NEPAL

EU COUNTRY ROADMAP FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

2016 – 2020

Date of approval: July 2016

Introduction
In recent years the Delegation of the European Union to the Nepal has reinforced its relations with Government and with the country's civil society organisations. Enhanced engagement with civil society has taken the form of information sharing meetings, consultation on programming documents, and consultations in the framework of call for proposals. The annual Europe Day celebrations, EU working group on human rights defenders, participation in different project related events and observation of international human rights day, indigenous people's day etc. have also provided a platform for discussion with Nepal's civil society.

This Roadmap has been devised to translate the priorities of the September 2012 Commission Communication† "Roots of democracy and sustainable development: Europe's engagement with Civil Society in external relations" into concrete actions on the ground. The priorities identified in this communication are:

1. To enhance efforts to promote a conducive environment for CSOs in partner countries;
2. To promote a meaningful and structured participation of CSOs in domestic policies of partner countries, in the EU programming cycle and in international processes; and
3. To increase local CSOs' capacity to perform their roles as independent development actors more effectively.

The goal of this Roadmap is to build a consistent EU engagement with civil society reducing fragmented strategies and support. This Roadmap will ensure implementation at country level of the new policy spelled out in the Communication.

The overarching term ‘Civil Society Organisations’ (CSOs) will be used as a collective term to include all non-state and non-profit making actors operating on an independent and accountable basis which include: non-governmental organisations, organisations representing indigenous peoples, organisations representing national and/or ethnic minorities, diaspora organisations, migrants’ organisations in partner countries, local traders’ associations and citizens' groups, cooperatives, employers' associations and trade unions (social partners), organisations representing economic and social interests, organisations fighting corruption and fraud and promoting good governance, civil rights organisations and organisations combating discrimination, local organisations (including networks) involved in decentralised regional cooperation and integration, consumer organisations, women's and youth organisations, environmental, teaching, cultural, research and scientific organisations, universities, churches and religious associations and communities, the media and any non-governmental associations and independent foundations, including independent political foundations.

In developing this roadmap the EU Delegation consulted with CSOs under the umbrella of NGO Federation of Nepal (NFN), an organisation with a membership base of 6034 organisations country wide. The Association of International NGOs (with about 114 INGO members) was also associated to the process and their inputs and view taken into account. Covering the three areas above, the Roadmap on engagement with civil society 2016-2020, identifies the existing gaps, challenges, strategic interventions and indicators of success. The Roadmap serves to guide and improve coordination between the Member States, the Delegation and other international actors on CSO matters. This Roadmap will be updated regularly.

1. State of civil society
1.1 Enabling environment, participation and roles

An enabling environment refers to the conditions necessary for civil society organisations in order to play their roles as active, effective and necessary actors of development.

Civil society is vibrant in Nepal. Around 40,000 CSO are registered with the Social Welfare Council. The Nepalese political environment has undergone substantial change in recent years with significant progress made on democracy and human rights, opening up potential space for CSOs to play a key role in terms of both promoting accountability and facilitating service provision. However the legal framework remains out of date and constraining while recent Government policy statements have sounded a more cautionary note on the role of CSOs. In addition, civil society itself suffers from a lack of effective coordination, weak financial base, limited capacity, political visibility, and inadequate accountability and transparency.

The Society Registration Act of 1960, which legitimised the role of the private sector in development under state patronage, was amended and renamed the Associations (or Societies) Registration Act in 1977 and widened to cover clubs, public libraries, literary societies, self-help groups, NGOs and cultural groupings. The Act gives authority to each Chief District Officer to register, guide, direct and supervise civil society organisations within their respective district. Moreover, the Departments of Labour, Industries and Cooperatives as well as Tribhuvan University are also authorised to respectively register trade unions, private research and consulting firms, cooperative societies and teachers and student unions. The Act was put in place by an undemocratic political regime mainly to regulate and control CSOs. Although these legal provisions have not been enforced in a repressive manner, that potential remains while the clauses remain on the books. A new Act is urgently needed to respond to the present realities on the ground.

The Social Welfare Act of 1992 was promulgated with the mandate to facilitate, promote, mobilise, coordinate, monitor and evaluate the activities of social organizations.

The new Constitution 2015 recognises the rights to association, peaceful assembly and freedom of expression. The constitution also guarantees the right to information as a fundamental right. The Constitution recognizes several rights including groups rights (e.g. Dalits, women, minorities, Madhesi) and economic, social and cultural rights as fundamental rights. However, some civil and political rights are provided to citizens only but not to non-citizens. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (ICCPR) to which Nepal is a party does not make such distinction. Nepal is party to the Convention against Torture (CAT). Article 29 allow for “compulsory service for public purposes”, which may not be coherent to the Article 8(3) of the ICCPR. Similarly, an oversight role of civil society, which was explicitly mentioned in interim constitution, does not appear in the Constitution 2015.

The Right to Information Act approved in 2007 that has become another important tool for CSOs to carry properly their work. The act creates a specific presumption in favour of access to all information held by public authorities, subject only to limited exceptions, though the Act is not perfect as per the international human rights standard. The act and subsequent jurisprudence has been ranked fairly well compared to other countries in the global right to information rating. However, there has been little progress in the implementation of the
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2 Eg. Articles 20 (right to justice), and 23 (preventive detention) of the Constitution 2015.
3 http://www.ri-rating.org/country-data
Right to Information (RTI) Act. Contrary to the experiences of many other countries in the early implementation period of such acts, CSOs have not been important drivers of “demand” for information in Nepal (in part due to the current overall attention given to post-conflict and constitution writing imperatives). Certain studies 5 show that civil society efforts to disseminate relevant public information and educate citizens about issues of key public concern are lacking a reflection of the current inaccessibility of information, and are limiting the possibilities for social accountability in Nepal.

Successive national planning documents (i.e. Development Cooperation Policy 20145, Post Disaster Needs Assessment, PDNA6; Post Disaster Recovery Framework, PDRF) have given civil society (both national and international) a role by recognising them as partners in national development with the potential to mobilise and implement resources at the grassroots level. CSOs have been encouraged to work in backward communities particularly in underdeveloped and remote regions. However, progress is mixed and while in some areas CSO participation is quite active (e.g. social policies such as education), in others it is surprisingly absent (e.g. budget process). While acknowledging the role of CSO in national development and in the national reconstruction after the earthquake, these documents clearly define budget support as the preferred option to channel donor's aid, leaving doubts on the actual scope that will be left for CSO activities. Similarly, the current national public procurement regulation makes it very difficult for Nepalese CSOs to access to the government funds.

CSOs are also recognised as development partners at the local level by the Local Self Governance Act 7 of 1999 which encourages Village Development Committees, Municipalities and District Development Committees to involve them in the identification, formulation, implementation and evaluation of projects under their respective jurisdictions. At this level CSO participation in the planning process has been more active than at the national level thanks to a conducive legal framework and financial support from various donors. The lack of elected representatives since the last local elections held in 1997 means that CSOs role in holding local civil servants to account is also particularly important.

The Social Welfare Council (SWC) is the government agency set up to oversee CSOs in Nepal, but there is no provision for representatives from CSOs themselves within its structure. The SWC may require further capacity enhancement to effectively regulate or facilitate CSOs work to date. For example, rules on registration and reporting are particularly lacking. There is also a lack of clarity in the division of responsibilities between the Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare and the SWC.

In its Development Cooperation Policy 2014, government sets out a number of rules for civil society organisations to follow including compulsory registration, government approval for all donors funding received, and alignment of all projects with national priorities and plans. The Policy does however still acknowledge the need to construct a conducive environment for civil society to participate in development efforts and the contributions made by them to date.

Regarding the NGO efforts to support Nepal reconstruction after the Earthquake, the National Reconstruction Authority (NRA) is the government agency that is tasked to coordinate all activities included the NGOs ones. The final policy framework published in May 2016 includes detailed procedure on mobilization of NGOs in the reconstruction. These guidelines
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4 Political Economy of Social Accountability in Nepal by Seira Tamang and Carmen Malena. Funded by Program for Accountability in Nepal (PRAN), February 2011
7 This Act is also in the amendment process as per the new Constitution. The Act was approved based on unitary system and now the Constitution declared Nepal as a federal country and local government became third tier of the government. The list of matters under responsibility of local bodies is presented in the Constitution (Schedule/annex 9)
intend to coordinate and monitor closely NGOs work around reconstruction. While this aim is plausible it could be counterproductive if the control from NRA or other government institutions become excessive or information requirements result in major delays in implementation of projects. A one door system is embraced (article 4), however, it is not clear from other articles how this policy will be effectively put into practice. Practical implementation of this policy should therefore be monitored to ensure that no further requirements from NRA nor from other agencies (i.e line ministries or social welfare council) are requested to NGOs to operate.

A study on the enabling environment for CSOs in Nepal carried out in 2013, based on questionnaire surveys and focus group discussions shows that in "the last years CSO have witness a degree of expansion in their operational space. Nepalese CSOs feel that they can more easily participate in government decisions on development issues and that their options are, to a greater extent than before, taken into consideration". The study also highlights the main obstacles that remain: political instability, absence of rule of law, insufficient state accountability and inadequate security and protection for human rights defenders. Another difficulty for an enabling environment pointed out by many CSO leaders is the difficulty to access foreign funding. The reason for this is more linked to diverse donor practices (complexity of procedures, language to submit the proposal, etc.) rather than a state restriction.

INGO’s could play a facilitating partnership role with CSOs to apply for and successfully manage donor funding by supporting proposal preparation, capacity building, organisational development processes, and technical support in particular areas. One way of overcoming this obstacle to access funding will be to set joint funds or programs supported by several donors as the ongoing Governance Facility (supported by Denmark, DFID and Switzerland). In addition, a brochure or table with simplified information on funding schemes of the EU and MS++ would also be useful.

Based on the above a summary of the assessment of the enabling environment in Nepal is the following: i) The Legal framework recognises the right to assembly, right to freedom of expression and right to information with limitations. ii) Policy documents also open the door for CSOs to influence policy however in practice this has proven to be difficult partly due to bureaucratic procedures to access the information. iii) Another important dimension for an enabling environment is the support provided to CSOs by donors. In this sense, the picture is mixed: while donors are committed to support CSO activities in all its different roles, latest government policies (i.e.: Development Cooperation Policy and reconstruction policy to some extend (too) show the trend to restrict funds for development activities through NGOs and particularly through human rights and advocacy NGOs. In addition, donors' complex procedures and lack of coordination has resulted in many CSOs and some particular sectors being excluded from funding iv) For human rights related CSOs the environment remains challenging. Harassment and threats against journalists and human rights defenders have been reported, in particular threats to civil society organisations and activists promoting the rights of Tibetan refugees, human rights organizations working in Madhesh/Terai and those demanding accountability for human rights violations committed during Nepal’s decade long conflict.
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8 Article 11 of the procedures on monitoring, evaluation and reporting stipulates that organisations should submit monthly reports. Article 12 prescribes that the NRA can prohibit organisation to work for certain period the required information is not provided in time.

9 How to protect and expand and enabling environment in Nepal – produced by Informal sector Center (INSEC) with support of DanChurchAid (DCA) September 2013.

10 Article 7.2 c National reconstruction authority procedures on mobilisation of non-government organisation for reconstruction, 2016: “the organisation assisting to reconstruct private houses shall be encouraged to deposit the money in the reconstruction fund of the Authority as far as possible”.

All in all, it can be said that the environment for CSOs work in Nepal has improved substantially in the last decades. However, current environment needs to be improved in what refers to practical implementation of legal framework (partly due to lack of commitment partly due to lack of capacities in different government bodies), improvement of political stability and rule of law, and peaceful environment for human rights related CSOs.

1.2 Capacity

Not many reports have assessed the capacity of Nepali CSOs in a systematic and thorough way. It is clearly not an easy task given the vast spectrum of CSOs operating in the country. Probably the most serious attempt to look into this issue was done in 2006, the CIVICUS Civil Society Index Report\textsuperscript{12}. The conclusions from this report were confirmed in the 2010 CSO mapping carried by the European Union Delegation to Nepal. Subsequent CSO related researches and project baseline studies come up with the similar analysis in regards with the weakness and strengths of CSO capacities.

STRENGTHS

i) CSOs are present in major parts of the country. After the restoration of democracy in 1990, thousands of CSOs were established throughout the country covering the majority of districts. However remote areas are less covered than easy accessible areas.

ii) CSOs are active in many sectors and represent different social groups. There is hardly any sector or group of people which is not covered by CSOs.

iii) Advocating for full democracy and human rights. CSOs are quite active in promoting democracy and human rights. In the popular movement of April 2006 which made drastic changes to the political situation, CSOs played a very active and catalytic role.

iv) CSOs are reported to be responsible for promoting awareness about various issues such as human rights, environment, health, and education, peace-building. In the last years, because of the CSOs activities, public awareness has increased tremendously, and there is increased awareness of civic and human rights and duties.

v) Role of CSOs in promoting participation of minorities in mainstream development

NGO Federation of Nepal (NFN) has been initiating various efforts to build the capacity of CSOs and to improve the institutional governance practices (such as Code of Conduct, Istanbul Principles of CSO development effectiveness, indicator based governance monitoring system etc.).

In the last few years, many CSOs have directed their activities towards uplifting the socio-economic conditions of the marginalised communities, particularly the dalit or ‘untouchable’ people. International donors have also focused their work on this area and enabled socially legitimate collective action.

WEAKNESSES

i) Most of the CSOs are not able to include diverse groups in their structure. The majority of CSOs are established through individual effort. Some of these are notable to include diverse groups in their committee since they are dominated by the relatives or friends of the particular founder. However, this practice is decreasing and professionalism is increasing gradually.

ii) \textbf{Dependency on donors}: Unlike traditional charity-based organisations, CSOs (particularly NGOs) are dependent on external assistance for their operation. Most of them are not able to develop their own sustainable resources and are active only when they are supported externally.

iii) Inadequate transparency and internal governance: This is one of the major problems for CSOs in Nepal. Most CSOs do not produce annual reports. Often the procedures to select their board members and staff are not transparent. There is corruption in some CSOs, which contributes to a negative image of civil society as a whole. Sometimes board members are hired as project staffs or consultants.

iv) Weak professionalism and management: Many CSOs do not have qualified staffs. They lack expertise in fundraising, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, etc. CSOs also often have weak management systems (administrative procedures and financial procedures). CSOs are weak in evidence based research and analysis. Another major weakness is the lack of independency of some CSO that are closely affiliated with particular political parties.

v) Umbrella organisations are not able to unite all CSOs: While the membership is on voluntary basis, there might be also bureaucratic procedures that discourage new organisation to join.

vi) Lack of coordination among CSOs in Nepal: There is a sense of competitiveness with in the sector as they compete for funds from same donors. While sometimes CSOs manage to join forces to advocate for certain issues (e.g. MDGs campaign, education for all), their political affiliation has also hampered the sector to be more united for common goals.

vii) Donors do not support sufficiently projects focusing on strengthening internal capacity of CSOs: On their side while CSO are interested in developing better capacities and strengthening their organisation, many do not take this issue as main priority and do not tackle it in a systematic manner.

2. Current EU Engagement
2.1 Structured EU dialogue with civil society

Structured dialogue\textsuperscript{13}, is not being held jointly by the EU Member States (MS) and the EU. However the EU is in contact with CSO through information session for the call for proposals, and some consultation meetings on different issues (i.e.; human rights, new CSO communication etc.). Similarly some MS ++\textsuperscript{14} (Denmark, UK, Switzerland) are in close contact with CSO through the joint governance facility and regular meeting with human rights defenders. Germany is organising regular coordination meetings for (mainly German funded) I/NGOs working on EQ relief/reconstruction. While neither of this can be considered a structured dialogue it provides the basis for further deepening the relationship.

The EU does not yet hold regular structured meetings with CSOs but engages with them on regular basis. For example EU engages with civil society in the programming processes, holds bilateral meetings with CSOs to discuss current issues and has also established working group on Human Rights Defenders that comprises of CSOs that work in area of human rights and democracy. Depending on the meeting the agenda might be either agreed jointly or prepared by the EU Delegation (for example for the purpose of programming). CSOs are also involved (with bilateral meetings or through invitation to participation in formulation workshops) in the context of identification and formulation or new EU interventions. As part of preparing the multiannual programming (2014-2020) of two thematic programs that support civil society organisations: the thematic Programme Civil Society and Local Authorities (CSO-LA) and European Instrument for democracy and Human rights (EIDHR), an additional consultation took place via the website of the Delegation, with the use of a questionnaire. Furthermore, the questionnaire was emailed to around 100 individual CSOs,

\textsuperscript{13} Structured dialogue, understood as inclusive and regular multi-stakeholders dialogue, to include trust and mutual accountability.

\textsuperscript{14} EU MEMBERS States and other ( non EU ) likeminded European countries present in Nepal (Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands and UK and as ++ Norway, Switzerland).
and to the umbrella organisations for national NGOs (NGO Federation of Nepal) and international NGOs (Association of International NGOs in Nepal).

On a yearly basis, CSOs are also consulted in preparation of the Calls for Proposals for civil society (CSO-LA) and the human rights and democracy (EIDHR). CSOs were also consulted during the implementation phase of the sector budget support program to the peace sector. The Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction and the donors contributing to the fund (including the EU which currently holds the Chair of the Nepal Peace Trust Fund-NPTF) had a number of meetings with CSO to discuss the possibility and modalities to open the peace trust fund to CSOs.

In the education sector, EU dialogue with CSOs is carried in the framework of the education budget support program with the CSOs represented by the Association of INGOs in Nepal (AIN) and the National Campaign for Education, Nepal (NCEN). Also other CSOs (including federations representing women, minorities, and people with disabilities, disadvantaged groups, NGOs and teacher unions) and universities/research institutions are part of the education sector reform program. As part of the consortium, CSOs representatives participate in the joint annual review but also in joint quarterly meetings and working groups.

The EU Delegation and most of the MS keep CSOs regularly informed about its interventions in Nepal through the Delegation's website and Facebook page and organises information sessions for CSOs and LAs on call for proposals and on contractual procedures. The EU Delegation shared the two strategic communications: “The Roots of Democracy and sustainable development: Europe's Engagement with Civil Society in External Actions” and “Empowering Local Authorities in partner countries for enhanced governance and more effective development outcomes” with CSOs and Local Authorities and asked them for feedback on their current situation and future plans. However, most of these discussion have been often confined to EU funded CSOs and have often taken more the format of unidirectional session where EU provided information than proper dialogue. In the future the relations should be strengthen, and broaden to include a wider representation of CSO for structured dialogue.

2.2 Policy dialogue for enabling environment

EU Heads of Mission meet regularly. Their discussions include updates on the operational space also of CSOs and the human rights situation in the country. In numerous occasions EU MS have issued statements reminding the Government of Nepal to respect international conventions and respect human rights.

On the occasion of high level visits from the EU and MS, Ambassadors have taken the opportunity to dialogue with the government on the governance and the human rights situation.

In the framework of the consultation held by the Ministry of Finance around the new development cooperation policy, donors took the opportunity to highlight the provision that could imply a restriction to CSO space and their contribution for development (i.e.: support to hardware vs software projects, prioritisation of budget support, etc.). The final draft was however not circulated again for donors’ comments.

In 2012 in response to the increasing number of complaints received from CSOs, donors created a working group to liaise with Social Welfare Council (SWC). Main complaints concerned delays in the approvals of project documents, delays in approval of visa for foreign staffs, quality of SWC staffs assigned to evaluations teams, etc. The donors group (co-chaired by EU, Denmark and Finland), met the SWC in several occasions and agreed that most of these problems were a consequence of the weak capacities of the SWC and the lack of coordination and lack of clarity in the division of responsibilities among different government bodies. Consequently, the SWC sent a formal request to UN resident coordinator (as chair of the International Development Partners Group–IDPG) seeking support to carry an
institutional assessment of the SWC followed by a capacity development program. Several meetings took place and funding was set aside from different donors. However, despite that initial request, SWC leadership and line ministry (Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare - MoWCSW) did not seem sufficiently committed and donors estimated that carrying such an institutional capacity assessment without minimum commitment and ownership of the government would have not served the purpose. With this background and given that SWC weak capacities can still be considered a constraint for an enabling environment for CSO work in Nepal, in the framework of this roadmap, it will be desirable to reopen the dialogue with the SWC around ways to strengthen the capacities of this institution.

EU also promotes policy dialogue for enabling environment at the local level. The majority of the EU funded projects supporting civil society work in the field of local governance focus on promoting CSO participation in the decision-making at the local level. In the occasion of EU field visit to projects Chief District Officers and VDC secretaries are encouraged to work together with CSOs to overcome local problems.

Recently the Association of International NGOs (AIN) has been invited to attend IDPG meetings. This development will facilitate policy dialogue between (I)NGOs and DPs.

### 2.3 Mainstreaming civil society

In the framework of EU cooperation to Nepal, mainstreaming of civil society is done at different level mainly by involving civils society organisation in formulation of projects and in its implementation.

At programming level while the new development strategy 2014-2020 was being prepared the EU sought for feedback from civil society in different occasions. Equally the EU civil society focal point reviewed and suggested some ways to mainstream CSO involvement in that document.

At project level it is done also through consultation with CSOs though not done systematically. There is not a structured or formal way to ensure that civil society is mainstreamed in the project documents. One of the objectives of this roadmap is precisely to set a more structured dialogue between EU (and MS) and CSOs.

### 2.4 Coordination

The EU is locally represented in Nepal by the EU Delegation, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Norway and Switzerland are also locally represented and usually involved with EU MS in coordinating activities.

Coordination takes place mainly through Heads of Missions/Heads of Cooperation. Meetings normally cover policy and programme issues which may include a civil society angle. While broad civil society matters are rather rarely an agenda, human rights issues are frequently discussed.

The EU and Member States occasionally exchange information on the support to CSOs on a bilateral basis but there is no regular exchange on supported projects, partners or good practices.

In the past there had been efforts to coordinate better among donors. A joint brochure was produced by PRAN (Program for Accountability in Nepal), RDIF (Rights, Democracy and Inclusion Fund), EU and LGCDP in 2011 with the aim to provide some clarity to the CSOs on different funding possibilities from different donors.

In 2011 donors also prepared terms of reference for a joint study to seek ways to have a more systematic and coordinated support to CSOs in Nepal. Unfortunately, the study was finally
Coordination could work better through the use of joint programs such as the recently approved Governance Facility where UK, Denmark and Switzerland have joint forces and funds to support jointly CSOs working in governance issues. Common strategy and approach like – Human Rights Country Strategy and follow up amongst the Member State, human rights core groups meeting and the EU Delegation may also work for promoting consistency and coordination amongst the agencies.

2.5 Lessons learnt

- Civil society support has not been based on any specific assessment of the gaps and entry points in which the CSOs could make an effective contribution.

- Although the EU and MS engagement with civil society in Nepal has increased in recent years, it has not been guided by a well-defined strategy and approach with clear objectives. The current Roadmap provides the basis for more structured engagement with civil society that defines clear benchmarks and objectives

- Support to civil society in Nepal needs to be more predictable with a long-term approach in order to allow CSOs to achieve their own strategic objectives. This would enhance civil society ownership over their strategic direction and reduce the possibility of donors “setting the agenda” through call for proposals

- EU and MS can have an important leverage to create space for CSOs for dialogue with the government. EU and MS can also play an important role in negotiating the scope and modalities of CSOs in joint mechanisms (i.e.: budget support, common funds, etc.)

- There is a lack of coordination between the different NGOs, despite the existing networks, which can lead to elements of duplication. In addition, due to weak donor coordination there is a risk of “double-funding”. More regular sector-group meetings organised and appropriate mechanisms for coordination should be defined.

- CSOs based in Kathmandu receive more funding at the expenses of the CSOs working in the rural areas at grass roots level. Modalities of support should ensure that CSOs in rural areas and without easy access to communication technologies are reached. Efforts must be made to ensure that these organisations are engaged in the dialogue.

- Experience and reviews have shown that the EU ‘call for proposals’ procedure is difficult for the CSOs to follow and comply with, and the process is also relatively slow. Some local CSOs find it difficult to implement the EU procedures and the EU Delegation often has to provide significant guidance. International NGOs usually have more experience and find it easier to comply with the EU rules and procedures.

- Donor support and requirements should be better harmonised. The current fragmented donor approach in supporting civil society has increased the donor burden on CSOs, particularly around donor due diligence requirements, narrative and financial reporting, and M&E.

- All EU donors include a capacity development component in their support programmes to CSOs, however in general these have so far not provided the kind of large-scale capacity boost that many of these organisations are in need of. There is a need to support capacity development understood in its broad sense (covering not only the classic project management,
but also leadership, human resource management, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, financial management, internal organisational management, institutional good governance etc.

### 3. Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 1 : Enabling Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. An improved operating environment to facilitate and safeguard CSOs</td>
<td>Legal framework for CSOs (namely Society Registration Act of 1977 and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work on advocacy, accountability and service provision</td>
<td>Social Welfare Act of 1992) revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Funding to CSOs is simplified, diversified and more sustainable</td>
<td>More CSO access donor funds and are receiving support from multiple sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 2: Civil society participation in policy dialogue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CSO participation in the policy making and execution is ensured</td>
<td>Number of advocacy actions to include the CSO participation as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the legal and policy documents.</td>
<td>obligatory provision in policy documents. Programming documents included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sensitisation of CSOs to national laws, policies, procedures and to</td>
<td>the documents that shows the CSO participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO experiences in other countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased consultation of CSOs by donors and government</td>
<td>Number of GoN mechanisms where CSOs are invited and/or members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The participation of civil society in budget preparation and tracking</td>
<td>CSOs are consulted and their contribution is reflected in the donors'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is strengthened</td>
<td>programming document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 3 : Capacity development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CSOs’ efforts to enhance their independence, internal governance,</td>
<td>Existence and implementation status of codes of conduct/internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency and accountability are supported</td>
<td>governance standards/financial procedures developed by CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CSOs’ efforts to work together and develop joint initiatives and</td>
<td>Existence of joint initiatives (coalitions) between the CSOs, CSOs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaigns are promoted</td>
<td>local authorities, and between CSOs and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CSOs’ capacity in research and evidence based advocacy intervention</td>
<td>Number of advocacy activities conducted on the basis of evidence based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is strengthened</td>
<td>research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination between EU and EU Member States</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coordination between EU and Member States with regard to CSOs is</td>
<td>Number of initiatives done jointly between EU and EU MS (i.e.: joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved</td>
<td>programs, financial support to CSOs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These priorities should be commonly addressed by CSOs, EU and EU Members States. Mobilisation of resources to achieve these actions will come from all parties.

### 4. Actions
4.1 Possible actions for the period 2016-2020

Possible indicative actions for the 5-year period under each pillar and priorities are presented below. Each year CSOs, EU and Member states will define the concrete actions to be taken forward, the exact timing, the responsible for organising and the responsible for funding.

PILLAR 1: ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Priority 1

An improved operating environment to facilitate and safeguard CSOs’ work on advocacy, accountability and service provision

Indicator(s)

• Advocate to revise the legal framework for CSOs (namely Association Registration Act 1977, the Social Welfare Act 1992, Public Procurement Regulation, Company Registration Act and Development Cooperation Policy 2014)

Actions:

A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research

• Study on legal framework and changes needed to enhance environment for CSOs
• Update CIVICUS civil society index
• Political economy study on enabling environment in Nepal
• Analyze the reports produced by various organizations regarding situation of civil society and CSOs (EENA-NGO Federation of Nepal, CSO Sustainability Index-GOGO Foundation etc.)

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation

• Facilitate improved and open relationship between Social Welfare Council, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare, Parliamentary Committees and CSOs
• Sensitize stakeholders (GoN, parliamentarians, media, etc.) on the need to review the acts

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

• Support initiatives amongst CSOs and their umbrella organisations to advocate publicly on their role in development in Nepal and the need for an enabling environment
• Support the review of the law and/or other proposed studies (e.g.: provision of technical assistance, workshop among CSO to proposed changes to law, etc.).

Priority 2

---

15 This study will serve to update the study mention in footnote 9.
Funding to CSOs is simplified, diversified and more sustainable

**Indicator(s)**

- More CSOs access donor funds and CSOs are receiving support from multiple sources

**Actions:**

**A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research**

- Mapping of funding opportunities and requirements and recommendations to make it more accessible to wider scope of CSOs
  - Review the country policies, working modalities and styles and advocate for amendments to ease the engagement with CSOs.

**B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation**

- Discussions between CSOs, private sector, government, local authorities and development partners are facilitated to build bridges and find creative solutions that could improve financial sustainability of CSOs

**C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming**

- CSOs supported in analysis of their financial sustainability (good practices in Nepal and in the region)

---

**PILLAR 2: Civil society participation in policy dialogue**

**Priority 3**

CSO participation in the policy making and their execution is ensured in the legal and policy documents.

**Indicator(s)**

- Advocacy actions are done to include the CSO participation as an obligatory provision in policy documents. Programming documents include documents that show CSOs’ participation

**Actions:**

**A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research**
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation

- Advocacy actions

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

- Support workshop and seminars for advocacy actions

---

**Priority 4**

Sensitisation of CSOs to national laws, policies, procedures and to CSO experiences in other countries

**Indicator(s)**

- Number of training courses organized for CSOs on national law, policies and procedures organised by NGO federation, other civil society federations and the GON

**Actions:**

A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation

- Advocate for publication of GoN regulations and procedures in a timely and transparent manner.

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

- Support trainings and sensitization workshops

---

**Priority 5**

Increased consultation of CSOs by donors and government

**Indicator(s)**

- Number of GoN mechanisms where CSOs are invited and/or members

**Actions:**
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
   - Study/compilation of good practices of CSOs involvement on policy dialogue in Nepal

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
   - Advocate for CSOs membership in the steering committees of EU budget support programs

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

---

### Priority 6

The participation of civil society in budget preparation and tracking is strengthened

**Indicator(s)**

- Advocacy actions are done to ensure that CSOs have access to draft budget are consulted in the process

**Actions:**

A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
   - Study to understand obstacles for an increased CSO involvement in budget process (national/local)

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
   - As part of policy dialogue under budget support programs, advocate for budget transparency and CSO involvement in budgetary process

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
   - Support CSOs in their analysis of budget, budget process and tracking expenditures
### PILLAR 3: CAPACITY BUILDING

#### Priority 7

Local CSOs efforts to enhance their roles (programming, delivery, monitoring and review/follow-up), sustainability, internal governance, transparency and accountability are supported

**Indicator(s)**

- Existence and implementation status of codes of conduct/internal governance standards/financial procedures developed by CSOs
- Existence of indicators for INGO performance in building local NGO capacity

**Actions:**

**A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research**

- 

**B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation**

  N/A

**C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming**

- Support CSOs efforts to enhance their internal governance, accountability and transparency. Fund capacity building projects and/or capacity building components to be included in funded projects

#### Priority 8

CSOs efforts to work together and develop joint initiatives and campaigns are promoted

**Indicator(s)**

- Existence of joint initiatives between the CSOs, CSOs and local authorities, and between CSOs and private sector

**Actions:**

**A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research**

- Compilation /mapping of good practices in joint initiatives

**B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation**
• Compilation /mapping of good practices in joint initiatives

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

• Support partnership in projects

Priority 9

CSOs capacity in research and evidence based advocacy intervention is strengthened

Indicator(s)

• Number advocacy activities conducted on the basis of evidence based research
• Existence of indicators for INGO performance in building local NGO capacity

Actions:

A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation

• Facilitate regular research discussion among CSOs using the existent networks
• Facilitate regular research and policy discussions with government and other stakeholders (private sector, media, academia, etc.)

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

• Support to strengthening alliances between community based organisations and stronger CSOs and think tanks at national level for effective advocacy work
• Research will be encouraged within funded projects together with training on fact based training.

EU AND MEMBER STATE COORDINATION

Priority 10

Coordination between EU and Member States with regards to CSOs improved
### Indicator(s)

- Number of initiatives done jointly between EU and EU MS (i.e.: joint programs, financial support to CSOs)
- CSOs issues discussed in Head of Cooperation meetings in a more regular way.

### Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review modalities for basket funds for CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hold regular discussion between EU, Member States and civil society. Consider also the possibility to invite other interested donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Actions for 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar 1: enabling environment</th>
<th><strong>Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsible</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tentative date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO Federation has already taken steps to request a revision of the legal framework for CSOs. A draft proposal for a Social Development Act has been prepared. NGO F will share and present the position paper and draft in English with donors and AIN by end of March 2016.</td>
<td>NGO Federation</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO Federation and AIN</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Possible roundtable to discuss the internal and external factors that affect an enabling environment for CSO in Nepal</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
<td>August/Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organise an annual civil society forum dialogue to enhance dialogue between EU and CSO in Nepal. The forum will be organised annually and will serve to advocate for enabling environment for CSO, enhance dialogue between CSO and EU and also with GON. The Forum will serve also to reflect/debate on the actions carried and to update the CSO roadmap priorities and actions for next years</td>
<td>EU Delegation and Member States ++</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Compile the information on programs to support CSO and how to access to grants with aim to simplifying information for Nepali CSO willing to access this funding. Dissemination will be done through websites (facebook) of EU MS++ and through NGO Federation to all its members</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
<td>Second semester 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pillar 2: participation in policy dialogue and domestic policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsible</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tentative date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Present the roadmap priorities and agreed actions for 2016 at IDPG (international development partners group) meeting to start the discussion</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
<td>Second semester 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 3 : capacity development</td>
<td>- training activities on capacity development and internal governance of CSO in the 75 districts</td>
<td>NGO federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal pillar: Coordination EU and Member States</td>
<td>-the EU MS++ group constituted to draft the roadmap will continue with regular meetings (every 3 months) to monitor actions agreed under the roadmap and to coordinate other CSO activities.</td>
<td>EU Delegation will chair for 2016 the group, after that another MS will take the chair role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EU MS++ will advocate with the GON for the participation/consultation of CSO in two main policy exercise that will take place in 2016: Post Disaster Recovery Framework and 14th 3 year development plan (lead by National Planning Commission)

- Norway will facilitate engagement (consultation/participation) of CSO (through NGFF) in the ongoing process to review the UN convention to fight corruption

Along the year
5. Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of Member States in Roadmap elaboration</td>
<td>Member States present in the country are actively involved in the elaboration of the Roadmap</td>
<td>Several meetings have taken place to share concept of roadmap. Some MS have shown interest namely Denmark, Finland, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation with local civil society</td>
<td>The Roadmap has been prepared on the basis of consultations with a broad range of local CSOs respecting principles of access to information, sufficient advance notice, and clear provisions for feedback and follow-up.</td>
<td>Nepali CSOs have been consulted through a consultative workshop in Kathmandu and through NGO platforms. The association of international NGOs (active in Nepal (AIN) has also been consulted. The draft was shared well in advance and one month was given for the consultation and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint actions</td>
<td>Member States present in the country are actively involved in the implementation of the Roadmap priorities</td>
<td>This part will be reported on during the annual reporting follow up on the CSO roadmap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This part will be reported during the annual reporting follow up on the CSO roadmap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>