

**DG ENLARGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR EU SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN
ENLARGEMENT COUNTRIES, 2014-2020**

MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND PROPOSED RESULTS FRAMEWORK

ALBANIA

NATIONAL TARGETS TILL THE YEAR 2020

Notes:

- This document was developed in consultations with 30 experienced CSO representatives including TACSO Albania Office, PA Albania, Albanian National training and Technical Assistance Resource Centre, Roma Active Albania, VIS Albania, Albanian Empowerment Women Network, REC Albania, Children Observatory, Urban Research Institute, LGBT Alliance, a number of FPAs like PA Albania, Centre for Economic Research, VIS Albania, EDEN Centre, and the representatives from Government Agency for Supporting the Civil Society and from the Ministry of Integration.
- Due to the lack of economic data, some targets were impossible to be projected.
- The findings and IPAS study commissioned by TACSO were considered by participants as too inflated and not appropriate to be considered as a baseline for the 3rd objective of the guideline: CSO capacities. Therefore the projections of national targets developed during the mid-scale workshop were far behind those proposed by IPSOS.

Background for the table:

- A set of objectives, results and indicators was developed for EU support to civil society, which allows the measurement of progress at country level as well as across the enlargement region
- The Guidelines are developed for the period of 2014 – 2020, however, one needs to have in mind that most of the objectives in the guidelines cannot be achieved in the period of 6 years, since the realization of objectives includes legislative changes and their proper implementation
- For the purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation and Proposed Results Framework we used following definitions of benchmark and target:
 - **Benchmark:** That which is attainable under ideal conditions; it is a standard or reference point. Building on a definition that a benchmark is “a quantitative target which represents what can be achieved by the best”, the benchmark in this framework is an **optimum situation**, measured through EU member states average. Since some of the indicators are qualitative, also corresponding benchmarks are qualitative as well. All benchmarks, except of some under CSO capacity (see: notes for participants of the mid-scale workshops), are based on analysis of secondary sources (such as Global Civil Society Index, Comparative Non-profit Sector Publication, JHU, 2004; Volunteering in the European Union, EAC-EA, DG EAC, February 2010; www.usig.org, etc.).

It is very important that the benchmark is measurable, even though it is qualitative. For example, if the indicator is “quality of *something*”, it is not advisable that the benchmark would be “better quality”, since one would then never know when the benchmark is reached. Therefore, when defining the benchmark one needs to define what exactly and concretely would better quality mean in each specific case, e.g. indicator 1.2.c Quality of (labour) legislative framework → Benchmark: Labour legislative framework is not discriminative towards CSOs (since that is one of the definitions of quality legislation from the point of view of CSO development).
 - **Target:** a specified level of performance for an indicator at a predetermined point in time. Since benchmarks for indicators cannot be achieved until 2020, **national targets represent a step towards achieving the benchmark and are set to 2020**. In other words, targets represent a mid-term goal towards achieving benchmarks. When setting the national target, stakeholders need to have in mind *national specifics*, e.g. baseline for each indicator in 2014. Participants at the mid-scale workshops should agree on quantitative target, where appropriate (when national quantitative target is need, the target is marked in yellow)
 - **Baseline:** the level of performance at some specified starting point. Provides the initial point of comparison for the future measures of performance. When setting the national target one needs to have in mind a baseline – the current state of affairs (in 2014) and what can be realistically achieved till 2020. In the cases of higher baseline, national target (2020) can be the same as the benchmark.

For determining a baseline we recommend to use EC annual progress report and BCSDN’s country reports on the Monitoring matrix for enabling environment for civil society development.

Notes for participants of the mid-scale workshops:

- Main question for you to answer is: what are we striving to achieve in a long run (benchmark) and what can be **realistically** achieved until 2020 (**TARGET**)
- Proposals for targets were made on the basis of indicators, however, since indicators differ in their scope and level, some targets are not 100% in line with the indicator. For example, some targets narrow CSOs to some specific type of CSO (e.g. public benefit, professional, etc.), since, in our opinion, target is relevant only for identified CSOs and not for all types (e.g. grass-roots, CSOs that work only for the benefit of their members)
- As described above, when setting a target, you need to have in mind country specific baseline. However, for the CSO capacity there is no baseline for the majority of indicators. We advised to use CSO participants at the mid-scale workshop to identify the baseline for these targets. The method is not objective, but it does offer some orientation.

Objectives	Results	Indicator	MoV	Benchmark	National target (2020)
Conducive environment					
1. An enabling legal and policy environment, for the exercise of the rights of freedom, expression, assembly and association,	1.1. All individuals and legal entities can express themselves freely, assemble peacefully and establish, join and participate in non-formal and/or registered organisations	1.1.a. Quality assessment of existing legislation and policy framework	BCDN Findings: 1.1.a. Registration of CSOs is not mandatory. Rules and procedures for registration are clearly established and foreseen by the Law. Gaps identified: Centralisation of registration process in the Tirana Court of First Instance. (findings from MM Report 2013)	1.1.a. Continuous comparative monitoring and analysing of legislation and policy framework is in place, 90 % of gaps in national legislation and policy framework are identified and addressed.	1.1.a. 90% of gaps in national legislation and policy framework are identified and addressed.
		1.1.b. Progress with the adoption and implementation of relevant legislation	1.1.b. Albania offers constitutional and legal guarantees of the right of citizens to express freely (MM report 2013). However, 91% of surveyed CSOs declare that there is no excessive use of force exercised by law enforcement bodies during assemblies, whereas 88% of surveyed CSOs declare that the	1.1.b. Legislation provides for freedom of speech without state interference, freedom of assembly without discrimination and hindering conditions, and for accessible, timely and	1.1.b. Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly; • maximum 10 working

			freedom of assemble is respected (MM report 2014)	inexpensive registration of CSOs	days needed for registration of CSOs, the registration cost is reduced to maximum 15 EUR; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> registration of CSOs should be decentralized in administrative regions of Albania through National Registration Center (QKR)
	1.2. The policies and legal environment stimulate and facilitate volunteering and employment in CSOs	1.2.a. Number of employees in CSO (permanent and part-time) 1.2.b. Number of volunteers in CSOs per type of CSO / sector 1.2.c. Quality of legislative framework	1.2.a. No official data available 1.2.b. No official data 1.2.c. Albanian legislation on human resources is unified for all employers and applied without differential treatment for CSOs. (MM report 2014)	1.2.a. 5,4 % of total workforce is employed in CSO sector (<i>EU average</i>) 1.2.b. The contribution of volunteers to GDP is 1,3 % (<i>EU average</i>) 1.2.c. Labour legislative framework (including active employment policy) is not discriminative towards CSOs ¹ ;	1.2.a. 2 % of total workforce is employed in CSO sector 1.2.b. The contribution of volunteers to GDP is % 1.2.c. There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation (including active employment policy) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> legislation enables tax-

¹ While labour law as such probably is not discriminative (= does not put CSOs as employers in a different position as other employers. e.g. with different conditions or demands), this may happen with other labour connected legislation and its implementation, especially active employment policy. Labour legislation would be discriminative, if, for example, subsidy for employment of people registered as unemployed would be available only for public institutions and/or business sector and not for CSOs.

				Legislative framework is stimulative towards promotion of volunteering	free reimbursement of travel expenses and per diems to volunteers (NA)
	<p>1.3. National and/or local authorities have enabling policies and rules for grass-roots organisations* and/or civic initiatives.</p> <p>*A grass-roots organisation is a self-organised group of individuals pursuing common interests through a volunteer-based, non-profit organisation. Grassroots organisations usually have a low degree of formality but a broader purpose than issue-based self-help groups, community-based organisations or neighbourhood-associations.</p>	1.3.a. Quality of the enabling environment for grass-roots organisations and/or civic initiatives	1.3.a. Registration of CSOs is not mandatory. (MM report 2013)	1.3.a. Registration of grass-roots is not mandatory; unregistered organizations can freely operate and receive financial support	1.3.a. Legislation recognizes and enables existence and functioning of grass-roots
2. An enabling financial environment which supports	2.1. Easy-to-meet financial rules for CSO, which are proportionate to their turn-over and non-	2.1.a. CSOs' perception of the ease and effectiveness of financial rules and	2.1.a. Financial reporting and accounting rules do not take into consideration the specific nature of CSOs and are not proportionate to the size of organisation and its	2.1.a. 80 % of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO	2.1.a. 40 % of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO turn-over; in their opinion,

sustainability of CSOs.	commercial activities	reporting requirements (disaggregated by type / size of CSO)	type/scope of activity. (MM report 2014) There is lack of capacities of tax inspections dealing with CSOs.(MM report 2014)	turn-over; in their opinion, an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers)	an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers)
		2.1.b. Quality assessment of financial rules (with the focus on built-in mechanisms that financial rules and obligations change as the turn-over and non-commercial activities change).	2.1.b. Financial reporting and accounting rules do not take into consideration the specific nature of CSOs and are not proportionate to the size of organisation and its type/scope of activity. (MM report 2014)	2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are clear, understandable and proportionate to CSOs' turn-over (at least 3 different formats)	2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are stable, clear, and financial reporting format for CSOs should be different from businesses
	2.2. Donations are stimulated with adequate legislation and regulations	2.2.a. Quality and applicability/practice of the legal framework for individual and corporate giving	2.2.a. Law on Sponsorship considers as sponsors only business companies and individuals that have the "quality of merchants" (MM report 2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of tax deduction is not encouraging enough for individuals and corporate donations to CSOs. (MM report 2013) • Procedures in place to claim tax deduction are not functional and do not encourage individual and 	2.2.a Legislation provides for stimulating tax incentives for corporate and individual giving: - tax relief in the amount of 5 % of taxable income for corporations, - tax relief in the amount of 10 % of taxable income for	2.2.a. Legislation provides for stimulating tax incentives for corporate and individual giving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tax relief² in the amount of 4 % of taxable income for corporations, • tax relief in the amount of 5 % of taxable income for individual persons OR 2 % tax allocation for public benefit purposes (for the countries with % law

² If there is some other system of tax incentives for donations in place in respective countries, participants at the mid-scale workshop should change the target accordingly.

			corporate donations. (MM report 2013)	individual persons OR 2 % tax allocation for public benefit purposes (for the countries with % law system)	system)
2.3. Financial (e.g. tax or in-kind) benefits are available	2.3.a. Quality of the system of tax benefits for the CSOs' operational and economic activities	2.3.a. Decision of Council of Ministers No. 953, date 29.12.2014, establishes a ceiling of 20% of the annual turnover of the CSO resulting from the economic activity is tax free (MM report 2014)	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity ³ , is tax free.	2.3.a. 20% of income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free.	
2.4. Government support to CSOs is available and provided in a transparent, accountable, fair and non-discriminatory manner	2.4.a. Ratio of amount sought vs. amount approved/disbursed annually through state funding to CSOs. (this proves availability of funds)	2.4.a. Public funding are not available for institutional and programme development of CSOs. • A contribution of 2.2% of the annual turnover from the National Lottery is dedicated to the “good works”, not specifically targeting CSOs. CSOs can compete for this fund. (MM report 2014)	2.4.a. State provides funding for the implementation of 80 % of public policies, identified in policy documents, for which CSOs are identified as key actors for implementation	2.4.a. State provides funding for the implementation of 10 % of public policies, identified in policy documents, for which CSOs are identified as key actors for implementation	
	2.4.b. Quality of state funding frameworks for civil society organisations (focusing on procedural document)	2.4.b. 35% of surveyed CSOs declare that public funding is “not at all” predictable and easily identifiable; 16% declare that it is “low” predictable and easily identifiable; 22% declare that it is “somehow” predictable and easily identifiable; 18% declare that it is “enough”	2.4.b. Legal framework for public funding includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, inclusion of beneficiaries in programming of the	2.4.b. Legal framework for public funding includes: inclusion of beneficiaries in programming of the tenders, clear criteria published in advance, deadlines for decision, merit decision with	

³ Mission-related economic activity is economic activity, implemented by CSO, which is directly connected to CSO's mission and the income from it is solely used for the realization of such mission.

			predictable and easily identifiable; and 9% declare that it is “very much” predictable and easily identifiable (MM report 2014)	tenders, clear criteria published in advance, deadlines for decision, merit decision with arguments, evaluation of achieved outputs and outcomes on the project and program level, possibility of prepayments and multi-annual contracts.	arguments, evaluation of achieved outputs and outcomes on the project and program level, possibility of prepayments and multi-annual contracts.	
Changing relations CSOs and government						
3	Civil society and public institutions work in partnership through dialogue and cooperation, based on willingness,	3.1. Public institutions recognise the importance of CSOs in improving good governance through CSOs' inclusion in decision making processes	3.1.a. Percentage of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively* consulted with CSOs * in terms of: - adequate access to information - sufficient time to comment	3.1.a. The law on Public Notification and Consultation adopted in 2014 puts forward the requirements for consultation on draft laws, strategies and policies with the group of interest (MM report 2014) • Written feedback on the results of the consultations is not provided and reasons for not taken into	3.1.a. 80 % of laws/ bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs	3.1.a. 70% of laws/ bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively ⁴ consulted with CSOs

⁴ For the purpose of Guidelines and monitoring effective consultations are those when minimum standards of consultations, as follows, are respected:

1. there is a legal obligation to publish draft laws on the Internet and drafts are regularly published,
2. sufficient time to comment: minimum 15 **working** days,
3. if there is a working group or other advisory body established for the preparation of specific draft, the working group members represent various stakeholders and criteria for appointment of the representatives are transparent, open, inclusive and known in advance,
4. there is an obligation to publish a feedback report with a summary of consultation process, list of involved stakeholders, summary of received comments/proposals, their impact on the draft law and justification of rejected comments/proposals.

<p>trust and mutual acknowledgment around common interests</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection and representativeness / diversity of working groups- acknowledgement of input - degree to which input is taken into account - feedback / publication of consultation results <p>3.1.b Quality* of structures and mechanisms in place for dialogue and cooperation between CSOs and public institutions</p>	<p>consideration of the recommendations provided by CSOs are not provided (MM report 2014)</p> <p>3.1.b. National level institutions have insufficient resources to facilitate the dialogue between CSOs and government, and to propose main policies for the development of civil society. (MM report 2014)</p>	<p>3.1.b. Mechanisms for dialogue are clear, open, accessible and efficient (issues are resolved in timely manner) on governmental and</p>	<p>3.1.b. There is a designated body⁵, institution or contact point for dialogue at governmental level: at least 60 % of ministerial level and 70% of local governments have such a</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

⁵For the purpose of Guidelines and monitoring the existence of a designated body for cooperation can be acknowledged if:

1. there is an equal representativeness of Governmental/public and CSO sector,
2. criteria for appointment of CSO representatives are transparent, open, inclusive and known in advance,
3. among CSO representatives, different types of CSOs are represented (according to the type, scope, missions of the CSO sector in the respective country)
4. The work of the body is open and transparent: there is a designated web-page, on which all documents and minutes of meetings are published, CSOs and other interested can send different proposals for discussion at the body's session and they receive feedback after the respective session,
5. The body meets regularly (at least 3 times per year) and discusses current issues.

In the case of ministerial contact point established, above criteria do not apply. The contact point may be acknowledged if:

1. the contact point is published on the ministerial web-page,
2. CSOs can access the contact point through various communication mechanisms (email, phone, etc.),
3. the contact point is actively engaged in solving proposals and issues raised by CSOs (there is a reaction and further action upon CSOs' proposals/issues raised),
4. the contact point provides feedback on the proposals and issues raised by CSOs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * in terms of: - CSO representation in general - representation of smaller/weaker CSOs - its visibility and availability - government perception of quality of structures and mechanisms - CSOs perception of structures and mechanisms 		ministerial level	body with continuous and constructive cooperation
CSOs Capacities					
4. Capable, transparent and accountable CSOs	4.1. CSOs' internal governance structures are transparent and accountable to members/constituents/beneficiaries	4.1.a. Percentage of CSOs publishing their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. independent survey run by TACSO	4.1.a. 80 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. 40 % of CSOs regularly publish and update their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)
	4.2. CSOs are able to communicate the results of their activities to the public	4.2.a. External perception of importance and impact of CSOs activities.	4.2.a. independent survey run by TACSO	4.2.a. 70 % of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements	4.2.a. 25% of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements
	4.3. CSOs are transparent about their programme activities and financial management	4.3.a. Percentage of CSOs making their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3.a independent survey run by TACSO	4.3.a. 80 % of CSOs make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3.a. 25 % of CSOs make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available

	4.4. CSOs monitor and evaluate the results and impact of their work	4.4.a. Share of CSOs that monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators	4.4.a. independent survey run by TACSO	4.4.a. 80 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) ⁶ monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators	4.4.a. 60 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators
5. Effective CSOs	5.1. CSO activities are guided by strategic long-term organisational planning	5.1.a. Share of CSOs which have developed strategic plans including human resources development activities in order to attract and retain talent	5.1.a. independent survey run by TACSO	5.1.a. 80 % of professional CSOs (with at least 1 employee) develop strategic plans, including human resources development activities, in order to attract and retain talent	5.1.a. 40 % of professional CSOs (with at least 1 employee) develop strategic plans, including human resources development activities, in order to attract and retain talent
	5.2. CSOs use research and other forms of evidence to underpin their activities	5.2.a. Number of CSOs' who use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	5.2.a. independent survey run by TACSO	5.2.a. 80 % of advocacy CSOs use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	5.2.a. 90 % of advocacy CSOs use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals

⁶ For the purpose of Guidelines and monitoring we used broader definition of public benefit organizations: not only those with officially recognized status (by the law or administrative decision), but also those that perceive themselves as active in public interest (they are active in one of the public interest fields, their services are not membership based), but cannot from different reasons gain the public benefit status (e.g. there is no legal basis for their legal type of CSO to gain such status).

	5.3. CSOs regularly network within and outside country borders and make use of coalition-building for increased impact in campaigning and advocacy	5.3.a. Share of CSOs taking part in local, national, regional and international networks	5.3.a. independent survey run by TACSO	5.3.a. 80 % of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network	5.3.a. 50 % of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network
6. Financially sustainable CSOs	6.1. Fund-raising activities are rooted in CSOs' long-term strategic plans and the core mission of the organisation	6.1.a. Percentage of CSOs that confirm that they are able to raise funds according to their strategic plans	6.1.a. independent survey run by TACSO	6.1.a. 80 % of CSOs are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan	6.1.a. 20% of CSOs are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan
	6.2. CSO have a diversified funding base, including membership fees, corporate/individual giving and social entrepreneurship	6.2.a. Diversity in CSO sources of income	6.2.a. independent survey run by TACSO	6.2.a. Sources of Income of 80 % of CSOs are derived from: one third public funding, one third economic activities and one third donations, including membership fees.	6.2.a Sources of Income of 15 % of CSOs are derived from:15% public funding, 15% economic activities and 15%donations, including membership fees.