

European NGO confederation
for relief and development

CONCORD

Confédération européenne des ONG
d'urgence et de développement

**The European Commission
Deconcentration process:
Summary of findings of the
2nd Monitoring report**

April 2007

CONTENT:

- **Summary of the findings**
- **Recommendations for action**
- **Annexes:**
 - I. **Region by category report**
 - II. **Comparison of reported cases to date by issue**
 - III. **Delegations and number of cases**
 - IV. **Cases by Member State**

**MAKING EUROPE WORK
FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

2nd Monitoring report of EC Deconcentration

Summary of findings

April 2007

Introduction

Context: The deconcentration of contract management functions from the European Commission in Brussels to delegations, completed at the end of 2004, carried with it enormous implications for the work of CSOs and their partners in developing countries. The CONCORD FDR¹ group recognised that deconcentration offered many opportunities for CSOs: closer contact with delegations and southern CSOs could engender meaningful interaction on development issues; greater possibilities for day to day contact could lead to quicker responses on administrative and management issues and problem resolution. Nevertheless, such a major change involving so many delegations carried with it the risk of differences in interpretation of legal and financial regulations, and differing and conflicting management practices. There was a fear that these changes might lead to unequal treatment of northern-based CSOs and their southern partners. The challenge of deconcentration to over 100 delegations, working in different contexts, in some instances with high staff turnover, should not be minimised. It is not easy to interpret complex legal texts and contractual requirements and CSOs were concerned that there were no clear lines of responsibility for arbitrating disagreements over interpretation of rules with delegations.

Objectives: Thus in August 2005, the CONCORD FDR group decided to monitor the deconcentration of EC contract management via the analysis of concrete examples of experience from its members and use its findings to work with the EC to identify weaknesses where they existed and to foster good management practices in a committed and sustainable way. More specifically, the monitoring exercise would serve to help improve the quality of the work of CSOs and delegations. By identifying issues that regularly cause problems between CSOs and delegations, general solutions could be proposed that would improve good practice and improve relations between delegations and CSOs. The exercise was not intended to name and shame individual delegations and thus create tensions between them and the CSOs concerned, nor was it to take up the individual management problems of CSOs or to attempt to identify individuals involved either at delegation, Brussels or CSO level as this was deemed counter-productive to future good relationships. It was felt that such an approach would not be necessary if the structures and proposals that this report recommends (see below) are implemented.

Methodology: A first monitoring report covering examples from 2004/05 was produced in November 2005. Building on the first exercise, monitoring continued during the whole year 2006. At the date of this second report a total number of 98 new depositions have been collected and analysed since February 2006, an increase of 45% on 2005. The FDR decided at the outset, and this decision has been reiterated recently, that depositions would remain anonymous and that specific delegations would not be linked to cases. Therefore a general list of delegations concerned is given at the start of each category. As already mentioned, the reports intend to propose general solutions to recurring problems, relevant to delegations, CSOs and Brussels. It will not flag up individual cases and risk disturbing on-going and sometimes delicate discussions on a bilateral level between CSOs and delegations.

Findings: Altogether, 98 depositions were made for the second monitoring exercise (February-December 2006). 37 CSOs from 10 different European Member states have made contributions. Of these, 67 give details of negative experiences, including cases of work in progress where negotiations were still on going at the time of reporting. Denmark, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands and the UK all had negative experiences above the overall average of 68%. The analysis will concentrate on those issues that complicate the project work of CSOs in the field. Some 32% of the cases in 2006 were positive experiences compared to 17% in 2005. Of the 31 cases, however, six cases qualified their experience by adding information about on-going problems.

¹ FDR: working group of CONCORD working on Funding for Relief and Development

Depositions submitted by European platform

Countries	To end of 2005	Cases for 2006	Number of CSOs	Positive experience	Negative experience	Percentage negative
Austria	4	5	1	3	2	40
Belgium	2	10	7	5	5	50
Denmark	0	8	2	2	6	75
Finland	3	0	0			
France	11	14	2	1	13	93
Germany	24	17	9	8	9	53
Ireland	4	3	1	2	1	33
Italy	7	0	0			
Luxembourg	0	1	1	0	1	100
Netherlands	5	13	3	4	9	69
Sweden	0	1	1	0	1	100
UK	28	26	10	6	20	77
Total	88	98	37	31	67	68%

This year the data is broken down by region: ACP (50%); Asia (22%), Eastern Europe and Central Asia (4%), Latin America (16%), Mediterranean and Middle East (2%), West Balkans (2%) and a miscellaneous category (4%)². The cases are drawn from a wide range of budget lines covering a long time period. In 2004/05 52 delegations were mentioned in depositions. In 2006, 50 delegations were recorded; of which 18 were new delegations while 20 delegations from the previous year were not cited. The register shows that some 72 of the 120 delegations are included in the database since the beginning of the monitoring exercises.

Unfortunately little can be learned from the regional analysis. The ACP and Asia delegations more or less reflected the same pattern of issues as each other and the average trend, though ACP had twice as many finance cases compared to Asia. In Latin America half of the cases involved communications issues and 35% were financial, although care must be taken in interpreting from such a small base. Grouping the other cases, the main issue was the CFP, which was more than twice the average distribution. It may reflect the influence of headquarters and regional offices in supporting their field teams secure a grant. Again caution is urged working with such small numbers.

Comparison of reported cases to date and the distribution by category and issue

		Number of cases			Positive/negative for 2006		
Category	Issue	Cases to end 2005	2006	Total	Positive	Negative	
Calls for proposals							
	Predictability (Eligibility)	0	1	1	0	1	
	Information	1	3	4	0	3	
	Guidelines (Waiting)	0	3	3	0	3	
	Guidelines (Procedural)	0	5	5	0	5	
	Subtotal	1	12	13	0	12	
Process							
	Eligibility	1	1	2	0	1	
	Delays	6	3	9	0	3	
	Subtotal	7	4	11	0	4	
Financial							
	Contract stipulations	12	10	22	2	8	
	Reporting requirements	14	7	21	1	7	

² This category reflects views of Head or Regional Offices.

	Exchange rates	9	3	12	0	2	
	Audit rules	14	5	19	0	5	
	Other (Procurement)	4	1	5	1	0	
	Subtotal	54	26	80	4	22	
Management				0			
	Process Time	0	2	2	1	1	
	Approval time for reports	9	7	16	1	6	
	Amendment requests	8	5	13	0	5	
	Payment delays	1	1	1	0	1	
	Other (Regulation clarification)	5	5	10	1	4	
	Subtotal	24	20	44	3	17	
Communications				0			
	Identification of EC delegation	1	0	1	0	0	
	Respecting contract	1	8	9	2	6	
	Shared lessons	2	5	7	4	1	
	EC Visits	4	1	5	0	1	
	Positive contact with delegation staff	6	18	24	18	0	
	Negative experience of delegation staff	0	4	4	0	4	
	Subtotal	14	36	50	24	12	
	Total	98	98	196	31	67	

Comparing the categories of depositions between this exercise and the last one, the cases on Calls for Proposals increased considerably, from 1 to 12. Process cases (of applications to approval) fell from 7 to 4. The Financial cases fell by half from 54 to 26 although as mentioned below financial issues such as bank accounts, exchange rates etc are often included as minor points in other depositions. Management cases remained almost the same at 20. The largest change was in the Communications category, (a leap from 14 cases to 36). This includes 18 positive cases, which is a large increase on the previous year.

Key Issues from the Deconcentration monitoring exercises with specific examples.

For clarity, examples have been grouped together under broad headings. Many depositions contain multiple aspects of a situation that could fit under several headings.

1. Calls for Proposals

Delegations: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Serbia, Sudan, Vietnam, Zambia.

- Calls for proposals only published locally when should have been open to all
- Cancellation of tender for inadequate reasons, delegation citing lack of administrative systems in place.
- Insufficient or contradictory information in call documents – lack of clear information on deadlines and information to be provided by applicants. Different documents gave contradictory information.
- Eligibility rules for applicants and partners unclear in call document
- Short notice for call – in one instance 14 days for submission of an expression of interest and only 23 days for a full proposal.
- Need for standardization of approval systems. Some delegations let CSOs know that they have given approval for Co-financing projects. This can lead to raised hopes and subsequent disappointment when Brussels turns down projects.

- Bids rejected for unfair reasons. Applicants rejected because they had not signed a partnership agreement even though the application format did not specify this (TACIS call). Information in call documents was ambiguous and delegation unwilling to reconsider.
- Flawed decision making processes and stated deadlines for response to applicants not respected. A CSO was first rejected, and then told they were on a reserve list and then waited many months to hear. In this situation, it is difficult to know whether to seek other funds or not and the project on the ground suffers.

2. Process: questions of eligibility and delays

Delegations: India, Jerusalem, Philippines, and Thailand/Myanmar.

- **Long delays in contract approval:** Cases where delegations very slow to conclude provisionally agreed contracts. No named person in a delegation with whom the CSO could communicate.
- **Excessive information demands for provisionally approved programmes:** More than one delegation has been cited as demanding the answers to several pages of questions to be incorporated into an approved project with very little time. In one case a delegation requested a revised approved project proposal from a CSO for a second round of approval. Imposition of demands for extra documentation with little notice and lack of understanding by delegation of difficulties of getting documentation.
- **Delays also due to last minute imposition of budget revisions.** After a decision-making process lasting over a year, a delegation expected a CSO to make budget modifications within one week or risk losing the contract. There was little scope for negotiation. Another delegation imposed budget cuts on a new project without negotiation causing distortion to an action.

3. Financial

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Cuba, DRC, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Sudan, Peru, Uganda.

- **EC officials incorrectly interpreting Standard Contract rules and imposing new rules on old contracts:**
 - One delegation initially imposed a 10% variation rule on a contract governed by the SC 2003 rules of 15%. Eventually, they climbed down but arbitrarily refused to allow a 15% variation on personnel costs. They also refused to allow transfers between sub-budget lines on personnel.
 - Another delegation has applied new rules to a contract dated 1999 by holding back 10% of the value of the contract until final report even though these rules did not apply at the time and there was no agreed payment schedule for this.
 - There continues to be confusion over bank accounts – with delegations imposing old rules or new contracts or vice versa.
 - One CSO was requested to pay back interest earned on the EC contribution to a contract immediately.
 - A delegation did not respect the percentage contribution stated in the contract when calculating the transfer of the balance of the contract but used a lower percentage causing the CSO to lose money.
 - Imposition of specific software re accounting. CSOs are being asked to keep two parallel sets of accounts.
- **Reporting requirements:** There is more than one case of delegations imposing new report formats on older contracts, or requesting more frequent reports and imposing their own formats.
- **Exchange rates – EC rules can cause CSOs to lose money.** Although the new Standard Contract is clearer in its use of exchange rates there continues to be problems and confusion for projects governed by older contracts especially the 2000 version. For example, one delegation arbitrarily interpreted the rule and refused to use the exchange rate for the month in which the request for payment was made. The use of the monthly InforEuro rate for conversion of local expenditure under the SC 2003 has caused currency losses in real terms for a project reporting in USD. Exchange rate problems are also mentioned by another CSO in the context of trying to explain to local partners why they appear not to have spent all their funds received according to the report using official exchange rates, even though they have spent the amount received in the bank, or vice versa.

- **Auditing problems:** This is a big category of problems and could also fall under the category of new rules being imposed on older contracts. More than one delegation has imposed specific audits on a project governed by the 2000 Standard Contract where the audit option stated in the contract was for a general audit.
 - One delegation has also insisted on a specific project audit in the third year of a project and withheld payment of funds, even though the contract states that the agency audit option was agreed. After lengthy discussion, it did eventually agree to a budget reallocation to pay for the audit.
 - A delegation issued detailed guidelines for a full audit report beyond the requirements of Annex VI for a contract governed by the SC Version 2003.
 - There have also been problems concerning the language of the audit, for example demands for audits to be translated into a language other than that of the contract.
 - One delegation reprimanded a CSO for not providing a specific audit of the administration costs of a project even though this is a fixed percentage of costs and does not have to be justified.
 - One CSO was informed that an audit was not necessary for the final report. Subsequently the delegation reinstated the process and demanded a report in a very short space of time.
- **Service Fees:** It is a major question regarding whether the EU should recover fees charged for services provided to beneficiaries through activities funded by the EU. Different delegations have reacted in different ways to this, and although **Brussels** was asked for clarification, the issue has still not been resolved after almost 12 months. In the meantime, payments have been frozen by several of the delegations involved. This is an example of no clear decision being taken or clear and consistent direction given to either the CSO concerned or the delegations involved.
- **Procurement:** the only case under this category is a positive example of a delegation being flexible with the granting of derogations to the contract.

4. Contract Management

Angola, Bosnia/Herzegovina, China, DRC, Ethiopia, Jerusalem, India, Ivory Coast, Nepal, Nicaragua/Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Russia, Sierra Leone, Sudan.

- **Process time:** There are several cases of delegations being very slow to respond to requests for advice and information thus delaying decisions necessary for project implementation.
- **Approval time for reports:** There are several examples of long delays in processing and approval of reports. For example, one delegation lost final reports twice. Another took more than one year to respond, and then did so with a query. Another frustration is the lack of feedback on reports, so that CSOs do not know if they have been approved or not. Delegations can sometimes be unfair, for example accusing a CSO of being late with a report when the delay is due to the delegation. The slow approval of reports is one of the major problems for CSOs, some of whom experience severe cash flow difficulties. The imposition of more frequent reports e.g. monthly can also lead to delays in approval.
- **Slow response time to requests for amendment and clarification and the subsequent knock on effect:** This is a particular problem when it involves requests for amendment of contracts. A slow response can mean that CSOs either reach the deadline for reporting without having received clarification or worse the end of the contract.
- **Payment delays:** Although only one case is reported here, payment delays are an integral part of the problems reports on approval time for reports and amendments. In this case, payment was delayed after the report was approved causing the NGO to almost cease activities.
- **Other:**
 - **Additional and unfair demands:** An evaluation, not agreed in the contract was imposed on a CSO at short notice.
 - **Excessive micro management:** One delegation has been unwilling to accept the rules of the SC 2000 with regard to variations of expenditure to budget to the extent that it would not allow any changes in lines or items including to Unit Rates. This kind of rigidity on items of details and demand for approval of very minor items makes it difficult to manage a contract. For example, one has insisted on CSOs using special accounting software.

- **Lack of clear guidelines** of responsibility for management of project between delegation and implementing CSO.

5. Communications and relation management

24 of the 36 examples in this category give positive accounts of experiences of interaction with delegations. These are covered together below with the positive examples from other categories. Other examples cover: Brazil, India, Cameroon, Thailand Myanmar, Ivory Coast, Cambodia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Nicaragua.

The negative issues covered here include:

- **Respecting contracts:** There is still a tendency for delegations to develop their own rules and interpretations, and there are perceived to be poor communications between delegations and Brussels on these matters.
- **Shared lesson learning and EC visits:** While most examples here are positive there are some concerns regarding cursory evaluations and lack of feedback from monitoring visits that do not offer any lesson learning. Local consultants hired for an EC monitoring visit to one project received very poor briefing on the projects they had to visit and the consultants themselves felt frustrated that there was little interest paid to their report by the delegation.
- **Lack of trained staff.** In one case, staff in the same delegation with differing opinions on interpretation of rules.

Positive experiences

Delegations with 1 or more recommendations in 2006: Tanzania (4); Ethiopia (3); Rwanda (2); Zimbabwe (2), Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, DRC, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Papua New Guinea, Thailand.

Delegations with positive recommendations in both reports: Tanzania, Ethiopia, Thailand, India.

NB: This report recognises this is not an exclusive list of delegations who provide effective support and guidance, there are certainly others. However, we can only list those who have been mentioned by our respondents.

There are 31 cases of positive experiences. CSOs appreciate working with delegations that can provide efficient and effective support and that are interested in the project and its results. There are several examples of CSOs building good relationships with delegations, especially with those that are quick, flexible and fair in managing the rules and regulations and that are interested in the projects. Delegations that offer quick turn around, provide time to explain complex rules and regulations and treat requests fairly enable CSO to manage their projects more successfully. In particular, the rapid processing of reports and release of transfers is very much appreciated by CSOs. Delegations are also in a situation where they can bring CSOs together, as well as offering advice on networking. Delegations that are able to provide efficient and effective support with regard to rules and regulations are appreciated by CSOs as it helps them provide a better service for their partners. Some delegations offer training or coaching on procurement. e.g. *untying of Aid, rules of origin and nationality*. This assists CSOs to understand the rules and their purpose, thus allowing efficient and smooth procurement and not allowing it to become a very thorny issue as it is elsewhere.

Examples of good practice:

- **Acknowledgement of NGO added value:** The Tanzania and India delegations have written letters of congratulation to CSOs for the quality of their projects.
- **Communications and networking:** The Tanzania and Bosnia & Herzegovina delegations have hosted meetings that give opportunities for NGOs to network between themselves and the delegation.
- **Training and capacity building:** The delegations in Zimbabwe, Burundi and Tanzania have provided explanations and a workshop (Zimbabwe) on procurement issues and regulations.
- **Quick turnaround of reports and speedy payments:** This is probably the most valuable to CSOs, and delegations in Liberia, Nigeria, DRC and the Solomon Islands are specifically mentioned for their efficiency in this respect.

Analysis of key Issues

1. Calls for Proposals

Delegations have very different ways of issuing calls for proposals. This has resulted in cancellation, Terms of Reference being insufficient and contradictory and variable formats and guidelines. There were two cases where the delegation interpreted the rules of the standard application form requirement in an ambiguous way (regarding who signs partnership agreements). Altogether, there were 12 cases of dissatisfaction over the fairness, lack of clarity and particularly over the time taken to decide. The post approval phase often results in excessive demands for further information and budget modification before contract conclusion.

2. Delays and Disruptions

There is range of approximately 60 budget lines with their own practices and rules, which delegations may have to administer. Standard Contract regulations were introduced in 2000, a second version came out in 2003 and the most recent set came out in August 2006. The numbers of budget lines and the changing regulations have produced a range of challenging issues. This is reflected in the number of complaints about delays and disruptions to work. The key one is late payments, which have a knock on effect as funds begin to dry up and work slows down - unless the CSO can pre-finance. It also results in higher administrative costs, which cannot always be recouped from the project budget. Delegations also hold back funds over administrative issues, such as procurements, staff conditions, etc. A lot of time and energy is wasted and delays of more than three months are becoming more common. A quarter of all cases involved delays. CSOs feel that delegations are antagonistic to the very projects they have approved, being imperious in their demands. One example where the CSO was given little time to prepare and provide documentation, the delegation threatened that the next tranche of funds would lapse if they did not have sufficient time to approve requests. In the event it is the communities and CSO partners that suffer from these random bureaucratic decisions.

3. Communication and relation management

Invariably during such an ambitious programme of deconcentration tensions will occur as vacuums are filled. There are issues between Brussels and delegations that have produced tensions that have made the situation more awkward for CSOs. Certainly there are existing tensions between delegations and the CSOs and partners. To some extent these can be alleviated through more effective communications. A key issue is the nature of evaluations which happen often at short notice with poorly briefed consultants who themselves are fighting for time and access to people. The resulting debriefings are cursory so the evaluation becomes a formality that offers little learning. There are several examples where the CSO feels that they are expected to execute 'orders' rather than be involved in a consultative process. There is a feeling that some delegations do not understand the consequences of their actions; for example drawn out disputes over interpretation of rules seriously threaten the implementation of the project and give the impression that they are unaware of how much they are acting against, rather than for, the project.

4. Financial

Whereas financial issues have fallen by 50% since the 2005 exercise, they often appear as additional minor points in the case notes. Exchange rates, budget revisions, and delayed transfers still create uneasiness and even suspicion. CSO fears of financial micro-management by EC Finance offices are a cause of concern. There has also been a spate of unannounced audits that were not in the contract and EC de-selection of auditors. Service fees have also become an issue especially in cost recovery elements of projects, which threatens long term sustainability. This is a very important issue: if the communities are in part paying for the services of the project why the delegation does just assume that this money belongs to them?

Budget Amendments: There are two issues: the nature of the modification and the time taken to approve the amendment. In addition there is disagreement as to who has the right to amend. Again there are examples of delegation staff imposing their own rules and interpretations on the Standard Contract e.g. regarding variation percentages.

5. Management

a). New demands and revisions beyond requirements of Standard Contract: There are many examples of delegations imposing new contract rules on older contracts. This creates a great sense of injustice among CSOs. The method that some delegations use: no prior warning, inopportune times and sometimes adopting an imperious attitude often mean the imposition of excessive and unreasonable demands and protracted negotiations. The method creates unnecessary antagonism as work is abruptly reorganised. There are also examples of delegation staff imposing their own rules in addition to the contractual obligations of the CSO. See points below.

b). Excessive reporting demands: Examples of the imposition of additional reporting formats and frequencies have increased considerably. 10% of issues mentioned reports. This requires extra resources and results in disruption of work. In one instance, a delegation imposed extra demands for information, and then threatened to withhold funds if the CSO did not show more urgency.

c). Other management (i.e. non financial): There is still concern over slow response time regarding other management (i.e. non financial) decisions and the subsequent knock on effect on the project. Some delegations still appear to be challenged by managing projects governed by different versions of the standard contract. It would appear that some delegation staff still receive little training and briefing. There are still problems resulting from high turnover of staff. There appears to be a culture of holding back funds re disputes over administration and procurement. Also there has been an increase in the demand for CSO personnel contracts and timesheets, while this is legitimate in new contracts, it is an excessive demand on scarce human resources for older contracts which did not have to plan for this. Another issue arising from the deconcentration process is the tendency by some delegation staff to micro-manage projects. This has led to excessive demands for information and interference in project management beyond the normal demands of the contract.

6. Delegations are developing their own rules

As part of an understandable reaction to the hiatus of deconcentration, delegations have to improvise. This is producing inconsistency not just between Brussels and the delegation, between delegations but also within delegations. There is a need for delegations to apply rules and regulations within a framework agreed by Brussels. Advice from Brussels is not always adhered to by the delegation.

Conclusions

Deconcentration is now a fact of life for CSOs. However, despite some positive experiences, this monitoring exercise has seen that many CSOs still practice extreme caution in their dealings with delegations, fearful that challenges to what they see as arbitrary and unfair demands may cause them delays and withholding of funds or jeopardize other project applications. There continues to be a feeling that the relationship between delegations and CSOs is not one of equal partners. A balance needs to be established between the need for the delegation to be confident in their stewardship of the project whilst leaving sufficient space for the CSOs and their partners to deliver the project. We hope therefore, that the recommendations for further action are viewed in the positive light in which they are made, with the ultimate aim of enabling the implementation of effective and sustainable development projects.

Recommendations

- 1. A structured dialogue to be instigated between the EC and CSOs:**
A reprise of one of the recommendations of the Palermo seminar, we recommend that a system of structure dialogue between all parties involved in contract management be set up. Effective dialogue already exists between CONCORD and EuropeAid at the level of Brussels and this model could be rolled out at local and regional level between delegations and CSO representatives. This will enable effective lines of communication to be developed, for discussion of issues of common interest on a regular basis. Such a dialogue will help to foresee and forestall certain management problems from developing. At the local level, it would enable delegation staff and CSOs to understand each other's viewpoint.
- 2. A Manual for all users of the Standard Contract.**
This manual would be available to both EC staff and CSOs. It could contain explanations and amplification of rules and regulations and practical guidance on contract management. It would enable the revision of unclear or illogical regulations. Written guidance would solve many problems of differing interpretations of rules, allow a standardization of approach across delegations, enable faster decision- making and ultimately more timely project implementation. CONCORD would be happy to provide a constructive input to this type of work.
- 3. The establishment of clear lines of authority for the arbitration of disagreements and final decision-making over interpretation of rules.**
There are two aspects to this recommendation. When the resolution of a disagreement over contract management issues cannot be reached at delegation level, a **clear system of appeal** at the level of Brussels should be devised. This would help avoid animosity building between all parties and ensure clear and rapid decision-making. Secondly we recommend that an **Ombudsman role** be considered, i.e. someone who can investigate problems and be responsible for the final decision on individual cases.
- 4. Regular and on-going training provided on the Standard Contract and its management at delegation level.**
We recognise that much good work has already been carried out in this respect, but would like to reiterate that given the high turnover of staff in some delegations, training should continue on a regular basis. Following the experience already noted in some delegations, of training sessions on the interpretation of rules and regulations for both delegation staff and CSOs, we recommend that this good practice be replicated as widely as possible in other delegations.

CONCORD,
FDR Subgroup for EC De-concentration monitoring,
April 2007

ANNEXES

CONTENT:

Annexe I	Region by category report
Annexe II	Comparison of reported cases to date by issue
Annexe III	Delegations and number of cases
Annexe IV	Cases by Member State

Region by Category Report

Region	Total	CFPs ³	Process	Finance	Management	Communications	Total	%
ACP	49	4	1	16	7	21	49	50
Asia	21	3	2	3	5	8	21	22
EE&CA	4	3			1		4	4
LA	15			6	3	6	15	16
MED&ME	2		1		1	0	2	2
WB	2	1			1		2	2
Misc	5	1		1	2	1	5	4
Total	98	12	4	26	20	36	98	100

³ CFPs: Calls for proposal

Comparison of reported cases to date and the distribution by category and issue

Category	Issue	Number of cases				% Category		% Issue	
		2004	2005	2006	Total	2004 / 5	2006	2004 / 5	2006
Calls for proposals						1	12		
	Predictability (Eligibility)	0	0	1	1			0	1
	Information	1	0	3	4			1	3
	Guidelines (Waiting)	0	0	3	3			0	3
	Guidelines (Procedural)	0	0	5	5			0	5
Process						7	4		
	Eligibility	1	0	1	2			1	1
	Delays	0	6	3	9			6	3
Financial						53	26		
	Contract stipulations	6	6	10	22			12	10
	Reporting requirements	5	9	7	21			15	7
	Exchange rates	2	7	3	12			9	3
	Audit rules	7	7	5	19			15	5
	Other (Procurement)	2	2	1	5			4	1
Management						23	20		
	Process Time	0	0	2	2			0	2
	Approval time for reports	6	3	7	16			9	7
	Amendment requests	4	4	5	13			8	5
	Payment delays	1	0	1	1			1	1
	Other (Regulation clarification)	0	5	5	10			5	5
Communications						14	36		
	Identification of EC delegation	0	1	0	1			1	0
	Respecting contract	0	1	8	9			1	8
	Shared lessons	1	1	5	7			2	5
	EC Visits	3	1	1	5			4	1
	Positive experience of delegation staff	2	4	18	24			6	18
	Negative experience of delegation staff			4	6			0	4
	Total	41	57	98	196	98	98	100	100

Delegations and number of cases

Country Delegations	Number of cases to end 2005	Number of Cases 2006	Total to 30/10/06	Positive cases	Country Delegations	Number of cases to end 2005	Number of cases 2006	Total to 30/10/06	Positive cases
Afghanistan		1	1		Madagascar		2	2	
Angola		1	1		Malawi	3	1	4	1
Argentina	2		2		Mexico	1	1	2	1
Armenia	1		1		Mozambique	4		4	
Bangladesh	1	5	6	2	Myanmar	1	1	2	
Bolivia	1		1		Namibia	2	1	3	
Bosnia & Herz		1	1	1	Nepal	2	1	3	
Brazil	2	1	3		Nicaragua	3	2	6	
Burkina Faso	1	1	2	1	Nigeria		1	1	1
Burundi		1	1		Palestine	1	0	1	
Cambodia	4	2	6	1	Pakistan	2	0	2	
Cameroon		1	1		Papua New Guinea		1	1	1
Chile		1	1	1	Peru	2	2	4	1
China	3	2	5		Philippines	1	1	2	
Colombia	1	1	2		Regional/LA		1	1	
Cuba		1	1		Russia	1	1	2	
Dominican R.	1		1		Rwanda	1	3	4	2
DRC	2	3	5	1	Senegal		1	1	1
East Timor	1		1		Serbia		1	1	
Ecuador	2	1	3		Sierra Leone		2	2	
Egypt	1		1		Solomon Is		1	1	1
Ethiopia	2	6	8	3	Somaliland	1	0	1	
Georgia	1		1		South Africa		1	1	1
Guatemala	1	3	4	1	Sri Lanka	3	0	3	
Guinea Bissau	1	1	2		Sudan	2	6	8	
Haiti	6	1	7		Syria	1	0	1	
India	1	4	5	1	Tajikistan	3	0	3	
Indonesia	2	1	3	1	Tanzania	2	4	6	4
Ivory Coast		2	2		Thailand/Myanmar	1	4	5	1
Jerusalem		2	2		Uganda	2	2	4	
Kazakhstan	1	3	4		Uruguay	2	0	2	
Kenya	1	0	1		Uzbekistan	1	0	1	
Somalia	2		2		Vietnam	1	1	2	
Liberia		2	2	1	Yemen	1	0	1	
Lebanon		0	0		Yugoslavia	1	0	1	
Laos	2		2		Zambia	1	1	2	
					Zimbabwe		2	2	2
					Miscellaneous		6	6	
Sub total	43	48	91	14		46	50	96	17
Total	89	98	187		Total positive	31			

Cases by Member State

Depositions submitted by European platform in 2006

Countries	To end of 2005	Cases for 2006	Number of CSOs	Positive experience	Negative experience
Austria	4	5	1	3	2
Belgium	2	10	7	5	5
Denmark	0	8	2	2	6
Finland	3	0	0		
France	11	14	3	1	13
Germany	24	17	9	8	9
Ireland	4	3	1	2	1
Italy	7	0	0		
Luxembourg	0	1	1	0	1
Netherlands	5	13	3	4	9
Sweden	0	1	1	0	1
UK	28	26	11	7	19
Total	88	98	39	32	66