

# Civil Society Strategy and Joint Strategic Programme

for Good Governance  
and Anticorruption in SEE 2020

[seldi.net](http://seldi.net)





# **Civil Society Strategy and Joint Strategic Programme**

**for Good Governance  
and Anticorruption in SEE 2020**

SELDI is the largest indigenous civil society network dedicated to good governance and anti-corruption in SEE. It is an open initiative, aiming to strengthen civil society in SEE and enhance its ability to engage with policy-makers, and other stakeholders to make citizens' voice heard in policy-debates on good governance and anti-corruption in Southeast Europe. *The Civil Society Strategy and Joint Strategic Programme for Good Governance and Anti-Corruption in SEE 2020* describes the current and desired future role of the civil society from the Southeast Europe region in implementing anti-corruption measures. It is the result of a consultation process between members of the SELDI coalition and stakeholders in the region, including other CSOs, government institutions, and regional organisations. It aims to present both a wider strategy for civil society in SEE in anti-corruption and SELDI's programme until 2020. It provides links to *SEE 2020 Strategy*.

#### **SELDI coalition members and associated partners**

Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria, (SELDI Secretariat)  
Albanian Center for Economic Research (ACER), Albania  
House of Europe (HoE), Albania  
Center for Investigative Reporting (CIN), Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Partnership for Social Development (PSD), Croatia  
INSTITUTI RIINVEST, Kosovo  
"Syri i Vizionit", Kosovo  
Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (MCIC), Republic of Macedonia  
Institute for Democracy 'Societas Civilis' Skopje (IDSCS), Republic of Macedonia  
Ohrid Institute for Economic Strategies and International Affairs, Republic of Macedonia  
Center for Democratic Transition, Montenegro  
Institute Alternative, Montenegro  
Romanian Academic Society (SAR), Romania  
Center for Liberal-Democratic Studies (CLDS), Serbia  
Forum of Civic Action FORCA Pozega, Serbia  
Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation, Turkey  
Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV), Turkey

Albanian Media Institute (AMI), Albania  
Institute for Democracy and Mediation, Albania  
Center for Civil Society Development in BiH, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Regional Anti-corruption Initiative (RAI) Secretariat, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Institute of Public Finance, Croatia  
Lëvizja FOL, Kosovo  
Organization for Democracy, Anti-corruption and Dignity – ÇOHU!, Kosovo  
The Centre for the Analysis and Prevention of Corruption (CAPC), Moldova  
The Network for Affirmation of the CSO Sector – MANS, Montenegro  
Belgrade Centre for Security Policy, Serbia  
Educational centre – Krusevac, Serbia  
Proaktiv, Serbia



*This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the SELDI initiative and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.*

**ISBN: 978-954-477-288-8**

© 2016, Southeast Europe Leadership for Development and Integrity (SELDI)

 Creative Commons License

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported

Center for the Study of Democracy

5 Alexander Zhendov Str. 1113 Sofia

tel.: (+359 2) 971 3000, fax: (+359 2) 971 2233

csd@online.bg, www.csd.bg

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1. Current corruption challenges and the role of CSOs</b> .....	5
1.1. Current corruption challenges .....	5
1.2. The role of CSOs and the SELDI initiative.....	5
1.3. Involvement with international and European initiatives.....	6
1.4. Key recommendations .....	7
<b>Chapter 2. Increasing the capabilities of the CSOs in the region</b> .....	9
<b>Chapter 3. Enhancing CSOs capacity to tackle corruption</b> .....	11
3.1. Identifying and collaborating with CSOs and policy-makers .....	11
3.2. Increasing transparency, accountability and legitimacy .....	12
3.3. Synergies and collaboration between CSOs .....	13
3.4. Working with investigative journalists and having a successful social media presence.....	13
<b>Chapter 4. Sustainability and Strategic Planning by 2020</b> .....	15



# CHAPTER 1. CURRENT CORRUPTION CHALLENGES IN SEE AND THE ROLE OF CSOs

## 1.1. Current corruption challenges

Despite some important achievements – mostly with respect to the stabilization of democratic institutions, the adoption of laws in key anti-corruption areas, a reduction in petty bribery and growing public intolerance of corruption – anti-corruption and good governance reforms are not consolidated, corruption among elected politicians and judges seems to be increasing and the enforcement of anti-corruption legislation is haphazard.<sup>1</sup> SELDI's *Corruption Monitoring System* has demonstrated that there has been continuous but uneven progress in tackling lower level administrative corruption in the region between 2001 and 2016. Some countries have worsened their scores in 2016 compared to 2014 though. The key anti-corruption issue in the region remains high level corruption and state capture as evidenced by the lack of investigations let alone effective prosecution of political corruption<sup>2</sup>. This undermines the functioning of basic democratic institutions, such as the separation of powers. Specialized national anti-corruption institutions struggle to combine preventive and repressive functions. The legislature and parliaments in the region do not rank high when it comes to public trust. Codes of ethical behaviour are rare and unenforced and lobbying regulation is even rarer. Only recently have procedures for lifting immunity from prosecution started to be introduced, albeit timidly; wherever there is an anti-corruption body in parliament, it is typically to supervise some executive agency, rather than deal with corruption among members. The culture of maintaining “control” over the public administration body instead of managing its work through motivation-based instruments is what obstructs both the enhancement of a professional civil service and the reduction of corruption. In all countries in the region there are sizable hidden economies, which confirms the wide gap between formal and informal institutions. This creates a vicious circle with corruption money winning unfair market advantage and stalling economic development, as evidenced by the very large income, employment and poverty gap to Europe. Not finding opportunities at home people in the region have voted with their feet, leaving for Europe at very high rates.

## 1.2. The role of CSOs and the SELDI initiative

Reducing corruption requires relevant institution-building measures and creating the social preconditions for establishing the rule of law. In that context, CSOs in the region can contribute by triangulating their efforts through finding a common platform with reformist minded local politicians and state institutions and regional, European and international stakeholders to work on anti-corruption monitoring, prevention, and prosecution. This is a daunting task for CSOs in a region strapped of

<sup>1</sup> SELDI, Center for the Study of Democracy, (2015). [Anticorruption Reloaded: Assessment of Southeast Europe](#).

<sup>2</sup> SELDI, Center for the Study of Democracy (2016). [Shadow Power: Assessment of Corruption and Hidden Economy in Southeast Europe](#).

public finances and low on private sector capacity and initiative. In addition, governments and radical local political groups have become increasingly assertive in labelling CSOs, which receive funding primarily from US but also in some cases from European donor as agents of foreign influence, seeking to reduce their impact capacity. One way to overcome this local hostility is to engage in cross-country joint action and know-how exchange in good governance and anti-corruption. Initiatives such as the Southeast Europe Leadership for Development and Integrity (SELDI) gather leading CSOs in the area to help build upon existing and create new opportunities for improving governance and anti-corruption. The European Union accession prospect has created an overall favourable political framework for addressing corruption in Southeast Europe. A key common conclusion drawn from implementing EU co-financed projects for supporting CSOs network creation in SEE is that international pressure and funding needs to be complemented by indigenous, dynamic platforms of CSOs who have proven to be capable of continuously monitoring internal developments, raising awareness on issues of concern, learning from regional peers and setting up coalitions comprising governmental, non-governmental, private sector and international partners to act on specific issues.<sup>3</sup> The current Strategy aims to set the principles of operation of such good governance and anti-corruption platforms in SEE, using as a stepping-stone the previous efforts and outputs of the Southeast Europe Legal Development Initiative (SELDI) in 2001 – 2002 and taking note of the efforts of transforming the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe into the Regional Cooperation Council with its Regional Anti-Corruption Initiative. SELDI aims to serve as an exemplar, open, indigenous, regional civil society platform for anti-corruption and good governance, taking lead from both local grassroots civil society efforts and regional government initiatives such as the *SEE Strategy 2020*<sup>4</sup> of the Regional Cooperation Council. The *SEE Strategy 2020* calls for reliance on rules and not on discretion to counter bribery, competitive standardised public procurement, and building the capacities of the law enforcement agencies and the judiciary. SELDI engages with SEE governments and other stakeholders to further good governance reform in the region. In 2012 – 2016 SELDI has gained recognition as a quality think-and-action-tank for its efforts in the region and in Europe creating the foundation for more active advocacy work in the future.

### 1.3. Involvement with international and European initiatives

The SEE CSO initiatives, including SELDI, as well as citizens can contribute to the good governance and anti-corruption policy debate at SEE and EU level in various forms. For example, they can supply recommendations and comments to the EU accession process reports (chapters 23 and 24) or perform monitoring of the implementation process of the United Nations Convention against Corruption – UNCAC (see [Using the UN Convention against Corruption to Advance Anti-corruption Efforts: A Guide](#)). They can also join the initiatives under the Governance Pillar of

<sup>3</sup> SELDI, (2013). *SELDI Strategy and Action Agenda for Good Governance and Anticorruption in Southeast Europe*.

<sup>4</sup> Regional Cooperation Council, (2013). *Southeast Europe 2020 Strategy: Jobs and Prosperity in a European Perspective*.

the [SEE2020 Strategy](#) or work with other international stakeholders active in the region, such as UNODC, UNDP, OSCE, etc.

Specific focus should be placed on international collaboration. Given the extreme partisanship in domestic politics, international commitments facilitate the adoption of reform policies that might otherwise have been shunned by national politicians. Progress reports by the European Commission, EU funding for reforms and twinning arrangements are crucial international instruments for the national anti-corruption agendas in most SEE countries. International involvement, however, also contributed to the risk of disengagement from local realities, unrealistic expectations for quick fixes, which in turn could prompt the adoption of superficial and ad hoc measures. This is further exacerbated by the natural EU preference towards the government-to-government approach, which often creates a separate reform track parallel to the work with CSOs. The engagement by international partners of reformist politicians and parties needs to be supported, and accepted by civil society in triangulation of cooperation.

#### 1.4. Key recommendations

The experience of SELDI countries in tackling corruption since 2001 demonstrates that solving the corruption challenge in the SEE region requires sustained efforts on many fronts. The *SELDI Regional Anti-Corruption Reports* provide a number of recommendations to achieve further progress in limiting corruption, which would also impact related hidden economy and organised crime to inlock economic development and well being. While the complexity of the issues of good governance require a comprehensive approach in many different domains, SELDI experience in the 2012 – 2016 period shows that three key issues need to be prioritized by countries in the region and at the European level in order to achieve breakthrough in the mid-term:

1. Effective prosecution of corrupt high level politicians and senior civil servants. No country has been able to break the vicious circle of corruption without demonstrating sustained and coherent progress in this respect over at least three four-year political cycles.
2. An independent corruption and anti-corruption monitoring mechanism on national and regional level in order to provide robust data and constant analysis so as to integrate both corruption diagnostics and anti-corruption policy recommendations and evaluation. It is critical that such mechanism be delivered by civil society in cooperation and acceptance from the public authorities.
3. Critical sectors with high corruption and state-capture risks (such as the energy, public procurement, management of state owned enterprises, customs, police, prosecution and courts, tax and revenue bodies, as well as other regulatory bodies) should be addressed with priority.



## CHAPTER 2. INCREASING THE OVERALL CAPABILITIES OF CSOs IN SEE

Non-governmental organisations in Southeast Europe are an important driving force of anti-corruption. It is not uncommon for think tanks to draft laws, for environmentalists to effectively challenge captured institutions or for watchdogs to catalyze/manage to insert new transparency regulations in state bureaucracies.<sup>5</sup> In SEE though, they are still a long way from translating public demands into effective advocacy for policies and from standing up to corruption due to a number of shortcomings. Although CSOs in the region have managed to establish some international public-private partnerships, these did not always translate into domestic partnerships. For example, despite the fact that civil society is formally consulted when draft laws and strategies are presented, there is no substantial commitment to include civil society as a vital actor in the process.<sup>6</sup> Over-reliance on international, including European financing, and the lack of national policies for nurturing vibrant civic sectors in Southeast Europe, compromise the sustainable impact and creation of local anti-corruption champions.

CSOs in the region face a set of capacity shortfalls and problems in their development, such as:

- inadequate human resources;
- financial weakness;
- poor management and strategic planning;
- lack of information on national policies;
- low levels of analytical capacity;
- low levels of knowledge on using technical instruments useful for monitoring and/or analysis;
- weak public and constituency support;
- ineffective and unsustainable networks.<sup>7</sup>

Good governance is not a technical exercise, but requires a national climate of trust, and civic and political responsibility – precisely the issues where CSOs have the most to contribute. Hence, there is the need to increase the capabilities of the CSOs to serve as watchdogs and engage government in anti-corruption reforms. This includes the ability to collect and collate primary information on the operation of government institutions, enhance CSOs skills in collecting, aggregating and empirically measuring the actual corruption situation, and through data analysis, engage in institutional evaluation and the formulation of policy reports. There is also a need for better integrating local networks in the region

---

<sup>5</sup> Center for the Study of Democracy, (2010). *Civil Society in Bulgaria: Trends and Risks*, p. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Center for the Study of Democracy, (2013). *Recent Developments and New Prospects: Major Corruption Challenges in Southeast Europe*. Center for the Study of Democracy, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Sterland, B., Rizova, TACSO, (2010). *Civil Society Organisations' Capacities in the Western Balkans and Turkey: a Comparative Summary of the Eight Country CSO Needs Assessment*.

with EU partners, including through allowing each other access to the same financing tools. Non-EU member countries of SEE are advised to learn from the knowledge and expertise contained in many EU-internal policies and practices, such as the EU Anti-Corruption Report. In order to have credibility in their anti-corruption work, CSOs in Southeast Europe need to provide an example of transparency and accountability. This constitutes of abiding by strict conflict of interest principles, providing their own self-regulation, undergoing regular auditing, disclosure of financial statements, explicit and transparent corporate governance procedures, and applying measures against capture by special interests.

The funding and legal environment in which CSOs in SEE operate should also be improved with respect to (a) rules and regulations for public funding (CSOs funding should be in the public benefit, and not commercial); (b) EU and international funding should not be disbursed through national governments; (c) donors should consider a larger share of funding for good governance programmes implemented in collaboration between civil society organisations and public institutions.<sup>8</sup> These programmes should have explicit requirements against CSO capture by special interests. Achieving impact in the CSO domain requires a longer-term perspective (10 years and above) and sustained commitment.

---

<sup>8</sup> Center for the Study of Democracy, (2013). *Civil Society in Bulgaria: Between Social Entrepreneurship and State Capture*.

## CHAPTER 3. ENHANCING CSOs CAPACITY TO TACKLE CORRUPTION

### 3.1. Collaboration between CSOs and policy-makers

National and grassroots civil society organisations that specialise in anti-corruption measures should be able to identify with one another, as they aim to convey the awareness and the significance of fighting against corruption in the most effective and efficient manner. This should also include the understanding of related fields and areas such as organised crime, hidden economy, good governance, open government, etc. By collaborating and building institutional frameworks, an endorsement of anti-corruption measures can be put in place. Collaboration thus results in enhanced transparency, accountability and effectiveness due to agreed agenda for action. This can be implemented by changing the internal structure or modus operandi of CSOs so as to increase their openness and, consequently, their cross border influences. Collaboration will increase social capital alongside community ties,<sup>9</sup> thus contributing to a dynamic civil society in Southeast Europe that is capable of participating in public debate and influencing policy and decision making process in the area of anti-corruption and good governance.

Alliances aiming at policy change must also strive towards increasing their power base and the effectiveness of their policy influencing effort. In order to build a strong, effective and healthy alliance, first, someone needs to take the initiative on an issue and secondly, there should be other who want to join in the effort. Building alliances and managing them means working on both the content and relationship at the same time. When that happens, the initiative can start to grow and will create a shared ambition of finding ways to tackle corruption.<sup>10</sup> In order to further find synergies and collaboration in the region, a network analysis categorization can be set up. This, in effect, should aim to assess whether there are other CSOs that have the same policy-influencing initiative and to provide an analysis of the sturdiness of the built network by seeing how closely each CSO manages to engage with those initiatives.

Collaboration between national and grassroots civil society organisations is vital in order to facilitate a greater focus on tackling corruption at the central and at the local level. Corruption cannot be explained by national circumstances alone, as a number of region-wide causes need to be taken into account in order to comprehend the depth of corruption and its effects. Adopting a horizontal structure would increase the capacity of CSO representatives as a result of the exchange of practical knowledge.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> OECD Insights, (2009). *Human Capital. What is social capital?*

<sup>10</sup> TACSO, (2011). *Advocacy and Policy Influencing for Social Change*, p. 124.

<sup>11</sup> TACSO, (2011). *CSO Management, Practical tools for organisational development analysis*.

In this context, it is recommended that the CSOs in SEE place a particular focus in their efforts on three main activities: (a) institutional development: improving relations between organisations; (b) organisational development: how internal capacity is developed in order for the staff to improve their output and performance; (c) initiating a 'quick scan' for potential partners by making overview of their mission, main target groups, sources of income and main donors. Alternatively, CSOs can access project-level information from web platforms such as the ERCAS Anti-Corruption Project Database<sup>12</sup> or the Anti-corruption Toolbox.<sup>13</sup>

After this initial scan is performed and a common goal is identified, there are several steps that can be taken in order to set up an effective anti-corruption strategy:<sup>14</sup> (a) set the integrity norms; (b) monitor the norms by using effective institutional weapons such as Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and (c) inform the public. After the monitoring period is complete, initiate exposure campaigns and naming and shaming activities, which need to be pushed in the media spotlight and also directly to the citizens (through flyers, door to door information campaigns, etc).

In dealing with citizens' and private companies' reluctance in engaging in anti-corruption activities, CSOs must provide examples for action, such successful anti-corruption business alliances and even encouraging the formation of such groups. Also, it is useful to provide behaviour examples and/or adequate information to ordinary citizens who say that they do not know how to react in a corruption situation. In addition, in order to counteract scepticism about CSOs' anti-corruption activity, it is necessary to offer a concrete follow up such as continuous monitoring and media disclosure, engaging with the authorities, providing feedback to citizens, etc.<sup>15</sup>

### 3.2. Increasing CSOs transparency, accountability and legitimacy

The effectiveness of CSOs in addressing good public governance issues in the region depends to a great extent on their capacity to maintain their own governance. They need to provide for their own self-regulation by adopting codes of conduct. CSOs need to also have a better understanding of the importance of being more transparent and accountable.

The risk of CSO capture by special interests, corrupt public officials or elected politicians stems from the opportunity to exploit a number of vulnerabilities of the non-profit sector in the region<sup>16</sup>:

- absence of mandatory transparency procedures;
- ineffective compliance with financial regulations;

<sup>12</sup> [European Research Centre for Anti-Corruption and State-Building \(ERCAS\) Anti-Corruption Project Database.](#)

<sup>13</sup> [The Anti-corruption Toolbox](#) was a project initiated by the Romanian Academic Society and continued by the European Research Centre for Anti-Corruption and State-Building (ERCAS).

<sup>14</sup> These steps for an effective anticorruption strategy have been used by the Romanian Academic Society in initiating and managing the [Coalition for a Clean Parliament](#), a CSO alliance formed ahead of the 2004 local and parliamentary elections in Romania. The initiative was cited as a good practice example in the *World Bank's Anticorruption in Transition Handbook* and it was adopted by several CSOs in the Western Balkans and the Black Sea region.

<sup>15</sup> Idem.

<sup>16</sup> Center for the Study of Democracy, (2013). [Anti-Corruption Policies against State Capture](#), p. 74.

- lack of an auditing culture;
- low level of self-regulation and coordination of efforts.

Hence, countering civil society capture as part of national anti-corruption efforts in Southeast Europe should be on the top of the reform agenda in the region. Although CSOs differ in terms of size, budgets, and funding sources, it is advisable for all of them to strive to provide a good transparency example, to the extent that their financial and management capacities allow – undergoing regular auditing, disclosure of financial statements, explicit and transparent corporate governance procedures, and measures against capture by special interests.

CSOs can aim to promote transparency by updating their websites. This in turn can improve precision of data, such as by publishing financial data, annual reports and funding. They can then be in touch with external assessment providers, such as Transparify<sup>17</sup> which provides global rating of the financial transparency of major think tanks. In doing so, the CSOs will be able to be highlighted internationally as an organisation that takes pride in disclosing information such as funding and projects.<sup>18</sup>

### 3.3. Synergies and collaboration between CSOs

Civil Society organisations can use ‘chains of influence’ in order to collaborate with other CSOs as well as the general public, thus efficiently getting the message across.<sup>19</sup> Importance should be given to identifying other CSOs with the same policy influencing objectives, as well as using the resulting collaboration for increasing the sphere of influence through joint networking, lobbying, campaigning, education and awareness raising.<sup>20</sup> Giving presentations at external events and writing joint policy briefs, media notes, or one-pagers, combined with targeted mailing, articles in the media, interviews, and new media outputs, such as info- or video-graphs, should all be based on CSOs collaboration to increase legitimacy of the policy recommendations. When giving equal attention to both the content and the relationship at the same time, an initiative can start to grow and create a shared ambition aimed at finding ways to tackle corruption.

### 3.4. Working with investigative journalists and having a successful social media presence

Developing direct contacts and relations between civil society organisations and investigative journalists is a key element for success in SEE CSOs’ efforts in anti-corruption. CSOs should first and foremost begin by approaching a journalist with relevant experience who has previously written articles on similar topics. CSOs should also feed specific information to the media, and not expect the journalists to pick up important messages from general presentations or events.

Ensuring effective internal communication will result in engaged staff members and minimized likelihood of a staff member giving inaccurate or

<sup>17</sup> Transparify website: <http://www.transparify.org/get-five/>

<sup>18</sup> Three SELDI members have been awarded five stars by Transparify in 2015 and 2016.

<sup>19</sup> TACSO, (2011). *Advocacy and Policy Influencing for Social Change*. Available at: [http://www.tacso.org/doc/doc\\_manual\\_5.pdf](http://www.tacso.org/doc/doc_manual_5.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> UNCAC Coalition, Transparency International, (2014). *Using the UN Convention against Corruption to Advance Anti-Corruption Efforts: A Guide*, p. 52.

potentially damaging quotes to a journalist. When drafting policy reports, CSOs should keep in mind that journalists and policy makers focus on the executive summary, so it should highlight the main findings and recommendations. The communication team could also develop a set of standard key messages to be included in a CSO's main communication strategy, further reinforcing the key network of relations. In addition, a successful online presence can increase a CSO's role in capacity building and advocacy. Social media is embodied by different channels of dynamic online mediums that comprise four core themes. These are networking (Facebook, LinkedIn), blogging (Wordpress, Blogger), video sharing (YouTube, Vimeo) and photo sharing (Flickr, Pinterest). Through these, CSOs can provide the citizens with short, simple, visually engaging messages and pieces of valuable information that can foster citizens' demand for more overall transparency and engagement. The most important aspect in social media policy and strategy is to provide frequent messages that are posted regularly, repeated if necessary with follow up on recent developments. The social media policy and strategy goals could include:

- expanding the outreach and awareness of services to the online community;
- creating networked communities for support and information sharing;
- linking online activism with offline activism to enhance the impact of advocacy efforts;
- leveraging social media for fundraising.

In order to implement the elaborated strategy effectively it is necessary to define the audience, include it in the process and modify the communication language accordingly. CSOs, including the anti-corruption domain, tend to use expert language, which is not easily digestible by the public. When communicating with the citizens, they should try to use the language of "the common people". Having defined this, the final element for a successful social media presence is the preparation of high quality content.

The following guidelines should be considered:

- use pictures, graphics, infographics and timelines to explain the issue;
- develop relevant and dynamic content to inspire the audience to read and share;
- share powerful but short quotes or relevant statistics;
- test different versions of a post early in a campaign;
- repeat a successful post that gets good engagement;
- be spontaneous and convey your enthusiasm for your work, while capturing the right moment to present new information.

There are numerous online guides which can assist CSOs in navigating through social media.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, CSOs need to deliberate the positioning of their brand, e.g. the organization symbol in order to connect your endeavours with the CSO's identity.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> For more information, see websites such as PR Daily, <http://www.prdaily.com/Main/Articles/11021.aspx#> and [http://www.prdaily.com/Main/Articles/Stepbystep\\_SEO\\_guide\\_for\\_YouTube\\_videos\\_11124.aspx](http://www.prdaily.com/Main/Articles/Stepbystep_SEO_guide_for_YouTube_videos_11124.aspx)

<sup>22</sup> USAID, (2014). *Social Networking: A Guide to Strengthening Civil Society through Social Media*.

## CHAPTER 4. SELDI SUSTAINABILITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING MATRIX BY 2020

The current *Civil Society Strategy and Joint Strategic Programme* is anchored on the practical example of the SELDI operation between 2012 and 2016. It aims to present possibilities for the continuation of anti-corruption initiatives and networks operating in Southeast Europe, based on the example of SELDI. This planning also highlights the potential for further usage of SELDI activities, and identifies new opportunities for future services.

### SELDI SUSTAINABILITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING BY 2020

#### 1. Target groups (customers/beneficiaries of the anti-corruption initiatives' products and services)

##### Target groups

- Government bodies, including:
  - o Anti-corruption and prevention of conflict of interest commissions to the Parliament
  - o Ministries of Interior, Justice, Finance, Public Administration, etc.
  - o Anti-corruption agencies
  - o The judiciary and prosecution
  - o National regulatory and law enforcement bodies (e.g. National Revenue Agencies, Customs Agencies, Food Safety, Construction Control Agencies, Financial Supervision Commissions, Commissions or Agencies for Protection of Competition and Protection of the Environment, Central Banks, Public Procurement Office, etc.)
  - o Tax, revenue, labour, health, energy, water and other inspectorates.

##### Target groups (continuation)

- CSOs, including:
  - o Community-serving
    - foundations, sponsoring programs and events
    - think-tanks or policy institutes (performing research and advocacy)
    - charitable organizations
  - o Member-serving, e.g. business, trade and industry associations
  - o Defined by geographic coverage
    - international
    - national
    - grassroots
- Researchers and their respective educational institutions
- Businesses and the private sector
- The media (reporting economic, business, and anti-corruption developments)

##### Needs of the identified groups

- analytical and statistical information
- policy recommendations
- corruption risk analyses
- trainings and awareness

**SELDI SUSTAINABILITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING BY 2020 (CONTINUED)**

<p>2. <i>Product description</i></p>	<p><i>Current products of the SELDI initiative</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Corruption Monitoring System, based on corruption victimisation population survey</i></li> <li>• <i>Regional Anti-Corruption Report</i></li> <li>• <i>National Corruption Assessment Reports</i></li> <li>• <i>Specific area-oriented analysis and policy briefs</i></li> <li>• <i>Policy recommendations and advocacy outreach to local governments</i></li> <li>• <i>Annual Regional Anti-Corruption Forum</i></li> <li>• <i>Website and social media sites</i></li> <li>• <i>Newsletter</i></li> <li>• <i>Press releases and media notes</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Future/Prospective products</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Monitoring Anti-Corruption Policy Implementation (MACPI) – a managerial tool for assessing anti-corruption implementation gaps</i></li> <li>• <i>Custom made corruption risk analyses</i></li> <li>• <i>Corruption media monitoring</i></li> <li>• <i>Support to grassroots CSOs for preparation of project applications</i></li> <li>• <i>Access to statistical databases, including the SELDI corruption survey data</i></li> <li>• <i>Development of anti-corruption manuals and handbooks</i></li> <li>• <i>Collaboration with investigative journalists</i></li> <li>• <i>Building open format databases relating to understudied/under-tackled sectors (IT, energy, etc.)</i></li> </ul>
<p>3. <i>Partnership/ synergies for joint action</i></p>	<p><i>Possible synergies and joint actions can be sought with:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Other CSOs, implementing similar actions in the areas of good governance and anti-corruption in the region and regionally, as well as within the EU</i></li> <li>• <i>International initiatives and international organizations</i></li> <li>• <i>Government institutions specialised in anticorruption policies</i></li> <li>• <i>Businesses and corporations</i></li> <li>• <i>Research institutions</i></li> <li>• <i>Individual researchers</i></li> <li>• <i>Media and the investigative journalists</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Links to other FPA/IPA networks working on similar topics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>South East Europe Sustainable Energy Policy (SEE Change NET)</i></li> <li>• <i>Advocacy for Open Governance</i></li> <li>• <i>Towards Efficient Public Procurement Mechanisms in the EU (potential) Candidate Countries</i></li> <li>• <i>South East European Media Observatory, etc.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Existing synergies with current projects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ANTICORRP (<a href="http://anticorpp.eu/">http://anticorpp.eu/</a>), a large-scale anti-corruption research project, financed by EC's Seventh Framework Programme. The project includes three SELDI partners.</i></li> <li>• <i>Macedonian Anti-Corruption Program, financed by USAID, including three SELDI partners.</i></li> <li>• <i>TACSO, financed by EC's DG NEAR.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Possible synergies with international organizations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>OLAF, FRONTEX; U Group of Experts on Corruption, etc.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Council of Europe; GRECO; UNDP and UNODC; RAI, CEI, SEECP; Transparency International; the World Bank and EBRD, Transparify.</i></li> <li>• <i>The organizations implementing the Council of Europe's Strategy for Innovation and Good Governance at Local Level and the European Label of Governance Excellence.</i></li> </ul>

**SELDI SUSTAINABILITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING BY 2020 (CONTINUED)**

<p>4. <i>Financial description</i></p>	<p><i>Financial assistance for continuation of the activities or development of new ones can be sought by:</i></p> <p>In descending order of availability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• international and EU donors</li> <li>• bilateral assistance</li> <li>• national governments</li> <li>• businesses and corporations</li> <li>• foundations/other CSOs</li> <li>• individuals</li> </ul>	<p><i>Possible methods of funding or engagement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grants or tenders by donors</li> <li>• annual/monthly membership fee from:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o network internal (members of the initiative)</li> <li>o network external (other organizations and contributors)</li> <li>o organizational</li> <li>o individual (including students)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• developing consulting capacity</li> <li>• volunteering</li> </ul>
<p>5. <i>Risks</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of private sector financial capacity and of private donations tradition</li> <li>• political antagonism, deterring cooperation between stakeholders</li> <li>• civil society and media capture (creation of government friendly media and CSOs)</li> <li>• fear of consequences and the usage of results and findings for political purposes</li> <li>• low capacity to mobilize and train human resources</li> <li>• lack of information (access to databases or policy documents)</li> </ul>	

**Source:** Eval-Inno Sustainability Business Plan, November 2012.

