

FINAL REPORT

ISTANBUL CONGRESS 11 - 12 February 2011

*CSOs challenge public authorities:
From political commitment to active dialogue*



**European Movement
Mouvement Européen**

TÜSEV

Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı
Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

With the support of:



İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY
A Member of Laureate International Universities



**Istanbul Congress of the
European Movement International (EMI)**

11-12 February 2011

*Civil Society Organisations challenge public authorities:
From political commitment to active dialogue*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
2. Concluding Remarks of Pat Cox, EMI President	5
3. Minutes of the Workshops	16
4. Annex 1: Speeches.....	39
5. Annex 2: Pictures.....	49
6. Annex 3: List of Participants	51
7. Annex 4: Programme.....	55

1. Introduction

The launching of the Istanbul Congress

Civil Society Organisations challenge public authorities: From political commitment to active dialogue

In recent years a much greater emphasis has been placed on the vital role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the reform process of candidate and potential candidate countries. While CSOs are key players in promoting a transparent and open participatory democracy, they continue to face numerous obstacles that hinder their development. It is the responsibility of both the national governments, as well as, of the European institutions to ensure that the role and influence of CSOs are strengthened and rendered as effective as possible.

The aim of the Istanbul Congress was to examine how the triangle - civil society development, European perspective, and national reforms - can be made more effective, emphasising the comparison of experiences of candidate countries in 6 corresponding workshops.

The Istanbul Congress served as a follow-up to the Ljubljana Congress which took place from the 16th-18th April 2009. It was decided on that occasion that the next event involving civil society activities, representatives of the European Institutions and national politicians and civil servants from the candidate countries should be held in Turkey. More than 300 participants from the host country, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo and Albania gathered in Istanbul.

The Congress in Istanbul contributed to the determination of the most effective means of ensuring a conducive framework and environment to the sustainable development of CSOs in candidate and potential candidate countries. The conference brought together Civil Society Organisations

from Candidates Countries, Members from National Governments and Parliaments and representatives of European institutions.

In this context, the first working day was composed of workshops bringing together CSOs representatives in order to discuss the biggest challenges CSOs are facing today and ways of efficient and sustainable solutions.

The conclusions of the workshops, speeches, programme, media coverage and some other useful information addressing the situation of the Civil Society Dialogue in the concerned countries can be found, hereafter.

The aim of this particular Congress was to encourage the Social Dialogue in candidates' countries not only by giving CSOs the opportunity to confront their National Representatives at the Parliament/Government on the challenges they have to face, but also by creating an international framework that would be conducive to positive dialogue and to the sharing of best practices between CSOs and Governments of the Region.

2. Concluding Remarks of Pat Cox, EMI President

Introduction

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen,

I am pleased to try to summarise and distill some of the wisdom of this congress and present it to you. It does not pretend to be comprehensive because, as you know, there have been long discussions during the workshops and we have heard an account of those this morning through presentations which, though brief, nevertheless took almost an hour to listen to.

Can I begin by agreeing with you Mr. Chairman that the closing debate which has just concluded was a really good session? And I thank our three guests for bringing their insight but also their honesty and conviction to

the table. My apologies to each one of you that I missed your opening remarks, not through discourtesy but duty, since I needed some time to try to synthesise our work.

Firstly, on behalf of the European Movement International, I want to again thank TUSEV for the wonderful partnership and organisational skills, which they have shown here and which we deeply appreciate. I also would like to thank again all of our other partners and sponsors. But mostly to thank all of you who have participated, the chairmen of the plenary sessions, the workshop moderators, the rapporteurs who took the notes and all of you for your very active participation over these past two days. I think the exercise has been a successful one and as I said to you my summary and concluding remarks attempt to synthesise our key observations without presuming to be comprehensive.

To begin let us recall some of the remarks of Commissioner Füle at our opening session yesterday. He observed, and this is a conviction shared by the European Movement, that the active engagement of Civil Society in participatory democracy is a key element of good governance and modern democracy. That is why we are here as civil society organisations in dialogue with parliamentarians, the European Commission and with the Turkish government, which is one of our host partners. The Commissioner observed regarding civil society organisations that 'with participation comes responsibility'. It is a balance. This responsibility requires of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) that they genuinely reflect public opinion and public needs. This sense of responsibility must be matched by credibility and it is an important headline point for us to retain. He also addressed public authorities by insisting that they must safeguard the right of civil society to express divergent views. Civil society has its responsibilities but so too do public authorities. In short, I believe the Commissioner made a call to develop a new sense of cooperation, not competition, based on principles acceptable to and accepted by wider society. An active civil

society and active citizens in a society are complementary to and add value to representative democracy. It is not the job of civil society to replace or displace representative democracy but working together they can give to and take from each other additional capacities to act and to deliver.

Permit me to recapitulate the work of our Istanbul Congress through what I will style as the **4 Ps: Public Purpose, Progress, Payments and Funding and Process.**

1. Civil Society and Public Purpose

Civil Society Organisations are diverse in size, in the subject matters which they address and in their capacity to act and they include foundations and non-governmental organisations among their number. One accepts that the definitions that mark out the boundaries between these forms of organization can be blurred but we tend to recognise one from the other when we see them, even if we find them at times a bit difficult to define precisely.

Civil Society Organisations ideally should be based on vision, values and convictions and should respond to genuine needs. They should represent and incarnate willingness and capacity to act. These values, vision, convictions, real needs representation and willingness and capacity to act are the motor force of civil society. Funding is a fuel but the fuel is not the force. The life force of civil society is based on values, conviction and delivery, assisted by the fuel of funding but not to be dominated by it.

For those involved, and here I talk of the individuals, I think it is very important to appreciate that an engagement with civil society, even if personally it is of a long term nature, is not in any conventional sense a career. It is instead a vocation. It is a call to service but not a call to careerism. If there this anyone running an agency of civil society whose essential private purpose is careerist they are in the wrong job, in my view.

Civil society and its funding are not there to facilitate the career objectives of individuals. Instead it embodies and expresses the vocation of public service. These elements are part of the value-set that people bring. In this sense civil society is a facilitator, an animator, a driver, an advocate, a deliverer and a voice for reform. All of this is not an end in itself but is the expression of a true vocation of public service. That to me, from listening to the various elements debated yesterday and today, distills the essence of what we have been talking about in terms of the public purpose of civil society.

Let me come to the second P.

2. Progress

I have been heartened to learn that here in Turkey and in the Western Balkans there is a general sentiment that in recent years change is both real and positive. It is an evolutionary process that is not complete but it has been a positive evolution. There are now growing numbers of new legal frameworks on association and specific rules, regulations, laws and procedures, occasionally even agencies to assist the emergence of civil society which is to be welcomed.

The Regional Cooperation Council in the Western Balkans in particular provides a very interesting example with regard to its websites and databases. These seek to enable wider connections for regional civil society with their outside counterparts. It is a good example of good practice and an area where perhaps together we can go back and dip a bit more into this goodwill and capacity to do some more things together across and within the region. The European Movement is willing to play its part in this process.

Certainly the progress is based very much on a 'learning-by-doing basis' and is built on 'people-to-people' contacts. This is the real value of our

meeting over the past two days. The more we can meet together in common cause and in common public purpose, in order to understand good practice or to share best practice, the more we can contribute, in our different ways, to the issues and themes to which we have dedicated ourselves.

However, while acknowledging the progress made, we also need to recognise that there are issues of implementation and occasionally of attitude that are worth highlighting. On the part of authorities we have heard more than one reference in the past two days to a lingering and residual sense of territoriality. This refers to public authorities in principle being in favour of civil society engagement but in practice sometimes being suspicious of what this actually entails. It is easier sometimes to change the law than to change attitudes. We still need to work together on the challenge of changing the culture as well as the law, in cooperation and not conflict with authorities but respectfully insisting that there still is room for improvement.

One notes a suspicion voiced by some participants of increased tax auditing from time to time of some of those bodies regarded by public authorities as too outspoken. It would be good to learn some more about this, based on evidence. If sustained on an evidence-led basis the issue should be addressed. It is not the role of civil society always to tell the authorities what they may wish to hear, no more than it is a requirement of its existence always to contest or be in conflict with governmental authorities.

There clearly is some evidence on the part of civil society of what could be called gaming the system. This happens when civil society organisations (re)construct themselves to fit funding guidelines. In other words, the guidelines are a socket through which flows the electricity of funding and organisations develop plugs designed to fit the socket. The risk is that this

may be not be a plug designed to fit the needs and the public purpose for which they were founded or which they wish to serve. In particular, and I picked up some threads of this from participants talking about the creation of partnerships, some of them are paper partnerships designed to technically qualify for assistance that otherwise one might not get. The problem with paper partnerships is like that of paper tigers in any area; in the end they are not real. So, while observing progress both authorities and civil society have implementation issues to address.

Turning to the third P.

3. Payments/Funding

There is a great diversity of funding sources and options such as public funds from the municipal, regional, national, European and international level and private funds raised independently or from philanthropic, corporate or foundation donors. There is evidence of growing engagement, not universal across the region, of the development of a more active corporate social responsibility by some companies willing to fund civil society. In addition there is the option of the old style route of raising one's own funds through various means outside the conventional channels of the state or corporate funding.

Some CSOs of course also are involved in service provision and can earn funding by this means if rules accommodating commercial income are part of the permissible system under the law. This practice increasingly is allowed under most of the new legal frameworks.

There are however other issues more on the level of principle which have been alluded to at this Congress, not least and namely the extent to which the system results in what could be called donor driven rather than needs driven prioritisation. This can happen when a donor, public or private, comes with deep pockets and an insistent view and suggests to an

impecunious CSO that it can have a slice of the action provided in effect that it does what it is told. This can be better sometimes than having no funds but it may actually be a distraction from the public purpose for which the particular civil society organisation was created or best could contribute to. There needs to be a dialogue between the donor community and the recipient community about prioritisation that respects the mutual needs and concerns of both but that is not always just singularly donor driven. There also is a risk with donor driven funding, particularly when it is removed from the grass roots, to come with more of a top down than a bottom up priority setting perspective. Again, this needs mediation and dialogue between donor community and civil society.

Many of you raised the question of sustainability of funding over the longer term as indeed did Commissioner Füle. This is easier to talk about than to realize but it is an important pointer to be factored in to your planning, that funding including European funding will not be there indefinitely. Consequently, organisations that aspire to a long term future need to ensure a diversity of funding sources. Several participants pointed to what they regarded as excessive reliance on foreign donors. I have not had the opportunity to verify if it is an accurate statistic but at one of the workshops it was suggested that in Macedonia 82 percent of the funding of civil society comes from foreign sources. I do not make this particular point about Macedonia but rather about the extent of reliance on foreign donors, this is good for so long as it lasts but it renders CSOs vulnerable over time and demands of them an investment of effort to develop a wider and deeper engagement of national and local funding diversity.

Finally as regards accessing funds, many commented that larger donors such as the European Union or international or philanthropic organisations frequently require recipient organisations to network or to federate. This arises because they cannot deal with a huge multiplicity of small scale individual applicants in all their diversity. I would like to say to you, that

insofar as we in the European Movement International can help, through our increasingly better organised network of National Councils throughout this region, we are willing to assist with your coalition building and federating activities the better to help to connect you to the requirements of the external donor community.

Let me turn to the fourth P.

4. Process

There was some very rich debate and good advice as regards the advocacy and reformist role of civil society. Where you get involved as an advocate and want to argue for reform try very hard to make it evidence led. Go and look for the facts. It is not about prejudices. It is not about personal preferences. It is not about anecdote. If you are looking for systemic reform then you need a quality of research, analysis and evidence that brings to the table something of substance, something which makes you a credible interlocutor for public or other relevant authorities.

A second point, that if you are to be credible as a civil society organisation, you will need your own democratic structures. If you have what I might call a one man band system it is not credible. It is too individualized. It is not representative in any meaningful sense. You need a transparent rulebook, an open voting system, the ability to elect people and to remove them and the ability to change people over time. For example, we in the European Movement International have a rulebook whereby the EMI President can be elected for two consecutive mandates of three years. No matter what may be one's personal preference or that of the organization itself, once the term limit has been reached the serving President has to go. I actually think that this is a good rule. It permits and obliges organisational renewal, growth and development. This democratic aspect constitutes part of a CSO's external credibility.

There also is a need for civil society in terms of process to focus on its targets and its target groups, not to be dispersed but to concentrate effort. Where you have a theme, a passion and a conviction then to have an effect your organisation and its network must stay focused.

One of the roles of civil society is to be a watchdog. Thinking about the watchdog role, a thought came to my mind which I have used in a political context in the past. Civil society is not a tail on the public authority dog. Civil society is a perfectly formed smaller dog and like any perfectly formed dog will need occasionally to bite and bark on its own account. This is for me amounts to a modest but accurate description of the watchdog element in the role of civil society. In other words, CSOs are not there just to do the bidding of governments or other donors and should that be the case then the system is not working the right way up.

One of the issues raised at the Congress regarding process relates to the nature of CSO participation. We use phrases like participatory democracy but for this to have meaning we need structures to make it work. Calling a meeting and doing something in an afternoon is an interesting event but it is not a process. A process is something deeper. It has structures. It has continuity. It has an agenda setting capacity. It measures progress through performance indicators. It monitors, analyses and evaluates outcomes. If you get involved in something which is structured then it is more than simply turning up and getting a little pat on the back and being told that you are doing a great job and that some funds may again be available in the budget next year. The latter is not participatory democracy. It is closer to a form of public relations in political terms. We have got to understand if we are developing a sense of best practice that looking at methodology and the process of participation is indispensable. Here we have more work to do both CSOs and the public authorities.

One of the suggestions I would like to make for this region concerns the Regional Cooperation Council and TACSO for the Western Balkans and TUSEV here in Turkey. We have heard many contributions about new legislation and new frameworks for associations such as CSOs in the region. It would be good to prepare and exchange written information for each State on what constitutes current practice to learn what is good and not so good both in terms of law and outcomes to spread insights based on 'learning-by-doing'. Through this we can become advocates for a deepening of change and a positive evolution of the consultative and participative process.

A final observation on this relates to Article 11 of the Treaty of Lisbon. It was correctly remarked here, and indeed has been discussed more than once at our board in the European Movement International, that the citizens' initiative part of that article is important. However, though it got most of the publicity, in the long term it may not be the most important element contained in Article 11. This also provides a legal base that demands more transparency and consultation. We have to work on what this can mean, in dialogue with others and with authority at EU and State level to ensure that these possibilities are animated by substance and content.

Conclusion

To conclude - for the European Movement we take from Istanbul a number of action items for future follow up. One is the suggestion that a future EMI/CSO meeting should focus on effective communications by examining media strategy and by sharing best practice. We are happy to work with you on this.

Second, we will try with partners to establish what is happening state by state in the region regarding the key issues of right of association, funding

and taxation of CSOs the better to learn and share from and with each other.

Moreover, and this is a matter of conviction for me and for the European Movement International, we are not here in Istanbul and in Turkey by accident. We are here by conviction. We are not just here by invitation, though we were invited and we thank our colleagues of European Movement Turkey and other partners for the invitation, but we are here by choice. We are and have been committed to this region's accession to EU, which includes Turkey.

Our role is not the role of an institution of state nor of an institution of the European Union and our theatre is not the theatre of summit meetings and Prime Ministers and Presidents. Our great theatre is people-to-people: - hands across borders – and the building of friendships, personal, professional and of networks. The engagement leading us here has to do with the people-to-people priority that is a fundamental part of our European values and convictions. In our hearts, we take as a duty from Istanbul to organise in the coming period with colleagues from Turkey an attempt to create a media campaign in Brussels to sensitise political authorities on the visa question. This is visible, tangible and real. It has both symbolic and practical dimensions. If we can contribute to unblocking something that is so real and meaningful to people then we really could accomplish something of real worth. This is our promise here today as we close our CSO Congress in Istanbul.

Finally, I observe from the opinion polls that in Turkey people increasingly are tired because of 'process fatigue' to do with the EU accession negotiations, as is also to some extent the case in the wider Western Balkans region. This finds a parallel in popular opinion in several EU member states many of whose peoples feel a certain 'enlargement fatigue'. Our being here and the kind of role we can play may be modest

but it is also real and really pleasing to have done so in partnership with you.

I would like to thank you all for being here. I want to thank our partners TUSEV for their wonderful cooperation. I want to thank our own staff in the European Movement International for all that they have done to make this Congress a success. I look forward to meeting you again to following up on media strategy, sharing and learning from best practice and on the visa question.

Thank you.

3. Minutes of the Workshops

*14h00 – 16h00: Parallel Workshops: **Standards for open government: CSO, public authorities and the theory of democratic governance***

Workshop 1 - [Development of civil society](#)

Moderator: Ms Ksenija Milenkovic, *Vice-President of the European Movement International*

Mr Arno Metzler, *Co-President of the Joint Consultative Committee EU-Turkey, European Economic and Social Committee*

Mr Zoran Puljic, *Director, Mozaik Community Development Foundation*

Civil Society Organizations are generally facing a decrease of international and national funding. CSOs are affected by the world economic crisis. Question of sustainability of CSOs was voiced!

Arno Metzler – EESC

- The role of CESE is to advise everybody. Dialogue, compromise. Close cooperation with the EESC members.

- Presentation of the different EESC programmes.
- It is important the dialogue between Turkey and EU institutions.
- EESC can play an important role to interlink the organizations.
- It is a challenge for CSOs to become more and more engaged (integration process, accession negotiations etc.).

Zoran Puljic – Director, Mozaik Community Development Foundation

- Compared the building of civil society with the process of building a green house. The Balkan region is trying to build a greenhouse while there unfortunately is only the foundation yet.

Open debate

- Civil Societies role is to provide services to citizens. In order to do so funding is needed.
- CSOs must build a strategy to be entrusted by donors
- CSOs need to create sustainable communication
- Professionalization of CSOs is a way of civil society development
- Development of civil society is increasing the role of CSOs in decision making processes and opening up to government services
- With professionalization comes the ability to make proposals and draft policies, laws for governments
- The capacity of state administration is for example a problem in Macedonia
- Sometimes state administration is in need of the help of NGOs

Zoran Puljic – Director, Mosaic Community Development Foundation:

- it is always somebody's fault in the CSO when we should question ourselves
- With professionalism volunteer work will disappear
- We should work hard on local issues

Ksenija Milenkovic: Do you think that CSOs want a more political role?

Open debate

- Yes - without becoming a political party
- NGOs with regards to the economic crisis are insuring their own security
- Salary conditions are a problem of the development of CSOs
- EESC membership can be important and useful in developing CSOs
- In Turkey, there are leading organizations which have the credibility, standing and the facilities to talk to authorities. Small organisations mostly do not have such capacities
- Small organisations are based on a large number of volunteers. Professional CSOs have standing structure and also participate in a larger number of events
- Different NGO professionalism than Think Tanks
- Philanthropy needs to trust CSOs
- Foundations as important funders and their development is part of the development of civil society
- Especially, in Turkey participatory processes are often blocked and budget cuts are imposed on civil society organisation that criticize for example the work of municipalities or the government. Mostly the city councils are linked with regional funding.
- In Croatia, the concept of citizen participation is going through a severe crisis. CSOs as such are losing touch with the citizens alongside a crisis of political representatives. Citizens are newer days considered to be more a consumer rather than as citizens. Public institutions and citizens need to work together and there is a strong need for a transformation from passive to active citizenship.
- Civil Society Organisations and their sustainability can be compared to the natural eco-system.
- Wider range and base of funding! English example, where a lot of charity organisations exist since a very long time without receiving any public money.

- Option to save money on local levels through the work of volunteers.
 - Think economical → Investing in CSOs also saves governments lots of money
 - Need for a certain level of professionalism and credibility (play counterpart regarding the disabilities of governments) but also facing realities.
 - Become more active on the subject of political issues, not as a party but maybe complementing the parties positions in civil society processes.
-

Workshop 2 – The advocacy and watchdog role

Moderator: Mr Bernd Hüttemann, *Secretary General, European Movement Germany, Member of the Board of the European Movement International*

Mrs. Antonella Valmorbidia, *Chair of the Civil Society and Democracy Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe*

Mr. Tony Venables, *Director, European Citizens Action Service*

Background

The experience across the region and within each country can vary. Whilst there are impressive instances of civil society organizations making a major impact on legislation to advance reform processes, there are also instances of where inclusion is an illusion. How to spread best practice more effectively? What is the role of model guidelines such as those of the Council of Europe or framework agreements (compacts)? What should be done to promote them across the region?

- Improving Donor Relations and the Local Philanthropy Sector: it is necessary to create incentives for philanthropy and volunteerism

at a local level (in order for CSOs to not have to depend so heavily on foreign aid). Must ensure uniformity of such procedures.

- Training Civil Society Organisations in policy dialogue and approaches to develop cooperation with government bodies
- Can more general standards of civil dialogue be established?

Antonello Valmorbida, Chair of the Civil Society and Democracy Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe, Association of Local Democracy Associations:

- From Civil Society in a dialogue with Public Authorities we have moved to today's participatory democracy
- Testing Civil Society in neighboring countries as one of the duties of the Civil Society and Democracy Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe.
- Therefore, the Council of Europe is the "watchdog" that controls and monitors countries and their respective civil society structures
- Transform pilot projects into sustainable civil society activities

Tony Venables, Director, European Citizens Action Service:

- Art. 11 EUT is the new legal framework participatory democracy in Europe introduced by the Convention on the future of the European Union
- It is one of the core articles for Civil Society and its participation
- However, most of the efforts in towards Art.11 are dealing with the 4th paragraph, the "European citizens' Initiative". Tony Venables asked that greater attention be paid to the rest of the article.
 - Consultation Process and Transparency: A new system of communication for Civil Society Organizations

- Involvement of Citizens and representative associations in decision making processes
- ECAS contribution to civil society Advocacy service searching for funding and financial means.
 - Financial perspective of the European Commission beyond 2013!

Effective ways to work on civil society advocacy:

- CSOs must always act based on evidence alone
- CSOs need to be very persistent
- CSOs must always look for alliances and form alliances; coalition building is the key. The more diffused our interests become, the more we have in common to help us come together and build coalitions
- CSOs have to stop their specific activity once one goal is reached

Civil Society should focus on the watchdog and reformist roles. The work of the civil society organisations are lacking in the civic part (no petition, no town hall meetings etc.). Deskbound grant applications hinder people from performing advocacy work on the streets.

Definition of Civil Society

Possible interpretations:

- Civil society falls between markets and governments
- and/or civil society is interpreted differently in different political cultures
- and/or civil society can be Foundations
- and/or NGOs are not examples of civil society
- and/or Civil society organizations must organize itself democratically
- and/or Civil society organizations must represent a larger group of members and/or a clear target group
- and/or CSOs must mainly seek legitimacy

The panel agreed that:

- Civil Society is a service provider and at the same time a player in the decision making process.
- Democracy is the best available form of government

Main elements from the general discussion

Gap between theory and practice:

- Many present grassroots organizations underlined that there is a gap between theory and the reality apparent in their countries. The financial basis for small initiatives such as human rights or disability advocacy associations in many countries is far from being perfect.

Professional dimension:

- Creating organizations (in and of themselves) can strengthen CSO structures by professionalism and a clear message. Clear objectives vs. broader perspective. Have a clear vision and one task.
 - Especially NGOs, which need to be much better organized in order to have the same output as professional companies, which can still perform even if they are less professional.
 - Decision making processes are not necessarily related to the subject as such but more to the understanding of advocacy processes.

Democratic dimension:

- There was a discussion about how democratic CSOs have to be. For some, a large number of financial supporters already give a high rate of legitimacy while still being professional as the economic sector

- Some CSOs underlined that in some countries important topics such as human rights questions can only be dealt with by CSOs and not by governments. How can independence be ensured?

Financial dimension:

- Finances have to meet the demands of CSOs both on European and on national/regional/local level. Common advocacy for better civil society facilities are needed.
- But not only money is needed. CSOs can also do their advocacy work at decentralized locations and on a basic voluntary level.

Recognition of advocacy groups within countries:

- Public authorities would prefer to have one voice for a range of civil society organisations, therefore, coalition building can enhance dialogue and success
- Guidelines such as those of the Council of Europe or framework agreements are important to be used by national civil society structures

Many questions could be touched on during these discussions, such as:

- In many countries, media are misused by governments, sometimes media pushes politicians to... without listening to the arguments of CSOs.
 - CSOs have to establish an effective media strategy
-

Workshop 3: The process of national reforms

Moderator: Mr. Gledis Gjipali, *Executive Director, European Movement in Albania*

Mr Basak Ersen, *Programme Director, Third Sector Foundation of Turkey*

Mr Zoran Stojkovski, *Executive Director, Center for Institutional Development - CIRa*

Western Balkan Countries

CSO legislation:

- There have been legal reforms concerning civil society organizations in almost all countries in the Western Balkans. In most countries, this is a very long process due to the fact that civil society is weak and finds it hard to mobilize and define common interests. On the other hand, governments are changing in positive ways.
- The most recent reforms were in Serbia in 2009 and Macedonia in 2010.
- Serbia adopted a new and more liberal law on associations in 2009.
- Macedonia adopted a new law on associations and foundations in 2010. This new law has brought about many positive changes for CSOs:
 - Commercial activities of CSOs are allowed for the first time
 - Foreigners and youth are engaged easier
 - There are improvements on tax regulations (VAT and property tax were lifted on donations)
- But in Macedonia and many other countries in the region, there is a need for more improvement because CSOs are being treated like

commercial entities by the accounting standards and tax legislations. This needs to change; local fundraising must be supported by the government by promoting the creation of campaigns, matching funds etc. One obstacle is that some governments still view donations as money laundering.

- In most countries in the region, problems with implementation of these legal reforms remain.

Access to decision making processes:

- There are documents, units and technical assistance projects for government and civil society in the region. But the capabilities of these entities are questionable (except for Croatia which remains a good example).

Local support structures:

- There are organizations and/or donors that support CSOs in each Western Balkan country. They use many different means such as websites, databases, funding etc.
- There are local business associations and forums that engage with civil society.
- There also is talk of establishing donor forums and associations for better donor coordination.

Role of international development agencies:

- Many international development programs overlap with the services and activities of local CSO support.
- There is a strong dependence on foreign donors for CSO resources, reaching 82% in Macedonia.

Basak Ersen – Programme Director, Third Sector Foundation of Turkey (TÜSEV)

Turkey's Civil Society experience:

The biggest difference between Western Balkans and Turkey is that Turkey has a much longer civil society history. It traces its roots to Ottoman foundations.

There are cooperatives, trade unions, political parties, associations and foundations (But we don't consider the first three types of organizations to be CSOs).

There are about 86000 associations and 4500 foundations in Turkey. The sector is much bigger than the Balkan Countries in terms of its quantity.

With the EU process, both the Associations and Foundations were reformed (in 2004 and 2008 respectively).

The problems:

- Implementation problems stemming from over-protective and suspicious attitudes of government officials.
- Fines and penalties are still quite high
- Though the legislation promotes self-regulations, human rights and minority organizations still face high government auditing
- In terms of commercial activities they are allowed.
- CSOs are still paying many of the taxes that companies pay.
- The public benefit system is very limited and the council of ministers makes the process very politicized.
- Private sector relations are improving. More companies are donating bigger amounts to CSOs as their understating of corporate social responsibilities is improving.

- Government relations remain weak and not institutionalized. Contributing to policy making is also weak since no legislation exists. Currently, there is only one regulation that says CSOs are useful sources of information.
- There are some laws that make fundraising very difficult for CSOs and they need to be changed as soon as possible.

Question and Answers:

- There are some offices for cooperation (for instance in Montenegro and Macedonia) with CSOs but they do not always function properly. In fact, sometimes they become obstacles to reaching authorities because they create even more bureaucracy. (Croatia is a good example in this respect).

Summary by Gledis Gjipali:

Many strategies are in place in the region but few of them are properly working. Legal and financial incentives should be introduced to increase local fundraising/philanthropy and lower the dependence from foreign donors. Though, these incentives must not be “administrative heavy” to the point that companies and individuals are discouraged to contribute and CSOs are required to have strong administrative capacities.

CSOs should be encouraged to use these new instruments/incentives as the only way to diversify funding and to guaranty sustainability.

Special structures established to facilitate the dialogue and consultation process with CSOs are not always the appropriate solution. In some countries it has increased the procedural barriers and in others it can complicate the work of the CSOs even more.

There is also ambiguity about the definition of civil sector actors and a clear concept of which organizations qualify as CSOs. [*close to government business organizations recognized as such – Turkey*]

Experiences of CSOs in the region are different and sharing their best practices would be very helpful to both CSOs and state authorities.

16h30 – 18h30: Parallel Workshops: **CSOs - Structure and local cooperation: networks, regional/international cooperation, how to improve CSO networks?**

Workshop 1 - [Networking and coalition building](#)

Moderator: Momcilo Radulovic, *Secretary General, European Movement in Montenegro*

Ms Cvejtana Plavska-Matic, *Director, National Foundation for Civil Society Development*

Ms Lidija Topic, *Adviser, Economic and Social Development, Transport and Infrastructure, Building of Human Capital, Parliamentary Cooperation Regional Cooperation Council*

Cvejtana Plavska-Matic, National Foundation for Civil Society Development

- Personally started 6 years ago to link about 10 organisations within the same platform and implemented a project at the national level.
- Speaking of her project, she referred to the fact that all the organisations came from the same city, making it easier to find a link.

- On the other hand, she considered it important to have organisations from several different levels and areas to ensure diversity.
- It is essential to build networks at regional levels.
- Regional organisation can give added value to networking as they have knowledge of the particular country, society, culture and recent developments. In this context they can judge which projects are better worth supporting.
- In addition, funding is needed for adequate information technologies in order to be able to better coordinate regional networks and foster coalition building.

Lidija Topic, Regional Cooperation Council

- Civil Society Organisation should speak on one policy.
- Regional progress has been made through The People to People Programme.

Account of experiences made during the process of networking

- Experienced difficulties managing national or regional coalitions.
- Regional Cooperation Council can help to structure networks.
- Functional assessments are the key to increasing efficiencies.
- TACSOs strategy is to create success, services and partnerships.
- TASCOS is supposedly the right organisation to create coalitions in the south east region.
- Coalition building as a way to generate funds. Here coalitions should apply the bottom up process.
- No donor driven coalitions but coalition driven initiatives.
- Problem especially with religious coalition building when different organisation have a hard time finding common issues that they can advocate together.
- Visions are needed though it is sometimes hard to find the right recipient. This is especially true at the European level. Whom should you address to achieve your goals? What will be the benefits and costs for members?

- Failure on regional levels with sometimes similar environments, working on cultural subjects.
- Social Media, like Facebook can help in building networks on a low cost level.
- These networks help to build coalitions. Coalitions need to build around boards while a network does not necessarily need a board and a more definite structure.
- Through a coalition you are able to mobilize the network → increased effectiveness.
- Donors recently focus more on projects with large partnerships and networks in order to have maximum impact.
- The essential target should be to keep a network alive and to lift it to a more pro-active level. The coalition building will come afterwards and go alongside with the networking at for example side events of the network.
- Low cost perspective when organizing events. No need to always request large funds. Advantage of NGO coalitions to organise activities on low cost level.

Conclusions

- geographical differences could be a problem of functioning
- we need regular communication
- TACSO should produce data base on networks useful for the CSO
- TACSO should create a southeast Europe list of organisations
- Improve management skills and tools of coalition
- Coalition structures need to be visible and transparent: Who is the chairman, clear list of members
- Additional trainings needed and practice in order to be able to perform better networking strategies
- Find common topics and agree on the same values
- Define clear targets and potential achievements
- Maintaining network is less costly than maintaining coalition structures

- Create larger and wider networks with common backgrounds and common goals
 - Make good use of side events which add to networking without costs
 - Recommendation to work also more in research and become part of advocacy policies and therefore contacts and talks with governments
 - Need to strengthen regional NGOs within Brussels institutions
-

Workshop 2 - [EU support for civil society](#)

Moderator: Ms Maja Bobic, *Secretary General, European Movement Serbia*

Mr Dirk Vantuyghem, *Director International Affairs, Eurochambres*

Mr Henk Visser, *Programme Manager, EU policies, Task Manager, European Commission DG Enlargement*

Henk Visser, *European Commission DG Enlargement*

- Procedures of EU – it is difficult for EU institution to really know what it needed in the streets – difficult to bring the EU to the people.
- No recognition for governments – I have to serve citizens of Europe and not governments. We should leave to local, regional, national authorities.
- We want to listen to civil society –NGOs have to unite and network in federations in order to let their needs come up to the EU institution so that we can help you with grants.
- 15000 civil servants in the EU, there is no unique opinion on how to support civil society. We try to find ways to make it easier while still respecting our financial rules etc. WE have to give money on transparent and equal criteria described in the guide lines since it is very competitive.

- How can we use NGOs, who are able to respond to our call for proposals, to help those who cannot (difficult, complicated process, in English etc not every NGO is able to apply). We should have a system to provide info to smaller NGOs so that they will be able to have grants. Using info coming to civil society, the EU is trying to create a strategy to develop a way to support those who are in the streets.
- You cannot depend on the EU grants and support because a lot of donors are backing out. You cannot count on EU support, which is why you have to help smaller CSOs with fundraising. You need to communicate.
- We want to push policies. We want to implement policies, directives and make it the least painful as possible. We want to assist civil society by communicating with governments for them to pass legislation that helps civil society. We need to show a bit more of the political message towards the countries. We have to show governments the added value of civil society organization.

Intervention Participant:

- EU support is very welcome and there are lots of projects (but very few will actually touch citizens). I'm happy you know that. There are already pillars in the region that give grants to smaller NGOs.
- Sustainability of civil society -> important question for civil society. Philanthropic development needs to be spread by citizens that believe in the added value of civil society organizations. It is essential that citizens believe in NGOs.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- Coordination is also very important between civil society organizations. Actions don't have to be sustainable, but the spirit behind that has to be on a volunteer basis so as not to just consume a grant.
- The most important thing: mentorship approach. Who already know how it works but we must help others to learn. Another

important thing: trust. Civil society must organise itself and organise its own anti-corruption systems of control. Civil society is all and nothing, so we have to create control systems. We don't know you, we have to trust you, and we can trust you if we work together.

Intervention Participant:

- Type of grants that you could provide with public money from EU.
- Networks -> artificial. The kind of networks you want can come naturally when and where there is maturity.
- Donors coordination: another question. Very egoistic approach of donors. EU is playing a significant role in the western Balkans but you have to coordinate with local donors. You have to involve the business sector.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- Networks are created because they are required in guide lines, they never met before and then they separate. This is not our point or our aim. Corporate philanthropy, tax exoneration to seduce donors etc. is okay but you have to work with us. You have to network, to work together (again the idea of mentors). We need to push together in order to go for the alternative because we won't be here forever.

Intervention Participant:

- Large amount of self-criticism among CSOs. We have no responsibility, we are not responsible, we always complain. The lack of self-criticism puts CSOs in the situation where they are. We are the ones who create this bad image and lack of trust from donors. We create the damage and we ask the EC to come and repair the damage made. This is a major issue.

- As long as there are opportunities to use “paper partnerships” we use it! We never build real partnerships.
- As long as we think this way, we cannot put in motion the changes that we are talking about.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- Two years ago I fired CSOs who were complaining that EU guidelines are very complicated. I agree that perhaps they are, but their proposals had no merit at all. International donors shift: yesterday, it was the Balkan region, today is Haiti, tomorrow maybe Sudan. You have to move and find local donors.

Intervention Participant:

- Regarding civil society facility one of the tools of EU to support us, networking is a major criteria for their call for proposals -> this is very useful to increase capacity and professionalism of CSOs in Balkan region to be competitive not only locally but also in a EU competition. There are huge possibilities in the actual triangle: Academia, business and CSOs. We (FYROM) are eager to be members of the EU.

Intervention Participant:

- Civil society needs to focus on projects that will really benefit citizens. The EU shouldn't finance NGOs that only apply to justify their existence without doing anything, without producing any sustainable and positive activity. There are smaller NGOs that really operate for citizens that don't find money to sustain their activities. CSOs are simply too weak to finance their projects.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- Civil Society Facility -> we want to have strong civil society organizations. Therefore, we have to push to the natural selection: we cannot have 5 barbers where there is only space for three.

Intervention Participant:

- Nobody is asking for easy money. Yes, of course, there are NGOs that are questionable. But its dangerous to take this approach: look to yourself and sustainability which makes it possible. Sometimes NGOs have products that are not marketable in all senses of the word, and sometimes those NGOs are the most valuable for the EU. We do not have the same experience as EU NGOs, so we need help and solidarity with certain issues such as guaranteeing stability.

Intervention Participant:

- Image of NGOs are very unfortunate -> we are seen like foreign agency. What should we do to have a better image? Very negative image of what we do. We don't create marketable products; people think we only want money. We should find means of pressure on governments and media for them to change our image.
- There is also the problem of the volunteering: if you are wealthy you can, but what if you are not? We are not in a position to discuss volunteering.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- We as commissions should make clear that we engage civil society. We should say that we like CSOs (medecins sans frontiers, etc).

Intervention Participant:

- Comments on project sustainability : professional CSOs are powerful, they initiate those projects. These big NGOs get the funds, but then local NGOs have to implement them without having participated to the first preparation phases. Local people should be supported as the real initiators of the projects. Generally, big NGOs come to local people after everything is arranged, which is not a good procedure.

Intervention Participant:

- I don't think the main problem is the image of NGOs. We should stress the fact that we have to push policies to help civil society to grow. We should focus on the way civil society achieves its objectives. Where will we go? How will go there? We should find a way to push to change the national policies in order to accept that there is an international civil society and not only a National civil society. We should focus on what civil society is asked to make to achieve this objective.

Intervention Participant:

- It's important to have a transition period so that governments are able to continue with reforms. Governments are not mature enough to make those changes and to continue those changes.

Intervention Participant:

- We have established an interregional framework of NGOs; in our case, we took the opportunity to establish a framework for cooperation because we felt that local institutions didn't do that. In a period of globalization, civil society has to create networks to push the institutional dialogue. Today, Civil society can be more powerful institutions to face global problems (traffic, climate

change etc.). We need to think how we are going to support EU efforts.

- Concerning EU support, there is more money and we should go for it. We would like to suggest to europaed that corporate responsibility should be proposed by europaed programme because I fell that we lost track with capitalism.

Henk Visser, European Commission DG Enlargement

- The main thing is that putting innovation in the way we deal with CSOs is important but we have to accompany the whole process and help civil society members to become their own specialists. Innovate, replace what doesn't work but accompany CSOs through the whole process

Workshop 3 - Free movement of people and European exchange programmes with the Region

Moderator: Mr Olivier Hinnekens, *Treasurer, Member of the Board, European Movement International*

Ms Zeynep Özler, *Senior Researcher, Economic Development Foundation*

Mr Melih Özsöz, *Senior Researcher, Economic Development Foundation*

Mr Kenan Hadzimusic, *Project Manager, IMPACT NGO Office, European Citizens Action Service*

Melih Özsöz, *Economic Development Foundation*

- Problematic Visa situation: Free movement of Turkish citizens is very limited.
- Pioneering study on VISA relations
- EC-Turkey Readmission Agreement to be signed soon

Kenan Hadzimusic, European Citizens Action Service

- Visa liberalization with Turkey is a must
- Visa exemption documents issued by Germany
- Soysal case of the European Court

Olivier Hinnekens, European Movement International

- 630.000 Visas in 2008
- What is the reaction when VISAS of people get rejected? Study of ECAS
- Visa regulation! Why do people apply 15 times for a Visa and get it but still have to apply for 16 times for a VISA.
- Astonishing ERASMUS figures?!

Open debate

- VISA regulations in conjunction with ERASMUS programs, limitations not only here but also when there is a need to attend important events.
- VISA liberalization does not necessarily lead to movement of workers in order to flood other job markets. Limitations also here with VISA accession countries and additional work permits are sometimes need (Belgium: Romania/Bulgaria)
- 2 weeks and 70 Euros and the need of a birth certificate in order to obtain a Visa

Pat Cox, EMI President

- Politicization of technical facts
- Arrange a seminar in Brussels and bring it forward in front of a large media and Brussels stakeholders
- Malmström to be invited
- Criminal class never had a VISA problem → cheat the system
- Telling the story in human terms, the ordinary citizens are those that carry the burden of the need for VISAS

- Why is Turkey a special case and why should they have VISA liberalization?
- Main argument:
 - Size of Turkey: biggest number of people by nationality in the EU states are of Turkish Nationality
 - People should be confronted with the fact of running out of excuses
 - Name the realities
 - Evidence lead presentation that people cannot deny
- Visa free regimes should not be restricted in terms of economical reasons but also trade in order to become the outside border of the European Union. Would Turkey be willing to fulfill this commitment?
- Freedom of Movement
- Visa Free Regime for Turkey is a gift to the citizens rather than to the Government.

4. Annex 1: Speeches

a. Speech by Štefan Füle, European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighborhood Policy

Ministers, Ambassadors, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very happy to be present today at the opening of this Congress of the European Movement. Today, we bring together Civil Society Organisations from the enlargement countries, members of national governments and parliaments and representatives from European institutions.

Overall, around 300 participants are present. This is an impressive response. It confirms the interest of the European Union and key stakeholders to discuss together policies and actions to strengthen civil society and its impact in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

I am also happy to be back in Turkey. I am sure you are all aware of the recent poll which has highlighted that many in the region see Turkey as proof that democracy and Islam can coexist that different lifestyles can coexist.

This makes Turkey a relevant example for the whole region, and we have to applaud Turkey for this achievement. At the same time we have to encourage the government to make further progress. They have a very important responsibility to uphold such a privileged position.

Let me now turn to my speech. I'd like first of all to address the role that civil society plays in ensuring good governance.

Secondly, I will briefly mention the importance of the "Civil Society Facility", which is one of the main instruments of the European Union to support civil society in fulfilling this vital role in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

Ladies and Gentlemen, good governance is an essential element towards meeting the political criteria for any country to be able to join the European Union. This means that civil society has to be included in any decision-making.

Citizens, both individually and via Civil Society Organisations, should be in a position:

- To participate in policy making and legislative processes, as well as
- To monitor closely the proper implementation of existing rules and regulations.

They must be able to do that through direct participation, not as a distant voice far from the action.

Of course, with participation comes responsibility. For their part, Civil Society Organisations have to show that they are committed and therefore responsible in their intent, for their credibility comes from their ability to reflect the different opinions of different segments of the population.

We have all seen the power that civil society can wield. Solidarnosc and Charter 77 have both demonstrated what is possible when the majority of the population supports an organisation that fills a democratic vacuum and provides hope for a better future.

In a participative democracy, the role of civil society is of vital importance in providing an alternative perspective and on occasion in filling a void left by the elected authorities.

Our host, the European Movement, is a prime example of such an organisation: generating change through education and dialogue with citizens and government around Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, the basic values of the European Union member states include a government's ability to take into consideration and accept critical and informed views from civil society.

It is therefore vital that the respective governments of the Western Balkans and Turkey continue to improve their legislative environment in order successfully to obtain a strong, vibrant civil society.

Civil Society Organisations today continue to face numerous obstacles that hinder the development of civil society as a whole. Most importantly, a new mind-set is required. Civil society and governments should view each other more as partners than as adversaries.

In this, it is the responsibility both of governments and of European institutions to ensure that the role and influence of Civil Society Organisations are strengthened and made effective. In many cases new

legislation may be required along with new working methods. Crucially, the right to express diverging views freely, without the fear of prosecution, needs to be safeguarded in a clear and unambiguous manner.

This will allow civil society to play a fundamental role in helping citizens of the enlargement countries not only to become aware of common European values, but also to actively promote those values.

This will mean Civil Society Organisations in the region working closely with their own public authorities as well as building partnerships between themselves and with their European Union counterparts. Since 2005, in the context of enlargement the EU is promoting civil society dialogue between EU Member States and candidate countries aiming at improving mutual knowledge and encouraging a debate regarding society and political issues.

I am pleased that today's Congress will look into ways how to best achieve these goals. I hope you will have very fruitful discussions, and let me assure you that the Commission will be glad to take any suggestions that may emerge to day into account on how to best support the development of civil society to actively participate in public choices and how to promote a conducive environment in order to make national reforms more effective.

Let me also make an explicit point here. You will not be alone in dealing with the challenges I have just set out. The European Union is with you, and provides support to help you meet these challenges.

This is done through political dialogue and financial assistance. In this context, we have introduced the "Civil Society Facility" specifically to strengthen civil society within a participative democracy, stimulating a civil society friendly 'environment' and culture in the enlargement countries.

Introduced in 2007 as part of the European Union's Enlargement Strategy, this Facility has continued to be developed strongly ever since. Financed by the European Commission from its Instrument for Pre-Accession it aims "to promote dialogue and civil society development" notably through capacity-building and exchange projects.

In November 2007, the European Commission underlined the importance of civil society's role in a participatory democracy and stressed the need to make further efforts "to deepen the freedom of association, to put in place regulatory frameworks and public incentives for the development of civil society organisations".

Since then, over € 80 million have been dedicated to the promotion and implementation of the Civil Society Facility in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

For instance, in Turkey the EU prepared some "Guiding Principles for EC Support of the Development of Civil Society in Turkey" based on a broad consultation of all stakeholders. The aim of this initiative was to refer in more concrete terms to the civil society development aspects specific to Turkey, including financial support under the Civil Society Facility and under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights in Turkey To give you another example, we have also established a special "People 2 People" Programme to bring journalists, young politicians, trades union leaders, teachers and others into contact with European Union institutions.

Many of you here have benefited from this support, and I am sure many more will benefit from it in the future. Yesterday, we had a "kick-off" event for 32 projects to strengthen civil society's role in the region, for a total value of about € 10 million.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I wish to conclude with the following thought about how to proceed in the future.

There is a need to develop a new sense of cooperation rather than competition between governments and civil society. For the new civil society culture to flourish, it is extremely important that any new legislation and principles are accepted by the population as a whole.

Let me in this context refer to the expectations the European Union has as regards the full and timely involvement of civil society in the drafting of a new Constitution in Turkey. I am aware that Civil Society Organisations and citizens are currently working on a "civil constitution" initiative. We welcome this process, which we believe is a crucial one for the constitutional changes that are needed.

Let me conclude: our common agenda has to be to put civil society in a position where it can effectively assist governments in their design of policy and its implementation. In order to do so, it is indispensable to put the necessary regulatory frameworks in place. These frameworks must allow for the deepening of the freedom of association and provide public incentives for the development of Civil Society Organisations.

This is where the conclusions and outcome of this Congress are crucial and I look forward to learning the results of your discussions. Thank you very much for your attention.

b. Speaking Notes of Egemen Bağış, Turkish Minister for EU Affairs and chief negotiator of Turkey in the accession talks with the European Union

Dear Pat,
Dear Stefan,
Dear Rector,
Dear Mr. Ergüder,
Distinguished guests,

- Welcome to the Congress of the European Movement, which İstanbul is proud host of this year.
- It is very fitting that the European Movement, whose structure, existence and the values were shaped by far-sighted European visionaries, such as Konrad Adenauer, Winston Churchill, Harold Macmillan, Paul-Henry Spaak and Altiero Spinelli, meet here.

I. INTRODUCTION

- Founded in 1948, the European Movement made important contributions to the establishment of a united Europe founded on the principles of peace, democracy, liberty, solidarity, and respect for basic human rights.
- It also sought to facilitate the active participation of citizens and civil society organisations in the development of a united Europe, focusing on seeking further integration in the political, social and cultural arenas.
- Let us also pay homage to the farsighted Turks in the process who strived for the same ends.
- As early as 16 August 1949, when the Members of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe debated future changes to the political structure in Europe, Turkish representatives advocated a strong Union.
- Mr. Kasım Gülek, the Turkish Vice-President of the Assembly, said in a speech to the founding members of the Council of Europe and I quote: “What lies behind the European nations’ history is old

customs and prejudices. All these can be achieved. We are certain that union is likely to be attained and we are here to make efforts within this regard.”

- Now, half a century later, after other notable Turks, who strived to bring Turkey closer to the European Union, I think this declaration is as relevant as ever.
- In this context, allow me also to thank President Cox, for his support and encouragement he has given us on the reformist and modernizing path which we, in Turkey, have joined.
- **Your decision to meet in Istanbul, with its vibrant civil society, is a tribute to our efforts to enhance people-to-people contact between Turkey and the EU.**
- In 2010, Istanbul was honoured with the title of “European Capital of Culture” and in 2012 she will be the “European Capital of Sport”. This title is given to a candidate country for the first time.

II. TURKEY AND CIVIL SOCIETY

- We believe that these activities and organizations would enhance the civil society interaction between Turkey and other European countries.
- To do our own share, we, the Secretariat General for the European Union Affairs, are the only state body which has a Directorate General for Civil Society and Communications.
- We have always regarded the European Union process as a “project of our people.”
- Instead of keeping it in conference halls, we brought it all around Turkey, from village cafes and school halls; from trade chambers to country-wide competitions.
- This is why we have acted energetically to ensure the active participation of the civil society.

- During my two-year-term of as Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, I came together with CSOs several times. I attended their conferences and meetings.
- We organised 5 broad-based meetings titled “Dialogue with Civil Society”. There were thousands of participants from different CSOs from different sectors and corners of Turkey.
- We have also launched many theme-based meetings of stakeholders, before and after opening chapters in our EU negotiation process.
- This year, we will kick-off a new civil society dialogue project related to political criteria and media. In this project, we will again have new partners from the EU member states.
- Each project and activity brings our European nations closer and makes them more familiar with each other.

III. TURKEY AMONG OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

- We believe that the enlargement process can be successful only if the social support is on its side. This is why the social interaction between candidate and member states has utmost importance.
- Tonight, we have many participants from member and candidate states of the EU. We have guests from Balkan countries with which we share a common history and similar cultural aspects.
- With some of them we have similar melodies in our folkloric music, similar tastes in our foods, and even similar sense of humour.
- And we have guests from some EU member states with whom we have close ties through millions of Turks living in their countries.
- In these member states, Turks are also part of civil society in which they are living. Dialogue among all civil society members of a nation is as important as dialogue among different nations’ civil societies.
- The common points we have are our biggest assurance and support in initiating and developing good dialogue with other European countries.

IV. CONCLUSION

- Now, here in Istanbul, we have a good platform to exchange views and listen to each other.
- We strongly believe in an open minded, enterprising, fair and unprejudiced power of civil society both in our reform and accession processes.
- And we believe that, discussions and sincere dialogue among civil society members will contribute to the progress in the enlargement process.
- I would like to thank TÜSEV and Bilgi University, and all those who prepared the ground and made the Istanbul meeting of the European Movement possible. I wish to express my sincere thanks also to Mr. Füle and Mr. Cox for being here.
- You are on a territory which has given our continent her name Europa. We hope you feel yourself at home, and design a better future of Europe with a stronger civil society.

5. Annex 2: Pictures



Rifat Hisarcıklıoğlu, TOBB President



Pat Cox, EMI President



Štefan Füle, European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy, and in picture below **Egemen Bağış**, Turkish Minister for EU Affairs (second from left)





Main conference hall of the Istanbul Congress on 11-12 February 2011 with more than 300 civil society delegates, high level experts and public authority representatives.



6. Annex 3: List of Participants

Countries	Names of participants (411)
Albania (23)	Anila Berberi, Stephan Doempke, Gjergji Filipi, Gjergji Gjika, Gledis Gjipali, Plejada Gugashi, Edmond Hido, Blerta Hoxha, Kati Kozara, Elton Lelo, Zirina Llambro, Kol Nikollaj, Genci Pasko, Sadi Petrela, Gentiana Qirjako, Elenita Roshi, Baisa Sefa, Artan Shrkreli, Marinela Sota, Anisa Subashi, Lorna Tabaku, Sinan Tajaf, Bledar Troka
Austria (2)	Sonja Greiner, Michaela Pichler
Belgium (33)	Michele Amedeo, Suzan Arslan, Jeff Bridgford, Joao Salviano Carmo, Ana-Cristina Costea, Vladimira Drbalova, Rainer Emscherman, Georgi Gotev, Kenan Hadzimusic, Olivier Hinnekens, Joerg Janssen, Pierre Jean Coulon, Aurélien Juliard, Andris Kesteris, Charles Kleinermann, N. Peter Kramer, Meglena Kuneva, Francesco Marchi, Arno Metzler, Staffan Nilsson, Charles-Ferdinand Nothomb, Matilde Pinamonti, Diogo Pinto, Wytze Russchen, Christophe Sykes, Aleksandra Tomanic, Louise van Rijckevorsel, Dirk Vantyghem, Tony Venables, Henk Visser, Marta Vojtova, Iva Zelic, Yazgulu Zeybek
Bosnia and Herzegovina (36)	Emina Abrahamsdotter, Marijana Aksin-Mačak, İsmet Bajramovic, Alija Baksic, Sanela Becirovic, Sanela Besic, Mersiha Beširović, Esad Bratovic, Lejla Brutus, Sabina Čano, Dino Čolić, Aida Daguda, Vedran Dedic, Slobodanka Dekic, Slavica Draskovic, Ognjen Dukic, Lejla Hadzic, Armin Hadzimusic, Asja Hafner, Esad Ibisevic, Snježana Ivandić Ninković, Jasmin Jasarevic, Hamdija Kujundzic, Aida Kurtovic, Rusmera Mandic, Marko Martic, Amna Muharemovic, Aleksandra Ostojić Matić, Natalja Petric, Prastalo Predrag, Zoran Puljic, Igor Šimšić, Kovač Tarik, Radenko Udovicic, Shahrzad Vakilzadeh, Palle Westergaard
Bulgaria (1)	Ivo Hristov

Croatia (35)	Mario Bajkuša, Adriana Bego, Marija Boltek, Denis Čajo, Igor Djordjevic, Mladen Domazet, Natalija Gojkovic, Daniela Jovanova Ivanković, Svetlana Jurko, Jelena Katic, Vesna Lončarić, Tonci Lucic, Uglik Martina, Marija Martinic, Marinko Metlicic, Dubravko Miholić, Ranko Milic, Katarina Milkovic, Neven Mimica, Davor Mišković, Stojan Obradovic, Gordana Obradovic-Dragisic, Natasa Owens, Milica Perdic, Teodor Petricevic, Martina Petrinjak Žekic, Cvjetana Plavska-Matic, Nikoleta Poljak, Sandra Prlenda Perkovac, Monika Rajkovic, Irena Slunjski, Dijana Sobota, Kresimir Stih, Igor Vidacac, Sonja Vuković
Czech Republic (3)	Tihomir Loza, Ondrej Nadvornik, Jana Petrlikova Terzimehic
Estonia (1)	Maiu Uus
France (3)	Jutta Gützkow, Françoise Mace, Inge Vendryes
Georgia (1)	Tamar Bregvadze
Germany (7)	Cornelia Abel, Alexandra Caterbow, Tiphaine Coulardeau, Bernd Hüttemann, Kristina Kocevaska, Bistra Mihaylova, Laura Seifert
Greece (7)	Michalis Angelopoulos, Rea Apostolides, Mario Bofondi, Efi Chrisochoidou, Nikolas Petropoulos, Eva-Maria Rembor, Alexandros Tsamis
Hungary (1)	Ilona Moricz
Italy (15)	Sergio Bianchi, Brankica Borovic, Goran Boshkov, Alessandra Brescia, Mauro Mascioli, Oriana Mazzali, Claudio Melchiorre, Romano Mosconi, Carlo Pileri, Paolo Quercia, Melita Richter, Paolo Tanese, Tolga Tanner, Antonella Valmorbida, Marcus Wilke
Kosovo (21)	Hiljmnijeta Apuk, Kanita Apuk, Haxhi Arifi, Reshat Bajrami, Ajri Begu, Levend Bicaku, Hajrulla Ceku, Ardita Kabashi-Hima, Mjellma Luma, Shkelzen Maliqi, Vuk Mitrovic, Anton Nrecaj, Arber Reci, Ardita Rizvanolli, Bashkim Rrahmani, Feride Rushiti, Elheme Selmani - Rexhepi, Sali Shoshi, Valon Xhabali, Bariu Zenelaj, Dafina Mehaj
Luxembourg (1)	Imre Simon

Macedonia (39)	Luzlim Aziri, Dimitar Barabanov, Daniela Barabanova, Mile Boshkov, Ljupco Despotovski, Natasha Dokovska, Dejan Filiposki, Mileva Gjurovska, Marina Gjorgioska-Kitanoska, Mirjana Gjorgjevska, Elena Ignatova, Vesna Jankova, Bardhyl Jashari, Todor Kalamatiev, Kornelija Koneska, Rasko Mishkoski, Zivko Mitrevski, Igor Nedelkovski, Ljubica Nuri, Dona Organdzieva, Ivana Petkanovska, Biljana Petkovska, Igor Petrusovski, Metodija Sazdov, Sunchica Sazdovska, Julija Shundovska, Natasa Sivevska, Goran Stojanoski, Zoran Stojkovski, Rizvan Sulejmani, Tulaha Tahir, Tanja Tomic, Dina Trajkova, Aneta Trgacevska, Nikola Todorovski, Vilma Venkovska Milcev, Milcho Smilevski, Todor Kalamatiev, Slobadan Antovski
Montenegro (16)	Momcilo Radulovic, Anica-Maja Boljevic, Goran Djurovic, Ksenija Dukanovic, Aleksandra Gligorovic, Aleksandra Kapetanovic, Danka Latkovic, Ivan Mitrovic, Azra Mucic, Jelena Ognjenović, Mišo Pejković, Ivana Prnjat, Miodrag Raceta, Dijana Uljarevic, Natasa Uskokovic, Vladan Žugić
Romania (5)	Adela Avram, David Baxter, Daniela Elena Dumitru, Csilla Hegedus, Ionut Sibian
Serbia (43)	Endre Balassa, Jelena Belic, Maja Bobic, Branislav Canak, Irena Cerovic, Agnes Curcic Asodi, Duska Dimovic, Natasa Dragojlovic, Tijana Femic, Tanja Ignjatovic, Branislav Jonas, Goran Jovic, Miroslav Jovic, Bojana Karavidic, Sanja Krsmanovic Tasic, Dejana Kuzmic, Natasa Lambic, Varga Laszlo, Ksenija Milenkovic, Danilo Milic, Aleksandar Ostojic, Goran Radisavljevic, Natasa Rankovic, Zorica Raskovic, Snezana Reseta-Pekovic, Gordana Ristic, Milica Ružičić-Novković, Marko Savic, Marijana Savic, Natasa Savic Janjic, Miodrag Shrestha, Lea Simokovic, Andjela Sofic, Jelena Sokreg, Zoran Stojiljkovic, Irina Subotic, Petrus Theunisz, Natasa Todorovic, Gordana Velev, Aleksandra Vitorovic, Irena Vujcic Pavlovic, Jelena Vukmanovic, Ivan Zivkovic
Slovakia (1)	Peter Simko
Slovenia (4)	Jakob Bec, Jasna Hrovat, Aleksandra Krumpak, Sonja Zavrl

Spain (2)	Carlos Brù, Daniel Correa
Sweden (9)	Charlotte Aberg, Eva Arvidsson, Robert Backlund, Lejla Hastor, Margareta Husen, Johanna Leander, Johan Mostrom, Karin Nilsson, Åke Sahlin
Turkey (96)	Ahmet Fatih Acar, Tefvik Akşit, Hakan Akşit, Ural Aküzüm, Alper Akyüz, Mehmet Ali Tuğtan, Suade Arançlı, Elif Ari, Batuhan Aydagül, Senem Aydın Düzgit, Mehru Aygöl, Egemen Bagis, Selda Basbugoglu, Volkan Bozkır, Çağlar Çakıralp, Yaylagul Ceran, Namık Ceylanoğlu, Şeyda Çimeli, Rana Birden Çorbacioğlu, Serdar Denктаş, Aytek Durak, Ercan Durdular, Mustafa Durna, Lale Duruiz, Lütfi Elvan, Dr. Aykut Engin, Neşe Erdilek, Üstün Ergüder, Aygen Erkal, YEŞİM Erkan, Başak Ersen, Nazlan Ertan, Hakan Erürker, Emre Gönen, Mehmet Emre Gur, Yaprak Gürsoy, Halil Güven, Ayça Haykır, Birgül Haznedaroğlu, Rifat Hisarciklioglu, Aslı İrkin, Kenan İrtak, İdil Işıl Gül, Bianca Kaiser, Sedat Kalem, Ozlem Kalmaz, Pevrul Kavlak, Derya Kaya, Sebahat Kaya, Ayhan Kaya, Faruk Kaymakcı, Necdet Kenar, Fuat Keyman, Tuba Kılıç, Levent Korkut, Tuğrul Kudatgobilik, Emel Kurma, Zümray Kutlu, Zeynep Meydanoğlu, Nur Oluk, Taysu Onur, İsmail Orakçioğlu, Önur Öymen, Uygur Özemesi, Neslihan Özgüneş, Zeynep Ozler, Zelal Özmen, Melih Ozsoz, Kayhan Özüm, Lise Pate, Marc Pierini, Asaf Savaş Akat, Asaf Savaş Akat, Burhan Şenatalar, Ayşe Sezgin, Orhan Silier, Bilsen Sirmen, Diane Sunar, Turgut Tarhanlı, Fikret Toksöz, Bertan Tokuzlu, Asli Toppare, İlter Turan, Orçun Ulusoy, Pınar Uyan, Tanay Sidki Uyar, Laki Vingas, Gülperi Vural, Miray Vurmay, Ege Yazgan, Atilla Yerlikaya, Ahu Yiğit, Ömer Ali Yıldırım, Laden Yurttagüler, Laden Yurttagüler, Fatma Zengir
UK (3)	Vahida Huzejrovic, David Sandford, Maureen Tominson

7. Annex 4: Programme

10 February 2011

19h00: The Welcome Reception by HE Egemen Bağış, the Minister for European Union Affairs and Chief Negotiator

The Marmara, Taksim Meydani Taksim 34437 Istanbul

Friday, 11 February

Venue: Istanbul Bilgi University, Dolapdere Campus

08h30 – 09h00: Registrations

09h00 – 10h15: Welcome words and opening speeches

Moderator: Mr. Charles-Ferdinand Nothomb, *Belgian Minister of State, Vice-president of the European Movement International, Chair of the Political Committee “The European Union and its Neighbours”*

- **Prof. Üstün Ergüder**, *Chairman of the Third Sector Foundation of Turkey*
- **Prof. Dr. Halil Güven**, *Rector of the Bilgi University*
- **Mr Rifat Hisarcıkloğlu**, *President of the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) Foreign Economic Relations Board (DEIK), Deputy President of EUROCHAMBRES*
- **Mr Pat Cox**, *President of the European Movement International*
- **Mr Egemen Bağış**, *Turkish Minister for the European Union Affairs and Chief Negotiator*
- **Mr Štefan Füle**, *European Commissioner in charge of Enlargement and the European Neighbourhood Policy*

10h15 – 10h45: Question and Answer session

10h45 – 11h15: COFFEE BREAK

11h15 – 12h00: Plenary Session – Socio-Economic Partnerships

Moderator: Mr Diogo Pinto, *Secretary General of the European Movement International*

- The role of the economic partners in supporting civil society

Mr Nahit TÖRE, Economic Adviser, Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations

- The benefits for the social partners

Mr Jeff Bridgford, *Special Advisor, European Trade Union Confederation*

- The responsibilities of governments in supporting SEPs

Mr Staffan Nilsson, *President, European Economic and Social Committee*

12h00 – 12h30: Question and Answer session

12h30 – 14h00: LUNCH

14h00 – 16h00: Parallel Workshops: **Standards for open government: CSO, public authorities and the theory of democratic governance**

Workshop 1 - Development of civil society

Moderator: Ms Ksenija Milenkovic, *Vice-President of the European Movement International*

Mr Arno Metzler, *Co-President of the Joint Consultative Committee EU-Turkey, European Economic and Social Committee*

Mr Zoran Puljic, *Director, Mozaik Community Development Foundation*

In the region this has been impressive. But is it sufficiently sustainable? With foreign donors tending to move to new areas, is there sufficient domestic support to replace their support? Has the issue of civic and citizen engagement in the non-profit sector been addressed? Is there an over concentration on national organizations? What about the local community level? Is there more scope for micro projects? How can we build the local capacities of CSOs in the region?

Workshop 2 – The advocacy and watchdog role.

Moderator: Mr Bernd Hüttemann, *Secretary General, European Movement Germany, Member of the Board of the European Movement International*

Mrs Antonella Valmorbida, *Chair of the Civil Society and Democracy Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe*

Mr Tony Venables, *Director, European Citizens Action Service*

The experience across the region and within each country can vary. Whilst there are impressive instances of civil society organizations making a major impact on legislation to advance reform processes, there are also instances where inclusion is an illusion. How can these best practices be spread more effectively? Can more general standards of civil dialogue be established? What is the role of model guidelines such as those of the Council of Europe or framework agreements (compacts)? What should be done to promote them across the region?

Workshop 3: The process of national reforms.

Moderator: Mr. Gledis Gjjipali, *Executive Director, European Movement in Albania*

Mr Basak Ersen, *Programme Director, Third Sector Foundation of Turkey*

Mr Zoran Stojkovski, *Executive Director, Center for Institutional Development - CIRa*

Most countries in the region now have in place a basic legal framework guaranteeing freedom of association, although there is some way to go before associations operating in the human rights area or for the protection of minorities are able to do so without harassment. Less appears to have been done in the area of tax relief and schemes to encourage corporate social responsibility. Legislative reforms are not enough. The workshop should also examine to what extent governments have a cross-cutting strategy

towards civil society and the mechanisms to back it up such as focal points, intermediate agencies and regular consultation.

16h00 – 16h30: COFFEE BREAK

16h30 – 18h30: Parallel Workshops: **CSOs - Structure and local cooperation: networks, regional/international cooperation, how to improve CSO networks?**

Workshop 1 - Networking and coalition building.

Moderator: Momcilo Radulovic, *Secretary General, European Movement in Montenegro*

Ms Cvejtana Plavska-Matic, *Director, National Foundation for Civil Society Development*

Ms Lidija Topic, *Adviser, Economic and Social Development, Transport and Infrastructure, Building of Human Capital, Parliamentary Cooperation Regional Cooperation Council*

The need for coalition building – both sectoral and cross-sectoral is accepted as necessary to allow civil society organizations to speak with one voice towards the national governments and the EU Institutions. But often the will and resources are lacking. How can these real difficulties in creating coalitions which are open, democratic and also efficient be overcome?

Workshop 2 - EU support for civil society.

Moderator: Ms Maja Bobic, *Secretary General, European Movement Serbia*

Mr Dirk Vantuyghem, *Director International Affairs, Eurochambres*

Mr Henk Visser, *Programme Manager, EU policies, Task Manager, European Commission DG Enlargement*

The Commission has done much to support the development of civil society. But are its financial mechanisms fit for purpose? To what extent does the Commission work with other donors? To what extent have information and consultation mechanisms between the EU and civil society improved? There is no doubt that an alliance between civil society and the European Institutions can help persuade national governments in the region to undertake reforms, but how does this really work in practice?

Workshop 3 - Free movement of people and European exchange programmes with the Region.

Moderator: Mr Olivier Hinnekens, *Treasurer, Member of the Board, European Movement International*

Ms Zeynep Özler, *Senior Researcher, Economic Development Foundation*

Mr Melih Özsöz, *Senior Researcher, Economic Development Foundation*

Mr Kenan Hadzmusic, *Project Manager, IMPACT NGO Office, European Citizens Action Service*

At the Ljubljana Congress of April 2009, the final session with the members of Parliament and government from the region was dominated by the issue of visas, which in the meantime is well on the way to being solved for the Western Balkans. But what about Turkey? The case for visa liberalization will be discussed with the presentation of the results of the IKV—ECAS hotline. This should be seen in the broader context of the different people-to-people programmes, particularly for the younger generation in order to strengthen the links between the EU and applicant countries. There should be a special emphasis on exchanges among CSOs within the region and with host counterparts in the EU.

20h00: Reception: welcome remarks by Mr. Saltuk Ertop, Corporate Affairs & regulations Group Director, Efes Beer Group.

Saturday, 12 February

Venue: Istanbul Bilgi University, Dolapdere Campus

9h00 – 09h30 *Introductory Speeches on Enlargement and Accession to the EU:*

Moderator: Mr Charles-Ferdinand Nothomb, *Belgian Minister of State, Vice-president of the European Movement International, Chair of the Political Committee “The European Union and its Neighbours”*

- **Mr Lütfi Elvan**, *Turkish Grand National Assembly, Co-Chair of the Turkey-EU Joint Parliamentary Committee*

09h30– 10h30: Presentation of the Political Chart

10h30 – 11h00: COFFEE BREAK

11h00 – 13h00: **Political Debate** *CSOs challenge Public Authorities*

Moderator: Mr Georgi Gotev, *Senior Editor, Euractiv*

- **Mr Neven Mimica**, *Chair of the European Integration Committee, Parliament of Croatia*
- **Mr Onur Öymen**, *Vice-Chair of the EU Committee, Turkish Grand National Assembly*
- **Mr Laszlo Varga**, *Chair of the Committee for the European Integration, Parliament of Serbia*

13h00 – 13h20: *Closing words/ Final Remarks*

- **Mr Pat Cox**, *President of the European Movement International*



**European Movement
Mouvement Européen**

**European Movement
International (EMI)**

Square de Meeûs 25
B-1000 Brussels

Phone: +32 2 508 30 88

Fax: +32 2 508 30 89

www.europeanmovement.eu

TÜSEV

Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı
Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

**Third Sector Foundation of
Turkey (TUSEV)**

Bankalar Caddesi Minerva Han 2
34420 Karaköy/İstanbul

Phone: +90 212 243 83 07

Fax: +90 212 243 83 05

www.tusev.org.tr