



Policy Association for an Open Society



EASTERN PARTNERSHIP
Civil Society Forum

Eastern Partnership Roadmap Monitoring

Jeff Lovitt
Executive Director
PASOS

jefflovitt@pasos.org

Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum Working Group 2 meeting,
Brussels, 13 May 2013

www.pasos.org

More for more: verifiable indicators?

Eastern Partnership:

A Roadmap to the autumn 2013 Summit

“Progress towards reforms will be assessed according to specific criteria which reflect the commitments already undertaken through the existing agreements between the EU and partner countries including those in ENP Action Plans/Association Agendas. The EU will take a holistic view of its relations with partners, including efforts to tackle instability and conflict in the region.”

General framework

The Roadmap's bilateral table focuses on the following main jointly agreed objectives:

- political association and economic integration
- enhanced mobility of citizens in a secure and well managed environment
- strengthened sector cooperation.

Objectives for CIVIL SOCIETY FORUM

- reforms that will further democratic values and respect of human rights.
- furthering bilateral and multilateral co-operation and European integration through increasing transparency in the relationship between the EU and the EaP countries.
- improving efficiency, co-ordination, and implementation of policies towards European integration.
- a new roadmap, or an alternative to a roadmap, for the coming two years - based on a design derived from the conclusions and recommendations emanating from the CSF monitoring.

Challenges

- monitoring a snapshot (May 2012 – autumn 2013) before October 2013 while demonstrating independent, empirical-based, expert evaluation
- Need to formulate clear, concise conclusions and recommendations
- Need to be credible and timely, and bring new data and fresh analysis
- Need to set the agenda for post-Vilnius summit

Methodological questions

- **Need for simplicity - as roadmap very open-ended**
- **outcomes in roadmap often not very specific (very often "Continuous action", so hard to measure....slightly more specific on multilateral roadmap interestingly ...**
- **Often necessary to look at individual country action plans**
- **need to really prioritise which objectives are most important in democratic development of given country (e.g:**
 - DCFTA
 - WTO accession for some countries
 - intellectual property rights
 - customs cooperation
 - approximate taxation systems
 - SME legal framework

Audiences and outputs

Targets

- national governments
- European Commission and EEAS
- European Council and EU member states

Outputs

- national assessments,
- comparative assessments,
- multilateral co-operation assessments
- policy briefs and two-page summaries for EaP and EU officials
- national and international op-eds

Three pillars to monitoring

- i. Independent verification of fulfilment of objectives set out in roadmap (including cross-checking of European Commission progress reports and national government progress reports)
- ii. Analysis of effectiveness of use of EU funding (ENPI/CIB/ budget support), and of dual-track funding challenge (where EU funding goes to governments and to civil society but without dialogue and co-ordination between the two recipient parties in-country)
- iii. Monitoring of inclusiveness and transparency of policymaking and implementation (including both openness to CSF, and responsiveness to initiatives and policy proposals from civil society)

Matrix for monitoring

1. the roadmap's stated objective, and perceptions of the relevance of the stated objectives to country needs
2. indicators used to assess the fulfilment of the objective
3. recommendations for reforms/policies
4. recommendations for adjustments to EU funding policies ("more for more") and flagship initiatives

Timeline

The aim should be to have:

- interim country assessments ready by the end of June (ahead of the 22 July EAP Foreign Ministers (28+6) meeting, and
- a full evaluation by late September ahead of the CSF Forum meeting and Vilnius summit.

	KEY EVENTS	REPORTS SCHEDULE
10-24 May		Finalise methodology after Forum partners' input and input of WG meetings (later for some WG meetings)
10-20 May		Appointment of research teams in six countries, and decision on project coordinator
28-29 May 2013	Euronest Parliamentary Assembly, Brussels	
24 May – 20 June		Research teams begin and complete first drafts of initial reports
June 2013 (originally due May, date tbc)	Publication of new EaP European Integration Index	
27-28 June 2013	European Council meeting, Brussels	
30 June		Completion of peer review and comparative review of initial report
1-18 July		Editing and finalisation of initial reports
1-20 July		Review of questions in full report methodology in the light of initial reports
10-30 July		National and international advocacy around initial reports
22 July 2013	EU and EaP Foreign Ministers (28+6) meeting, Brussels (and preceding Council of EU Foreign Affairs Committee meeting)	Advocacy pre-EU foreign affairs meeting and EaP foreign ministers meeting
20 July – 30 September		Research teams begin and complete first drafts of full reports
4-5 October 2013	CSF annual meeting in Chisinau, Moldova	Debate and feedback around full reports at CSF meeting in Chisinau
1-15 October		Peer review and comparative review of full reports
16 October 2013	<i>Presidential election, Azerbaijan</i>	
October 2013 (date tbc)	<i>Presidential election, Georgia</i>	
7-8 October 2013	Luxembourg, EaP JHA EU Ministerial meeting realising Council conclusions on	Advocacy ahead of EAP JHA EU meeting and ahead of Foreign Affairs Committee

Roadmap monitoring – initial reports – July 2013

Areas and Objectives	Policy accompanying measures by partner countries	Participatory policymaking
<p>The questions and research tasks are to be applied to each Area and accompanying Objectives as set out in the official roadmap</p>	<p>List in each section: (a) measures taken that directly address the objectives, and (b) parallel policies and measures by partner countries not linked to EU co-operation (sources: public information on laws and government activities and budget allocations)</p>	<p>Has partner country government policymaking been inclusive, including public participation (consultations on legislation, public debates, expert reviews of legislation)</p> <p>Has the government been open to consideration of civil society initiatives?</p> <p>Has the government consulted with the CSF national platform/ working groups?</p> <p>Please give examples, and outline the participatory phases of the policymaking process.</p>

Initial outputs

The outputs (including online dissemination) at the end of June/early July 2013 will comprise:

- **Two-page summaries for government officials in EaP countries of the main successes, failures, or stagnant areas (in terms of roadmap objectives set)**
- **Two-page summaries on each country for EU and EU member government officials**

Roadmap monitoring – full reports – October 2013

<p>Areas and Objectives</p>	<p>A. Perception of objectives (gathered by interviews and monitoring of statements/ media coverage/ existing public opinion surveys)</p>	<p>B. Policy accompanying measures by partner countries (updated from initial report)</p>
<p>The questions and research tasks are to be applied to each Area and accompanying Objectives as set out in the official roadmap</p>	<p>How are the objectives set out in this Area perceived by the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) general public (if polls exist) b) media c) government (relevant ministers and officials) c) political parties d) experts (academics, think-tanks) e) civil society f) EU delegations <p>Questions to these groups (answers on a scale of 0 to 3 – 0 for not at all, 1 to some extent, 2, quite a lot, 3 very significantly):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Are the objectives realistic in the roadmap timeframe? 2) Are they important among the priority needs of the country in the timeframe? 	<p>List in each section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) measures taken that directly address the objectives, and (b) parallel policies and measures by partner countries not linked to EU co-operation (sources: public information on laws and government activities and budget allocations)

Roadmap monitoring – full reports – October 2013

Areas and Objectives	C. EU support	D. Participatory policymaking (updated from initial report)
<p>The questions and research tasks are to be applied to each Area and accompanying Objectives as set out in the official roadmap</p>	<p>(a) Has the EU support been effective in supporting the fulfilment of the objectives?</p> <p>Expert opinion based on analysis of government actions and outcomes (answers on a scale of 0 to 3 – 0 for not at all, 1 to some extent, 2, quite a lot, 3 very significantly):</p> <p>The judgements should be explained in detail, outlining the different EU instruments, the changes or lack of change, and the impact on policy outcomes in the given area.</p> <p>(b) Dual-track challenge. Does this Area attract funding to government and CSOs separately without dialogue channels? Please give examples, and the challenges posed for effective governance.</p>	<p>Has partner country government policymaking been inclusive, including public participation (consultations on legislation, public debates, expert reviews of legislation)</p> <p>Has the government been open to consideration of civil society initiatives?</p> <p>Has the government consulted with the CSF national platform/ working groups?</p> <p>Please give examples, and outline the participatory phases of the policymaking process.</p>

Roadmap monitoring – full reports – October 2013

Areas and Objectives	E. Target/ Outcome/ Timeframe	F. Recommendations for reforms/ policies/ flagship initiatives
<p>The questions and research tasks are to be applied to each Area and accompanying Objectives as set out in the official roadmap</p>	<p>Assessment of outcomes: Expert opinion based on analysis of government actions and outcomes (answers on a scale of 0 to 3 – 0 for not at all, 1 to some extent, 2, quite a lot, 3 very significantly):</p> <p>(a) Verifiable indicators: - new laws - new institutions - new budget allocations - --- changes in measurable indicators (e.g. anti-corruption prosecutions, independent assessments of election freedom and fairness). - new policy outcomes.</p> <p>(b) March 2013 EC progress reports – do these represent an accurate picture in this Area? If not, in which elements does the picture in the country diverge from EC assessment?</p>	<p>Recommendations for adjustments to EU funding policies (in line with “more for more” approach)</p> <p>Recommendations for revised objectives for future roadmap, including choice and focus of flagship initiatives.</p>

Civil society engagement

1. Did the partner country government willingly engage with civil society actors who can take up the role as independent watchdogs, monitoring and evaluating the effective use of public resources?
2. Did the EU delegation and European Commission work to bring together government and civil society actors to engage in a policy dialogue?
3. If it took place, was dialogue between the partner country government and civil society actors effective in improving participatory policymaking?
4. Have trilateral for a been established for regular consultations between the respective partner government, the EU delegation, and representatives of the national platforms of the Civil Society Forum to consider, assess, and monitor implementation of, policy developments in relations between the EU and the respective Partner countries?

Civil society engagement ...

5. Are public consultations carried out to reach out to all sectors of civil society and the wider public?
6. Are bilateral agreements between the EU and the partner country government subject to clear, publicly available timetables for each stage in the process - so that the public and civil society can exercise an effective watchdog function of monitoring the procedure of first policymaking, and then policy implementation?
7. Is access to policy drafts made fully public at key stages of the decision-making process to ensure adequate time is provided for feedback from civil society actors and the wider public?

Scoring civil society engagement

For each question, the researchers should answer “Yes” or “No”.

For each question, the researchers should outline the sources used, any challenges encountered in answering the questions, and they should set out the reasons for their response.

The methodology expert will then code the responses and return scores for all six partner countries to the local researchers, enabling cross-review between the different country researchers. Scores could then be adapted to eliminate discrepancies and misunderstandings.

Questions answered with yes or no will be coded 1 = yes or positive and 0 = negative, or 0.5 if clarity cannot be obtained. The scores will be determined through a linear transformation.

.

Outputs from full reports

The outputs (including online dissemination) in September/early October 2013 will comprise (as well as op-eds for the media):

- **Two-page summaries for government officials in EaP countries**
- **Two-page summaries on each country and a two-page comparative summary for EU and EU member government officials**
- **Six country reports, in English and local languages, including the tables set out above, and a comparative report in English and local languages**
- **Policy briefs setting out the design of the new roadmap and/or key policy reform proposals.**



Policy Association for an Open Society

Jeff Lovitt
Executive Director

PASOS
Tesnov 3, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic

www.pasos.org

Tel/Fax: +420 2223 13644

Mobile: +420 7315 17224

jefflovitt@pasos.org

www.pasos.org