

DG ENLARGEMENT
GUIDELINES FOR EU SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN ENLARGEMENT COUNTRIES, 2014-2020
MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND PROPOSED RESULTS FRAMEWORK

SERBIA: COUNTRY TARGETS FOR THE PERIOD 2014 - 2020

Notes:

- The first draft of this document, along with other two (Monitoring plan and List of questions and clarifications) was produced in consultations with core group of actors that involved: TACSO National Office, representative of EU Delegation in Serbia, Civic initiatives that represent both Resource Centre as well as BCSDN in Serbia; OCCS consultant on Action plan for National Strategy for Enabling Environment for Civil Society and Trag Foundation.
- This version of the documents is a product of a workshop and consultations, in which larger number of stakeholders participated. In some cases, targets are not set, because either there are no adequate starting data, or because we are waiting for data that Office for Cooperation with Civil Society, once when full 2014 baseline study is produced. Having that in mind, some of the targets will be introduced at later stage, while some might be affected by new data. In each of such cases, this is clearly marked with the note and/or footnote.
- Further changes might happen once final version of the National Strategy for Enabling Environment for Civil Society is completed.

Indicator	MoV	Benchmark	Starting point (2013)	2014	2016	2018	National target 2020
CONDUCTIVE ENVIRONMENT							
<p>1.1.a. Quality assessment of existing legislation and policy framework</p> <p>1.1.b. Progress with the adoption and implementation of relevant legislation</p>	<p>1.1.a. and 1.1.b. BCSDN</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 inexpensive registration of CSOs. added: Legislation is fully implemented.</p>	<p>1.1.a. 53,8% gaps is addressed (traffic lights doc as reference)</p> <p>1.1.b. - Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed by Constitution and The Law on Public Assembly</p> <p>- The application must be submitted, authorization is not needed</p> <p>- legislation is not fully implemented</p> <p>- Registration needs 5 days; costs: app. 50EUR</p>	<p>1.1.a 23,9% of gaps are addressed (new, 2014 traffic lights doc as reference)</p> <p>1.1.b. - Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation</p> <p>- legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly</p> <p>- legislation is not fully implemented</p> <p>- Registration needs 5 days; costs: app. 50EUR</p>	<p>1.1.a. 50% of gaps in national legislation and policy framework are identified and addressed.</p> <p>1.1.b. - Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation</p> <p>- legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly</p> <p>- legislation is fully implemented</p> <p>- Registration needs 5 days, Costs: app. 40EUR</p>	<p>1.1. 60% gaps in national legislation and policy framework are identified and addressed.</p> <p>1.1.b. - Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation</p> <p>- legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly</p> <p>- legislation is fully implemented</p> <p>- Registration needs 5 days, costs: app. 30EUR</p>	<p>1.1.a. 70 % of gaps in national legislation and policy framework are identified and addressed.</p> <p>1.1.b. - Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation</p> <p>- legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly</p> <p>- legislation is fully implemented</p> <p>- maximum _5_ days needed for registration of CSOs, the registration costs are maximum 20 EUR</p>

<p>1.2.a. Number of employees in CSO (permanent and part-time)</p> <p>1.2.b. Number of volunteers in CSOs per type of CSO / sector</p> <p>1.2.c. Quality of legislative framework</p>	<p>1.2.a., 1.2.b. and 1.2.c. BCSDN</p>	<p>1.2.a. 5,4 % of total workforce is employed in CSO sector (<i>EU average</i>)</p> <p>1.2.b. The contribution of volunteers to GDP is 1,3 % (<i>EU average</i>) or growth of number of volunteers</p> <p>1.2.c. - Labour legislative framework (including active employment policy) is not discriminative towards CSOs¹; - Legislative framework is stimulative towards promotion of volunteering</p>	<p>1.2.a. 0.39%² of total workforce is employed by civil sector</p> <p>1.2.b. There are no reliable data at this point, but it is assessed that there are some 150,000 volunteers in Serbia</p> <p>1.2.c. - There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation. - legislation enables reimbursement for travel expenses, accommodation and food (other things as well), it is tax free (CSO treated as other legal entities) - Law on volunteering needs changes in areas: less formal definition and conditions of volunteering (as voluntary private initiative), abolishing</p>	<p>1.2.a. 0.39 % of total workforce is employed by civil sector</p> <p>1.2.b. There are no reliable data at this point, but it is assessed that there are some 150,000 volunteers in Serbia</p> <p>1.2.c. - There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation. - legislation enables reimbursement for travel expenses, accommodation and food (other things as well), it is tax free (CSO treated as other legal entities) - - Law on volunteering needs changes in areas: less formal definition and conditions of volunteering,</p>	<p>1.2.a. 1% of total workforce is employed in CSO sector</p> <p>1.2.b. Number of volunteers increased for 5%</p> <p>1.2.c. - There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation. - legislation enables reimbursement for travel expenses, accommodation and food (other things as well), it is tax free (CSO treated as other legal entities) - New Law on volunteering is adopted, adopted changes in suggested areas</p>	<p>1.2.a. 1,5% of total workforce is employed in CSO</p> <p>1.2.b. Number of volunteers increased for 10%</p> <p>1.2.c There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation (including active employment policy) - legislation enables tax-free reimbursement of travel expenses and per diems to volunteers - Legislative framework is stimulative towards promotion of volunteering</p>	<p>1.2.a. 2,5 % of total workforce is employed in CSO sector</p> <p>1.2.b. Number of volunteers increased for 20%</p> <p>1.2.c There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation (including active employment policy) - legislation enables tax-free reimbursement of travel expenses and per diems to volunteers - Legislative framework is stimulative towards promotion of volunteering</p>
---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

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.

² Calculations based on SBRA data: in 2013, total number of employees in Serbia was 1,715,000; from this number 6,729 was employed in non-profit organisations (6,170 in CSOs and 559 in foundations/endowments)

			obligations of organizers to register volunteers in the Ministry as well as to submit report on volunteering	abolishing obligations of organizers to register volunteers in the Ministry as well as to submit report on volunteering			
1.3.a. Quality of the enabling environment for grass-roots organisations and/or civic initiatives	1.3.a. BCSDN	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	1.3.a. Legislation recognizes and enables existence and functioning of grass-roots	1.3.a. Legislation recognizes and enables existence and functioning of grass-roots	1.3.a. Legislation recognizes and enables existence and functioning of grass-roots	1.3.a. Legislation recognizes and enables existence and functioning of grass-roots. Grassroots organisations have equal treatment with registered CSOs in receiving financial support
2.1.a. CSOs' perception of the ease and effectiveness of financial rules and reporting requirements (disaggregated by type / size of CSO) 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.a. 2.1.b. BCSDN	2.1.a. 80 % of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO turn-over; in their opinion, an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers) 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are clear, understandable and proportionate to CSOs' turn-over (at	2.1.a. 77% assess financial, including tax rules as clear and understandable; for 62% they are simple to implement 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are clear, understandable and proportionate to CSOs' turn-over (new procedures and rules underway, but no different formats)at this point - every CSO fills in the same documentation regardless of the size/budget	2.1.a. . 77% assess financial, including tax rules as clear and understandable; for 62% they are simple to implement 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are clear, understandable and proportionate to CSOs' turn-over (new procedures and rules underway, but no different formats at this point - every CSO fills in the same documentation	2.1.a. 80% of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO turn-over; in their opinion, an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers) 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are clear, understandable and proportionate to CSOs' turn-over ³	2.1.a. 80% of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO turn-over; in their opinion, an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers) 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are stable, clear, with at least 3 different formats	2.1.a. 80% of CSOs perceive financial, including tax, rules as reasonable, clear, proportionate to CSO turn-over; in their opinion, an efficient support system is in place (clear instructions, knowledgeable financial public officers) 2.1.b. Financial, including tax, rules are stable, clear, with at least 3 different formats according to CSOs' turn-

³ new procedures and rules underway, but no different formats at this point - every CSO fills in the same documentation regardless of the size/budget

		least 3 different formats)		regardless of the size/budget		according to CSOs' turn-over	over
2.2.a. Quality and applicability/practice of the legal framework for individual and corporate giving	2.2.a. BCSDN	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 individual persons OR 2 % tax allocation for public benefit purposes (for the countries with % law system)	2.2.a. - 5% of gross income is not calculated as taxable income for corporations - no tax relief for individuals and no tax allocations for public benefit purposes - definition of public benefit purposes for which tax relief is allowed is not harmonized in relevant laws - CSOs that provide social services and social protection institutions don't have the same status	2.2.a. - 5% of gross income is not calculated as taxable income for corporations - no tax relief for individuals and no tax allocations for public benefit purposes - definition of public benefit purposes for which tax relief is allowed is not harmonized in relevant laws - CSOs that provide social services and social protection institutions don't have the same status	2,2.a - 5% of gross income is not calculated as taxable income for corporations - no tax relief for individuals and no tax allocations for public benefit purposes - definition of public benefit purposes for which tax relief is allowed is not harmonized in relevant laws - CSOs that provide social services and social protection institutions don't have the same status	2.2.a. - 5% of gross income is not calculated as taxable income for corporations - no tax relief for individuals and no tax allocations for public benefit purposes - Legislation for definition of public benefit causes is adopted in which public benefit purposes are harmonized in relevant laws - CSOs that provide social services and social protection institutions have the same status	2.2.a. - tax relief ⁴ in the amount of 5 % of taxable income for corporations, - tax relief in the amount of 5 % of taxable income for individual - Legislation for definition of public benefit causes is adopted in which public benefit purposes are harmonized in relevant laws - CSOs that provide social services and social protection institutions have the same status
2.3.a. Quality of the system of tax benefits for the CSOs' operational and economic activities	2.3.a. BCSDN	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity ⁵ , is tax free.	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free up to app. EUR 3,300.(RSD 400,000) .	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free up to app. EUR 3,300.(RSD 400,000) Note: this might be	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free up to app. EUR 3,300.(RSD 416,000) ⁶	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free up to app. EUR 3,300.(RSD 432,000)	2.3.a. Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is tax free up to app. EUR 3,300.(RSD 450,000)

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ Calculated according to the NBS projection of 4% inflation in 2016.

				<i>changed soon, so at this point we are able to provide reliable assessment.</i>			
<p>2.4.a. Ratio of amount sought vs. amount approved/disbursed annually through state funding to CSOs. (this proves availability of funds)</p> <p>2.4.b. Quality of state funding frameworks for civil society organisations (focusing on procedural document)</p>	<p>2.4.a. and 2.4.b. BCSDN</p>	<p>2.4.a. Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is at least 58%</p> <p>2.4.b. Legal framework for public funding includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, inclusion of beneficiaries in programming of the 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.</p>	<p>2.4.a. Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is 14,7%⁷</p> <p>2.4.b.legal framework includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, beneficiaries are not included in programming tenders, criteria not always clear, rarely merit decisions with arguments, no evaluation of achieved outputs/outcomes on the project/program levels, no possibility of prepayments; there is a possibility of multi-annual contracts but they are rarely supported (1,86%)</p>	<p>2.4.a Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is 15% (data not available at this point, using 2013 data)</p> <p>2.4.b.legal framework includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, beneficiaries are not included in programming tenders, criteria not always clear, rarely merit decisions with arguments, no evaluation of achieved outputs/outcomes, no possibility of prepayments there is a possibility of multi-annual contracts but they are rarely supported (1,86%)</p>	<p>2.4.a. Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is 20%</p> <p>2.4.b.legal framework includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, beneficiaries are included in programming tenders, 50% of the funds disbursed through clear and merit based CfPs with arguments, no evaluation of achieved outputs/outcomes, no possibility of prepayments there is a possibility of multi-annual contracts but they are rarely supported (1,86%)</p>	<p>2.4.a. Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is 25%</p> <p>2.4.b.legal framework includes: public funding on the basis of policy papers, beneficiaries are included in programming tenders, 60% of the funds disbursed through clear and merit based CfPs with arguments, evaluation of achieved outputs/outcomes, no possibility of prepayments, more often multiannual contracts applied</p>	<p>2.4.a. Percentage of the public funding in the overall CSO income is 30%</p> <p>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 arguments, 70% of the funds disbursed through CfPs, evaluation of achieved outputs/outcomes, no possibility of prepayments, more often multiannual contracts applied</p>

⁷ Calculated for 2013 based on the OCCS data of public funding to CSOs on national level (RSD 4.3 bill.) and total income of CSOs in 2013 based on APR data (financial reports submitted by CSOs) that is RSD 29,190 bill.

Indicator	MoV	Benchmark	Starting point (2013)	2014	2016	2018	National target 2020
CHANGING RELATIONS CSOS AND GOVERNMENT							
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 - selection and representativeness / diversity of working groups - acknowledgement	3.1.a. and 3.1.b BCSDN	3.1.a. 80 % of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs There is no obligatory for inclusion CSOs in process of adoption bylaws Feedback is rarely, if at all provided to CSOs.	3.1.a. - 8% consulted for policies 28% for specific laws; 30% for national strateg. 33%for local strateg.; 27% for LAPs; 21% for NAPs - 83% think they have adequate access to info - 71% enough time for comments - diversity of working groups - acknowledgment of input	3.1.a. and 3.1.b. waiting for OCCS data, expected in April 2015	3.1.a. 50 % of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs There is no obligatory for inclusion CSOs in process of adoption bylaws Feedback is rarely, if at all provided to CSOs.	3.1.a. 70 % of laws/ bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs There is no obligatory for inclusion CSOs in process of adoption bylaws Feedback is rarely, if at all provided to	3.1.a. 80 % of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively ⁸ consulted with CSOs Inclusion of CSOs is obligatory in process of adoption bylaws, Adoption of bylaws Is simultaneous with law adoption Feedback to CSOs on their comments is provided on regular basis

⁸ 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>of input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 * in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CSO representation in general - representation of smaller/weaker CSOs - its visibility and availability 		<p>3.1.b. Mechanisms for dialogue are clear, open, accessible and efficient (issues are resolved in timely manner) on governmental and ministerial level Government Office,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30% think that their input was taken into account - 10% think that there was feedback <p>3.1.b. - There is no designated body as defined by this document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are ___% ministries with designated contact points. <p>OCCS in number of cases serves as go-between the government and CSOs</p> <p>Note: waiting for OCCS data</p>	<p>3.1.b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is designated body as defined by this document. - There are ___% ministries with designated contact points. <p>OCCS in number of cases serves as go-between the government and CSOs.</p> <p>Note: waiting for OCCS data</p>	<p>3.1.b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is designated body as defined by this document . - There are 40% ministries with designated contact points. <p>Note: might be changed after receiving OCCS baseline data for 2014</p>	<p>CSOs.</p> <p>3.1.b.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is designated body as defined by this document. - There are 60% ministries with designated contact points. 	<p>3.1.b. There is a designated body⁹, institution or contact point for dialogue on governmental and at least 80 % of ministries has such a body with continuous and constructive cooperation</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

⁹ For 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.

- government perception of quality of structures and mechanisms - CSOs perception of structures and mechanisms							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator	MoV	Benchmark	Starting point (2013)	2014	2016	2018	National target 2020
CSOS CAPACITIES							
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 Resource Centre with TACSO support	4.1.a. 80 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. 66% of CSOs claim that they publish their statute, (41% on web) 23% claim they have rulebook and publish on the web	4.1.a. 25 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. 50 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. 60 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)	4.1.a. 70 % of CSOs regularly publish and updates their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)
4.2.a. External perception of importance and impact of CSOs activities.	4.2.a. independent survey run by Resource Centre with TACSO support	4.2.a. 70 % of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements	4.2.a. Note: No data available; from the recent research: at least 30% respondents find CSO engagement in 16 different areas as more useful than harmful	4.2.a. at least 30% respondents find CSO engagement in 16 different areas as more useful than harmful ¹⁰	4.2.a. 30% of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements	4.2.a. 40% of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements	4.2.a. 50% of respondents can list at least 10 positive CSO achievements
4.3.a. Percentage of CSOs making their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3. an independent survey run by Resource Centre with TACSO support	4.3.a. 80 % of CSOs that have audit make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available Note: In Serbia, all CSO financial reports are public on the site of APR; according to CI 2011 research, only 13% of CSO has org. audit, as it is quite expensive	4.3.a. 15% claim to publish their financial statements on web page; 19% claim to have audited reports on web page	4.3.a. 20% of CSOs that have audit ¹¹ make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3.a. 25% of CSOs that have audit make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3.a. 30% of CSOs that have audit make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	4.3.a. 50 % of CSOs that have audit make their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available

¹⁰ As there are no adequate data for 2013/2014, it is expected that this question will be included in the survey for 2015, and that we will have more clear idea of the targets set.

¹¹ As audit is quite expensive and not all CSOs can afford it, our benchmark/targets are set in the way that reflects this fact. Upon introducing new, three formats for financial reports, according to annual turnover of CSOs, we expect that CSOs that have largest income will have the audit. Therefore, targets here might change.

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 Resource Centre with TACSO support	4.4.a. 80 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) ¹² monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators	4.4.a. Note: no adequate starting data, available: - 68% evaluate projects - 86% have established system for evaluating projects - 69% have established system for evaluation of implementation of SP Note: In Serbia there are no public benefit organisations, there public benefit causes	4.4.a 30 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators	4.4.a. 50 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) 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	4.4.a. 70 % of public benefit CSOs (public benefit status/implementing activities in public benefit) monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators
5.1.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 Resource Centre with TACSO support	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. - 71% have developed strategic plan - 44% have HR development plan (27% are developing)	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	5.1.a. 50% 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. 60% 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. 70 % 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.a. Number of CSOs' who use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	5.2.a. independent survey run by Resource Centre with TACSO	5.2.a. 80 % of CSOs advocating toward public institutions use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving	5.2.a. Note: full data not available (argumentation) - 64% of all CSOs use research and analysis (47% official data, 15%	5.2.a. 60 % of CSOs advocating toward public institutions use adequate argumentation	5.2.a. 70 % of CSOs advocating toward public institutions use adequate argumentation and analysis for	5.2.a. 75 % of CSOs advocating toward public institutions use adequate argumentation	5.2.a. 80 % of CSOs advocating toward public institutions use adequate argumentation and analysis for

¹² 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).

	support	advocacy goals	their own research)	and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	achieving advocacy goals	and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	achieving advocacy goals
5.3.a. Share of CSOs taking part in local, national, regional and international networks	5.3.a. independent survey run by Resource Centre with TACSO support	5.3.a. 80 % of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network	5.3.a. - 47% members of international network - 76% members of national network - 34% members of LN	5.3.a.50% of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network	5.3.a. 60% of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network	5.3.a. 70% of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network	5.3.a. 80% of CSOs are taking part in at least 1 local, national, regional or international network
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 Resource Centre with TACSO support	6.1.a. 80 % of CSOs that have strategic plan are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan	6.1.a. Note: no adequate starting data - 70% state that they fundraise according to their strategic plan Note: CI research 2011. shows that 34% fundraised full annual budget and additional 43% partial annual b.	6.1.a. Note: no adequate starting data - 70% state that they fundraise according to their strategic plan	6.1.a. 50% of CSOs that have strategic plan are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan	6.1.a. 60% of CSOs that have strategic plan are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan	6.1.a. 65% of CSOs that have strategic plan are able to fundraise at least 70 % of their strategic plan
6.2.a. Diversity in CSO sources of income	6.2.a. independent survey run by Resource Centre with TACSO support	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. Note: no full adequate starting data available data: - 55% from local/reg. gov. 35% national gov. - no data on economic activities - 33% citizens, 29% companies, 43% membership	6.2.a. Note: no data on 2014, hypothesis based on 2013 - app. 50% have income from public funding - app. 30% have income from donations - no data for economic activities	6.2.a. Sources of Growth of 5 % compared to 2015 ¹³ 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 Growth of 10% of CSOs compared to 2015 are derived from: one third public funding, one third economic activities and one third donations, including membership fees	6.2.a. Sources of Growth of 15% of CSOs compared with 2015 are derived from: one third public funding, one third economic activities and one third donations, including membership fees.

¹³ Our assumption is that for 2015 Serbia will have another research on civil sector in which adequate question will be asked. Until then we have no sources of data for the defined benchmark