platform, effective coordination around sectors is still weak, and this limits the opportunity of civil society to be heard and consulted in national and regional governance processes. The absence of effective umbrella organisations in each sector increases fragmentation and leads to duplication of activities and a waste of resources.

Several roadmaps indicate that networking and coordination beyond traditional NGOs and CSOs should improve. One exception was noted in the Seychelles. Recently, the umbrella that groups the country's CSOs was transformed into a Citizens Engagement Platform, representing all NSAs, including political parties, media organisations and trade unions. The state has formalised partnerships with CS through a Memorandum of Understanding with the umbrella organisation to increase collaboration with CSOs and encourage integrated development as identified in the National Action Plan on Social Development.

Albeit often challenging, there are also good practice consolidating alliances and strategies between different civil society actors, particularly in Latin America, the Dominican Republic, Peru and Colombia. In Namibia, the umbrella body for NCSOs (NANGOF Trust) was revived in 2009 and is recognised by the government as the representative body of CSOs. As such, the NANGOF Trust acts as a collective voice for CSOs and provides supportive services to its 122 member CSOs. Different platforms have also been established around sectors (health, environment, education, tourism, etc.).

The EUDs and other donors in several countries are working to enhance the financing of CS networks and umbrellas, providing an incentive for coordination and efficiency.

3. The Roadmap process

Roadmap Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good MS involvement in roadmap development • Diverse and intense consultations with civil society, combining face to face meetings at the EUD, decentralised consultations and on-line questionnaires in several countries • No support received from the Facility (except in 2 countries) • 2/3 of the roadmaps restricted.
-----------------	---

Despite the fact that the EUDs from this cluster work in relatively tranquil and balanced environments, six EU Delegations, from a total of 21, did not manage to present their roadmaps. There was no FBF for three.

3.1. Consultation with civil society

In all but two countries, the EUDs used a participatory approach in developing the roadmap by engaging in intensive consultations with civil society actors. In South Africa, consultations were principally held with professional CSOs and think tanks. In all other countries, except for Barbados where no information on consultation with civil society was provided, a series of

meetings combined with other mechanisms were set up to engage broader representations of civil society. In several cases, the roadmaps also included plans for their participation in implementing the priorities.

Examples:

- In Brazil, the EUD engaged in 8 consultations with CSOs, including two with NGO beneficiaries of EU funding, five in five different states and one with sector specialists.
- In Colombia, well known for its vibrant civil society, three meetings with platforms and six regional working groups were organised with the support of the Colombian confederation of NGOs.
- The Jamaica roadmap enjoys a high degree of support from CSOs that have displayed interest in participating in future annual forums to discuss strategies and joint initiatives. A questionnaire was sent to a wide range of CSOs (trade unions, private sector, NGOs in social sectors, right-based NGOs), and two meetings were held with CSOs in the capital.
- In Mexico, three consultations took place including CSOs, NGOs, trade unions, private sector, universities, research institutes, agricultural organisations, etc., two in the presence of the Cooperation Section and the Head of Delegation. One workshop included high-level representatives from the private sector and trade unions and discussed formalisation of relations between ECOSOC and Mexico. With the purpose of reaching out and involving civil society outside the capital city, a survey was published at the website of the EUD and also widely distributed among networks and local organisations in the country. Also key informant interviews were conducted with five different experts and the RM includes a long bibliography of documents consulted. CSOs request the EUD to create a permanent dialogue mechanism in specific areas: environment and climate change, migration, children's rights, capacity building, advocacy.
- The EUD in Lebanon capitalised on seven consultation meetings organised in the framework of the drafting of a mapping study on Lebanese civil society under the Civil Society Facility. During a restitution seminar with Lebanese CSOs, both the roadmap and the mapping were presented.

3.2. Involvement of Member States in developing and implementing the Roadmap

In 9 cases, the roadmap was developed with good involvement from the Member States (MS), in four countries, the involvement was average, and in one case no information was provided. In Namibia, for example, coordination with the MS was excellent. The UK, Spain, France, Germany and Finland actively participated in drafting Section 2 of the roadmap. MS will also contribute to the implementation of the RM to the extent that it is possible. Finland might provide funding to implement some of the actions. Germany cannot select specific actions at this stage but might support some of the studies and policy facilitation. Spain will support the elaboration of case studies as well as policy facilitation. Relevant staff working at the National Planning & Communication unit in the government was also consulted. Heads of Missions from France, Germany, Finland, Spain, United Kingdom and the Delegation of the European Union approved the Roadmap. Also in Lebanon, EU MS were actively involved. A series of meetings between the EUD and MS were held and a 'Roadmap Group with 11 focal points' (EUD + 10 EU MS) was created.

Most roadmaps provide information on the involvement of MS in its development, but only a minority also give good detail about how MS are going to be part of the implementation process. Only three roadmaps state that the final document was approved by both the EUD and Member States. Jamaica includes the signatures of MS Ambassadors. Few roadmaps mention other donors. In the Seychelles, the two resident MS were consulted during the RM process and are involved in its implementation; UNDP and the government were also engaged in this process. Also in Mauritius, the UK and France were consulted and will be actively involved in implementation, as will UNDP, government agencies and the Ministry of Social Security in charge of NGOs. This is the right way forward.

4. The Roadmap priorities, indicators and actions

Roadmap document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities are in line with the EC Communication • At analytical level, most RMs include a wide variety of civil society actors • At the level of involvement of CS in elaborating the RM, it is not always clear who the actors are and it is not always explained what consultation mechanisms were used and who was engaged • The process of priority identification in all countries of this cluster resulted in the definition of properly contextualised and country-specific priorities • Six country roadmaps present too generally defined and not properly measurable indicators • The definition of viable actions is the weakest link. Only about one quarter of the roadmaps manages to define concrete actions and relate these to the financial instruments.
------------------	--

Number of priorities: Seven roadmaps present between two and three priorities, three selected four priorities and the remaining five EUDs defined between 5 and 13 specific and global priorities. All are considered relatively country specific and contextualised, except for the priorities of the roadmaps from Mauritius, the Seychelles and Fiji.

2-3 priorities/ 4-12 indicators	4 priorities/ 13-22 indicators	5-13 priorities/ 29-32 indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 Roadmaps • 4 Roadmaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Roadmaps • 7 Roadmaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Roadmaps • 4 Roadmaps

Quality of priorities: All UMIC country roadmaps divide their priorities among the three priorities of the 2012 Communication. In only three cases there are other, out-of-the-box priorities proposed. The HIC roadmaps show a different pattern. They do not include capacity building and, in the case of Barbados, neither does the roadmap identify priorities for an enabling environment. The focus of these roadmaps is, understandably given the context, on promoting civil society participation in public policies and dialogue.

Enabling Environment: All roadmaps define priorities related to the environment, except for Mauritius (with a focus on two priorities only). In Fiji, the EUD monitors the CS environment during regular meetings with key donors as well as through frequent informal meetings with CSOs funded through EIDHR programmes. A good example of a contextualised and practical priority for an EE came from Colombia: *“Establishing a structured, informed and consistent dialogue with CSOs, the state and the international community.”* The related indicators and actions are also practical and precise. Colombian civil society also benefits from international recognition for promoting democratic processes, constructive action in promoting human rights and participation in international forums.

Other roadmaps define priorities that are too general and fall way beyond the scope of EUD capacity and action, and rather than priorities express ideal situations. Priority 1 of the Algeria roadmap for example: *“Improving the legal and operational framework in which the Algerian civil society operates”* or Priority 4 of the Namibia Roadmap: *“Government recognises the important role of CSOs in development, is open to CSOs and includes CSOs in national policy and decision-making processes, as well as the legislative processes.”*

One already mentioned issue that stands out in several roadmaps is that the environment for CSOs engaging in service provision is open, and legal frameworks are in place, yet those organisations that work in human rights increasingly encounter difficulties. In Peru, for example, the environment is difficult and at times hostile for organisations that are active in the fields of indigenous peoples and environmental issues. Colombian civil society is protected by a legal framework, including in remote areas where the government has little influence. However, human rights organisations also suffer from criminalisation and persecution. In South Africa, the roadmap notes a declining respect for civic space, particularly the right to assemble peacefully and freely express opinions (i.e. police violent interventions in some demonstrations). The priorities could focus more on EUD support to organisations working in this field, as the Roadmap for Peru does.

Civil society participation in public policies and dialogue: All roadmaps of this cluster present priorities linked to the involvement of CSOs in public policies. Evidently, the EUD can play an important role as a catalyst for promoting engagement between civil society, national and local government.

- In Fiji, EU engagement with the government to promote an enabling environment for CSOs will be part of EU political dialogue once cooperation resumes in 2015. Ad-hoc measures helping to support civil society have been taken (e.g. press releases when the permit for the 2013 Women's Day march was withheld by Government) and support to NGO activities is a recurrent subject of discussions with the Fijian Authorities.
- In the case of Mexico, for example, the EUD has on several occasions actively intervened to promote issues of concern to civil society organisations in its official relations and dialogue with the government. This has had a positive impact.
- The Algerian Roadmap envisages as a long-term result of EUD action the establishment of a formal consultation platform for civil society that is truly representative and has an impact on national policy making.
- The Jamaica Roadmap prioritises EU engagement in supporting CSOs to engage with the public and the authorities in justice reform processes, and develop and implement communication strategies that will help build consensus and awareness for reform.
- The Roadmap for Peru envisages a clear role for the EUD in promoting the creation of civil society participation mechanisms to influence the development of public policies.

Capacity development: All roadmaps also include actions to improve the capacity of CSOs (weak internal governance and financial administration). Comparatively, civil society is most HICs and UMICs is pro-active, diverse and vibrant, yet professionalisation continues to be a priority and lack of funding a concern. In Israel, for example, CSOs interviewed for the mapping study recognised the need to improve their internal governance and their upward and downward accountability systems.

The Roadmap for Peru, and other roadmaps, propose to support civil society platforms to improve their representativeness. This is an important priority that can concretely contribute to enhancing collaboration and cooperation between civil society actors, and hence their collective voice in national policy-making. Indeed, the Colombia roadmap as well proposes to continue its support to increase CSO capacities to network and strengthen alliances to act more efficiently as development actors.

One overall weakness of most roadmaps is that the priorities and indicators are too ambitious and removed from possible concrete EU/MS action, rather than presenting clear objectively verifiable priorities that can be managed by the EUD and fall within its scope, albeit contextualised to a certain degree. Rather than presenting steps for strengthening engagement of the EU/MS with civil society in any given country, they reflect the vision of the EUD for a country. Roadmaps should stay close to their mission: they should be practical, operational and measurable. For example, Priority 1 of the Roadmap for Jamaica reads: *“(a) Improved access to justice for all, in particular the poor, women, children, people with*

disabilities and members of minority groups, (b) Monitoring and reporting on governance concerns within the security sector such as those contributing to impunity and inequality (e.g. extra-judicial killings and other human rights abuses)." Albeit wonderful priorities, the EUD can and should not pretend to have the capacity to achieve such goals. It could, however, envisage concrete support to civil society to contribute to this vision the EUD has for the future of Jamaica.

The number of indicators varies between 4 (Israel) and 32 (South Africa and Namibia). Whereas the quantity of priorities and indicators is not always directly correlated to the quality of the roadmap, it is safe to say that the more priorities and indicators, the more complex monitoring and implementation of the roadmap will be. Hence the importance of fine-tuning, reducing and defining measurable indicators that are connected to concrete actions and contextualised priorities.

The quality of the indicators of this cluster are both specific and measurable in 9 countries. The indicators presented in the roadmaps for Algeria, Namibia, Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Lebanon and South Africa, however, will not be easy to measure. The EUDs from South Africa and the Dominican Republic indicated that they would benefit from support in defining more realistic, timely, qualitative and quantitative indicators.

An overall assessment of proposed actions shows that in 75% of the roadmaps these are defined too broadly and too general. In Algeria, for example, actions are not linked to specific initiatives, operational support or research making it somewhat difficult to assess their linkage to the proposed priorities. The EUD has indicated that support would be welcome in mapping activities that already exist and need to be continued and identifying new actions tailored to the specific polarised and restrictive operating context. Actions are properly defined in only four countries (Mexico, Namibia, Jamaica and Seychelles).

The Lebanon FBF makes the following observation: *"The selection of actions is specific and contextualised, however, even if they are achieved, the priorities may not."* Indeed, an integrated approach to priorities, actions and indicators is crucial to an analytical and operational roadmap. Were the instructions for defining actions not clear, or is it Roadmap fatigue at the end of the process? A majority of roadmaps will need to further specify their actions referring to specific studies, research, dialogues and operational support. Roadmaps can further trim their indicators and priorities where possible to enhance implementation and monitoring. The indicators envisage clear outcome and roadmaps should include means of verification defined to allow continued tracking. None of the roadmaps thus far include means for verification.

5. EU Engagement

EU engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several RMs fail to identify the specific programmes and financial instruments that are likely to fund the proposed actions proposed by the RM • Mainstreaming is envisaged in a majority of roadmaps • Approximately half the roadmaps do not clearly indicate MS involvement in future implementation of the RM • Examples of innovative practice.
---------------	---

Thematic and other EU programmes: About half the roadmaps do not provide much detail on specific programmes and instruments that could fund the proposed actions. All do provide references to general instruments such as calls for proposal under CSO&LA and EIDHR. Two roadmaps provide a good overview of EU cooperation budget-lines, including regional programmes that could be accessed for funding. A few also mention MS sources. Most roadmaps, however, could improve guidance on MS contributions to the achievement of the three global priorities set by the 2012 Communication.

Mainstreaming is a priority in approximately 2/3 of the HIC/UMIC countries:

- South Africa has been one of the leading EU Delegations in terms of mainstreaming civil society. A recent evaluation of budget support highlights the fact that engagement of CSOs (particularly in justice and health) has led to policy innovation and an enhanced equity approach in service delivery and accountability.
- Civil society mainstreaming in Israel is a priority in education and other social sectors (gender), however, this is limited to a few organisations. At national level, the EUD encourages direct interaction between CSOs and the Israeli government in the framework of TAIEX projects. The EUD also promotes engagement of local authorities with CSOs through the thematic line CSO-LA and as a result, five LA projects are implemented in partnership with CSOs.
- CSOs in Mauritius are involved in the identification and formulation of budget support and also consulted during implementation. However, they are not directly engaged in the implementing and monitoring of BS operations.
- For the EUD in the Dominican Republic, mainstreaming of civil society in all sectors is a priority: participation of civil society in reform processes through co-administration with the government. Bilateral cooperation and programmes support the reform of the public administration at central (PARAP) and local (PASCAL) level.

Examples of innovative practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Peru, an EU/MS Working Group has been created for the development and implementation of the roadmap • In Israel, in the context of the development of the Roadmap, (as has been suggested by the guidance but not often implemented by the EUDs) non-EU counterparts that are important players in support to civil society were also involved • In Elias Pina, Dominican Republic, one of the poorest regions of the country, a mapping was done of civil society actors and projects to include these in the development plans of the local authorities, enhance their involvement and avoid duplication • In South Africa, the EU funded “Access to Justice and promotion of constitutional rights”(AJPCRP) support programme was based on a strategic collaboration between the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (DoJ&CD) and the Foundation for Human Rights (FHR), a civil society actor • The Roadmap for Argentina proposes to systematise good practice in advocacy of already implemented and ongoing projects financed by the EU, to serve as a catalyst for internal dialogue • In Argentina as well, the Red Argentina de Cooperacion Internacional (RACI) develops capacity building trainings at national level for CSOs with limited capacity • The Mexico roadmap proposes a number of actions that showcase a practical approach and could be a blueprint for other EUDs to follow, i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The EUD developed a matrix overview of EU and MS projects funded with civil society ○ Promote systematic participation of CSOs when the EUD is visiting the provinces; develop joint EU/MS support for pilot projects ○ On the basis of mappings of civil society projects in the country, promote their visibility by sharing the results with national and local governments ○ Enhance civil society participation in EUD efforts to analyse and address gaps in the legal framework. The results of the survey conclude that CS is

appreciative of dialogue with the EU in the field of human rights (as an example of good practice: the EU Permanent Working Group with Civil Society on Human Rights was created in May 2013)

- Support networking between local CS and European CSOs.
- The Dominican Republic NSA Panel has used a fortnightly TV talk show to share key messages and concerns with its CSO members and society at large. In Barbados, Dominican Republic and St. Lucia these panels have created specific websites and email groups providing information to their members about new opportunities for tender and participation in EU sponsored projects
- In Fiji, in the framework of the support to the sugar cane sector, a more structured dialogue with CSOs delivering assistance is taking place on issues like sustainable development, environment, gender and role of women in development. Four NGOs (FRIEND, Habitat for Humanity, Empower Pacific, Ramakrishna mission) and two farmers' associations, Fiji Crop & Livestock Council and Fairtrade associations, representing more than 15,000 farmers, participate in six monthly Programme Steering Committee meetings. Stakeholders in the sector collaborate well and the enabling environment for CSO policy engagement is adequate. Strategic discussions with line ministries and relevant authorities on rural development, agriculture, sugar sector or social housing take place on a regular basis.

6. SWOT and Conclusions

The purpose of the RM process is to improve engagement of EUDs with CS (particularly local CS). A review of the HIC and UMIC roadmaps shows that EU support and engagement with CS is not only key in service delivery but also in promoting the rule of law and mediating between citizens and the government.

In line with the below analysis of trends regarding context, process and content of the roadmaps and EU engagement with civil society in the HIC and UMIC countries, most recommendations extracted from the FBF highlight the importance of further fine-tuning and narrowing down of priorities, indicators and actors. To enhance their implementation, roadmaps need further operationalisation. Second generation roadmaps could also significantly improve linking actions and programmatic tools, developing M&E systems and mechanisms for data collection and indicator development.

	Strengths	Challenges/Opportunities
Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political stability, democratic contexts, economic growth • Supportive enabling environment • Functioning legal frameworks • Active civil society in a wide variety of areas and sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significant differences in income and development ▪ Enabling environment for human rights organisations often challenging ▪ Good opportunities for strengthening EU engagement with civil society, particularly in governance issues.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good MS involvement • Good CS involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Division of labour with MS ▪ Diversification of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two countries received support • 10 roadmaps are restricted. 	<p>consultations with more diverse groups of CS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support RM implementation ▪ Develop in-country communication strategies about the RM process.
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities in line with the EC Communication and properly contextualised • At analytical level, most RMs include a wide variety of civil society actors • Six country roadmaps present too generally defined and not properly measurable indicators • Weak definition of viable actions in a majority of RMs • Weak identification of financial instruments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrow down and fine-tune priorities, indicators and actions ▪ Involvement of CSOs in elaborating the RM ▪ Involvement of CSOs in implementing the RM ▪ Concrete plans for joint implementation of RM priorities.
Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstreaming envisaged in a majority of RMs • The often innovative and implementing role of CSOs recognised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information on consultation mechanisms not captured in the capitalisation exercise ▪ Regular consultation and dialogue mechanism with CS following the RM process should be strengthened ▪ Follow up with CS: joint implementation of RM priorities ▪ Further concretise mainstreaming.