**EaP CSF National Platforms yearly self-assessment**

**- Assessing the levels of compliance with the EaP CSF Code of Ethical Conduct -**

**OBJECTIVES**

The yearly self-assessment process aims to assess to what extent EaP CSF and its internal bodies (National Platforms (NPs) are implementing the Forum's values and standards of conduct as described in the [EaP CSF Code of Ethical Conduct (CoEC)](https://eap-csf.eu/wp-content/uploads/Code-of-Ethical-Conduct.pdf) and in each NP-specific Code of Ethical Conduct.

The self-assessment process provides an opportunity for each NP to:

* **Reflect** on practices related to ethical conduct at the Forum and at the NP level (internally);
* **Monitor** institutional developments concerning the ethics within each body of the Forum and highlight areas of learning;
* **Identify** areas in the implementation of the CoEC where more attention is needed (in the framework of one year (until the next self-assessment) and in the long term (within a period of three years);
* **Identify and share internal best practices**

**FREQUENCY OF SELF-ASSESSMENTS AND EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS**

The self-assessment form is completed on an yearly basis by the CoEC advisor based on the input received from the National Platform.

**PROCEDURES FOR FILLING IN THE SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM FOR THE NATIONAL PLATFORMS**

In the case of the **EaP CSF National Platforms**, the self-assessment process will be led and coordinated by the **NP CoEC Advisor.**

Within each NP, the CoEC advisor will:

**1) Lead and coordinate the launch of the CoEC self-assessment process**

Every year, the CoEC advisor will be in charge of leading and coordinating the NP Self-Assessment process.

Upon the launch of the self-assessment process, the NP CoEC advisor will ensure that the NP's membership - including local Working Group Coordinators, National Facilitator Facilitator- and the NP Secretariat fill in the self-assessment form within a given period of time.

**2**) **Fill in the yearly NP self-assessment form (one document)**

Based on the collected forms, the CoEC advisor will assess all the received answers and scores to each question. To reflect the diversity of the received answers**, the advisor will fill in one Self-Assessment Form on behalf of the National Platform (in Word format, *see* below)**

Particular attention will be given to Section 5 of the Self-Assessment Form focused on priority CoEC issues which will need attention over the next 12 months.

**3) Share the results with the EaP CSF Secretariat and the Compliance Committee**

The CoEC advisor will share the filled-in self-assessment form (one document) with the EaP CSF Statutory Affairs Manager ([admin@eap-csf.eu](mailto:admin@eap-csf.eu)) and with the Forum's Compliance Committee ([complaints@eap-csf.eu](mailto:complaints@eap-csf.eu)).

After the process is concluded, the results of the assessment should be discussed at in a dedicated meeting led and organised by the CoEC advisor with the participation the NP board, National Facilitator and NP members.

**SCORING RESPONSES**

Scoring should reflect the following levels of CoEC compliance:

* **Score 1:** Unsatisfactory level of compliance. The NP does not fulfil the basic requirements of the CoEC standards. Needs serious improvement, if this is feasible in the specific country context.
* **Score 2:** The NP demonstrates a partial level of compliance. Needs improvement.
* **Score 3:** The NP demonstrates full compliance with the CoEC.

*In cases where respondents are unsure whether to give scores 1 or 2, or 2 or 3, they may provide a halfway score. For example, 1.5 or 2.5.*

Some categories and sub-categories may not be relevant to all the NPsForum bodies. If a category or sub-category is not applicable, mark these as **NA (Not Applicable).**

Sometimes respondents will not have sufficient information to respond to a specific question. In such cases, they should mark these **IIA (Insufficient Information Available).**

**No category or sub-category should be left blank.**

**HOW ARE THE RESULTS OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT USED?**

Each CoEC advisor within each National Platform will share the results of the self-assessment process with the Statutory Affairs Manager and the Compliance Committee.

On a case by case basis, the Compliance Committee will provide recommendations to the CoEC advisor regarding the areas that deserve particular attention over the next 12 months.

Internally, at the level of each National Platform, the CoEC advisor will discuss the results of the assessment, as well as the priority areas with the NP board, National Facilitator and membership. The results and the priority areas of this year will be considered a reference for the next yearly self- assessment exercise.

**PRIORITZING ISSUES THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT/SETTING BENCHMARKS**

Following the completion of the self-assessment process, the CoEC advisor will convene a meeting with the National Faciliator, local WG Coordinators and members. The objective of this post-assessment meeting is to evaluate the results of the self-assessment process and discuss the priority issues that should be paid attention to over the next 12 months (where there is realistic scope for some improvement over this period). *See* Section 5 of the self-assessment form.

Benchmarks can help ensure that the NP overcomes apathy and continuously strive to improve its performance standards. They can help the NP identify areas where the gaps between their standards and full implementation of the CoEC are the largest.

Benchmarks should be realistic and reflect incremental improvements. For example, for some categories of CoEC compliance, it might be unrealistic for an NP to expect to jump from a 1 score to a 2 score, or from a 2 to a 3 score, over the 12-month period following the self-assessment, especially in view of country-specific constraints for some categories of behavior and activities. Hence, for some of the most prioritized but challenging categories, NPs are advised to provide benchmark scores indicating improvements of up to half a score, for example, from a self-assessment score 1 to a benchmark score 1.5, or a self-asssessment score 2 to a benchmark score 2.5.

**TIMELINE FOR THE 2021 NP SELF-ASSESSMENT**

**Launch of the self-assessment process: initiated by 12 March 2021, at the latest**

- NP CoEC advisors should share the self-assessment questionnaire among the NP membership (including local WG coordinators, National Facilitator) and NP Secretariat

**Self-assessment process: concluded by 19 March 2021**

- Respondees have received the CoEC advisor communication regarding their participation in the NP self-assessment; the questionnaire shared with them is anonymous and gives the possibility to provide their input regarding the compliance of the NP with ethical standards.

**Reporting: concluded by 22 March 2021 EOB**

**-** The CoEC advisor will receive all the questionnaires filled in the NP membership; based on the received answers, s/he will fill in the form below which will serve as „reporting“. This form only should be submitted to the EaP CSF Statutory Affairs Manager (admin@eap-csf.eu) and the Compliance Committee (complaints@eap-csf.eu).

**[Country] National Platform SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM**

*(to be filled in by the CoEC advisor based on the answers received from the NP membership)*

**Name of National Platform involved in the self-assessment:**

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Name of the NP Code of Ethical Conduct advisor**

..........................................................................................................................................

**Period of final self-assessment completion:**

dd/mm/2021 – dd/mm/2021

**Link to the self-assessment form filled in by NP membership:**

..........................................................................................................................................

**SELF-ASSESSMENT PART 1: GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CODE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT AWARENESS LEVELS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Question** | **Survey options**  *Under each option, the CoEC advisor will indicate the number of responders who chose each option:*  *i.e. Yes: 32 || No: 2* | | | | **Comments by the CoEC Advisor**  *This column will be filled in by the CoEC advisor based on the collected self-assessment answers* |
| 1. | Have you consulted the CoEC during the last 1 year? | Yes | | No | |  |
| 1.1 | If you answered „yes“, please explain „why“. |  | | | |  |
| 2. | Are you aware of the existence of the Code of Ethical Conduct Advisor(s) within your NP? | Yes | | No | |  |
| 2.1 | If you answered „yes“ at the previous question, how would you assess your level of understanding of the responsibilities of the CoEC advisor? | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good |  |
| 3. | Throughout the past year have you been in a situation that required the involvement of the CoEC advisor? | Yes | | No | |  |
| 4. | Do you believe that discussing ethical matters at the NP level is important? | Yes | | No | |  |
| 5. | How would you assess the importance of the CoEC self-assessment exercise? | Not important | Somehow important | Important | Very important |  |

**SELF-ASSESSMENT PART 2: FUNDAMENTAL VALUES AND PRINCIPLES**

Please respond to ALL questions. If a category or sub-category question is not relevant or applicable to your NP mark it as 'N/A' (Not Applicable). In cases where there is insufficient information to respond to a statement, mark it as 'IIA' (Insufficient Information Available). Do not leave any question blank.

Level of compliance scores:

* **Score 1:** Unsatisfactory level of compliance. The NP does not demonstrate the basic requirements of the CoEC standard. Needs serious improvement, if this is feasible in the specific country context.
* **Score 2:** The NP demonstrates a partial level of compliance, but needs improvement.
* **Score 3:** The NP demonstrates full compliance with the CoEC.
* **NA:** Not applicable.
* **IIA:** Insufficient infromation available.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE SCORES**  *Under each option, the CoEC advisor will indicate the number of responders who chose each option:*  *i.e. Score 1: 12; Score 1,5: 2;* | | | | | | | | **Comments reflecting on the received answers**  *This column will be filled in by the CoEC advisor based on the collected self-assessment answers* |
| **1** | 1.5 | **2** | 2.5 | **3** | **NA** | **IIA** | |
| * 1. **FUNDAMENTAL VALUES** | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1.1 | **The application of human rights (equality, diversity, inclusion).** The NP is fully guided by human rights in its internal functioning. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.2 | **Respect for the dignity of individuals.** The NP's leadership and members fully respect the dignity of fellow members and external actors. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.3 | **Practice of transparency.** The NP's leadership and members ensure the free flow of relevant information internally and with other Forum bodies. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.4 | **Practice of good governance.** The NP fully follows the procedures described in the Forum's Statute and internal NP rules and regulations. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.5 | **Promotion of diversity and inclusiveness.** The NP fully promotes diversity in its membership and activities (i.e. gender, ethnicity, social background, disability and other factors). | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.6 | **Promotion of gender equality.** The NP makes a conscious effort to ensure a balance of women and men in its leadership and programs. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.7 | **Promotion of democratic ownership and participation.** The NP's members own their decision-making processes and activities. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.8 | **Promotion of environmental sustainability.**  The NP makes a conscious effort to promote environmental sustainability in its activities. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.9 | **Opposition to corruption and other illegalities.** The NP is vigilant in preventing and detecting all forms iif corruption and other impropieties. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| * 1. **FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES** | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1.2.1 | **Independence.** NP bodies and members make decisions independently from government agencies, religion and ideology. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1.2.1 | **Non-profit principles.** NP members represent CSOs that are bona fide not-for-profit, independent and voluntary entities. | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **2. ETHICAL CONDUCT WITHIN THE FORUM** | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 2.1 | **Respect** | | | | | | | | |  | |
| a. | NP members behave respectufully towards each other within the NP and with external stakeholders. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| b. | NP as a whole and its members do not make disparaging remarks based on nationality, ethnicity, gender, culture and beliefs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| c. | NP members fully respect diversity of thinking and other differences among members. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 2.2 | **Conflicts of interest.** The principle of the avoidance of the conflict of interst by the NP bodies and its members is practises and enforced | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **3. EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 3.1 | **Political activity.** | | | | | | | | |  | |
| a. | NP members represent CSOs that are not affiliated with a political party or coaltion. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| b. | None of the NP's individual members are affiliated with any political party/coalition in an official position. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| c. | The NP is explicitly independent of party politics when undertaking its activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 3.2 | **Financial activities and solicitations.** | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | a. | **Fundraising principles.** The NP's fundraising practices focus solely on the Forum's/NP's mission, without improper motive, inappropriate conduct or personal benefit. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  | b. | **Grant commitment.** The NP fully honors approved grants in an ethical and legal manner. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **REPORTING MISCONDUCT** | | **Circle the appropriate response**  *Under each option, the CoEC advisor will indicate the number of responders who chose each option:*  *i.e. No: 12 || Yes: 1 || Partly: 2* | | | |
| **4.1** | Have you witnessed or been a victim of any form of ethical misconduct during the past 12 months? | No | Yes |  | IIA[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| **4.2** | Was the misconduct reported (whether to the CSF Compliance Committee, National Platform board, NP compliance committee, CSF Steering Committee or Brussels-based Secretariat?) | No | Yes |  | IIA |
| **4.3** | Was the reporting taken seriously? | No | Yes | Partly | IIA |
| **4.4** | Was the misconduct dealt with satisfactorily? | No | Yes | Partly | IIA |

**Comments on Section 4: Reporting misconduct**

*This section will be filled in by the CoEC advisor based on the answers received from the NP membership – including local WG Coordinators, National Facilitator – and NP Secretariat.*

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

1. **Prioritizing issues which need attentionover the next 12 months**

*This section will be filled in by the CoEC advisor based on the answers received from the NP membership – including local WG Coordinators, National Facilitator – and NP Secretariat.*

Based on the received answers, please fill in the table below and list at least 3 CoEC issues that should be prioritized for improvement over the next 12 months. The issues must be ones whose level of compliance can realistically be improved and measured over this period of time by about half a score to 1 full score.

For example, if an issue scored 1 in the current self-assessment, your NP may want to reach 1.5 (partial improvement) by the next annual self-assessment or 2 (significant improvement), if this is manageable. Being realistic about what your NP can achieve over the next 12 months will make it more likely that the benchmark can be achieved.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question number** | **Summary of issue** | **Steps to be taken to improve compliance** | **Current score** | **Benchmark score** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. IIA – Insufficient Information Available [↑](#footnote-ref-1)