



**CASE**  
**(Civic Action for Security and Environment)**

**Small Grants Programme**

**GUIDELINES**

(DRAFT)

14 January 2009

## **List of Acronyms:**

CASE	Civic Action for Security and Environment
CBOs	Community-based Organizations
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
ENVSEC	Environment and Security Initiative
GEF	Global Environment Facility
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
OCEEA	Office of the Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PEIC	Public Environmental Information Centres
REC	Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe
SECTOR	Supporting Environmental Civil Society Organisations in South Eastern Europe
SGP	Small Grants Programme
UNDP	United National Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

## **Table of Contents**

1.	BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	5
1.1.	Launching of CASE.....	5
1.2.	Objectives and Target Outputs .....	6
1.3.	Target Beneficiaries .....	6
1.4.	Implementation Modality .....	6
1.5.	Purpose and Objective of the CASE Guidelines .....	7
2.	STRATEGIC BACKGROUND FOR CASE .....	8
2.1.	Strategic Outputs of OSCE .....	8
2.1.1	OSCE Strategy Document .....	8
2.1.2	OSCE Economic and Environmental Forums .....	8
2.1.3	Sixth Ministerial Conference on “Environment for Europe” .....	9
2.1.4	Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security .....	9
2.2.	UNECE Environmental Conventions.....	10
2.3.	OSCE-Supported Initiatives .....	11
2.3.1	ENVSEC Initiative .....	11
2.3.2	Aarhus Centres .....	11
3.	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	13
3.1.	OCEEA .....	13
3.2.	OCSE Field Operations .....	14
3.3.	National Focal Points .....	14
3.4.	National Screening Boards .....	15
3.4.1	Constituents of Boards.....	15
3.4.2	Roles and Responsibilities of Boards.....	16
3.5.	CASE Country Strategy .....	16
3.5.1	Formulation of CASE Country Strategy.....	16
3.5.2	Content of CASE Country Strategy .....	17
4.	FRAMEWORK FOR SMALL GRANTS.....	18
4.1.	Thematic Priorities for Small Grants .....	18
4.1.1	Possible Thematic Priorities .....	18
4.1.2	Framework for Thematic Priorities .....	19
4.1.3	Cross-cutting Themes .....	20
4.2.	Eligibility .....	21
4.2.1	CSOs Eligible for Application .....	21
4.2.2	Eligible Projects.....	22
4.3.	Provision of Small Grants to Projects.....	22
4.3.1	Guiding Principles in the Provision of Grants .....	23
4.3.2	Amount of Small Grants .....	23
5.	CASE PROJECT CYCLE .....	25
5.1.	CASE Project Cycle: Summary of Basic Steps .....	25
5.2.	Application for Small Grants .....	25
5.2.1	Call for Project Concepts .....	25
5.2.2	Preparation of Project Concepts .....	26
5.2.3	Evaluation of Project Concepts .....	27
5.3.	Preparation and Selection of Projects.....	28
5.3.1	Preparation of Project Proposals.....	28
5.3.2	Selection of Projects .....	29
5.4.	Implementation of Projects .....	30
5.4.1	Signature of the Memorandum of Agreement .....	30
5.4.2	Disbursement of Grants .....	31
5.4.3	Project Execution .....	31
5.5.	Project Reporting .....	32
5.5.1	Function and Importance of Project Reporting .....	32
5.5.2	Technical and Financial Reports.....	33

5.6.	Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.....	34
5.6.1	Project-Level M&E .....	34
5.6.2	Country-Level M&E .....	35
5.6.3	Corporate-Level M&E.....	35
6.	ATTACHMENTS.....	37
ATTACHMENT 1: CASE Communications Strategy.....		38
A1.1	Purpose of CASE Communications Strategy.....	38
A1.2	Target Groups.....	39
A1.3	Key Communication Principles .....	39
A1.4	Challenges and Bottlenecks .....	40
A1.5	Opportunities and Strengths .....	40
A1.6	Means .....	42
A1.7	Messages .....	43
A1.8	Outreach and Visibility .....	43
A1.9	Implementation Arrangements.....	44
A1.10	M&E of the Communications Strategy .....	45
A1.11	Funding of the Communications Strategy .....	46
A1.12	Other Considerations .....	47
A1.13	Communications Strategy Action Plan.....	48
ATTACHMENT 2: Capacity Building Framework.....		49
A2.1	Purpose of the Capacity Building Framework .....	49
A2.2	Output 1: Start-up of CASE.....	49
A2.2.1	CASE Introduction Meeting.....	49
A2.2.2	Capacity Building for National Screening Boards.....	50
A2.3	Output 2: Increased Public and Political Awareness.....	50
A2.3.1	Regional Campaign.....	50
A2.3.2	Country-Level Campaigns.....	50
A2.4	Output 3: Strengthening Capacities of CSOs.....	51
A2.4.1	Training Tool Kit.....	51
A2.4.2	Training Workshops .....	52
A2.5	Output 4: Supporting the Projects of CSOs .....	52
A2.5.1	Technical Assistance for Projects .....	52
A2.5.2	Capacity Building for Networking .....	53
A2.6	Needs/Capabilities Assessment .....	54
ATTACHMENT 3: Sustainability Framework .....		55
A3.1	Purpose of the Sustainability Framework.....	55
A3.2	Achieving Project and Programme Sustainability .....	55
A3.3	Need for a Strategic Framework .....	56
A3.4	Performance Appraisal .....	56
A3.5	Resource Mobilization.....	57

# 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

## 1.1. Launching of CASE

**Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)** is the world's largest security organization with 56 participating states from Europe, Central Asia and North America. Cooperation and security is at the centre of OSCE mandate. Its 19 field missions in South-Eastern Europe, Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia act as pre-eminent instruments for early warning, conflict prevention, conflict management and post conflict rehabilitation. OSCE deals with three dimensions of security, namely the politico-military, the economic and environmental, and the human dimension. Through these dimensions, it addresses a wide range of security-related concerns, including arms control, confidence and security-building measures, human rights, national minorities, democratization, policing strategies, counter-terrorism and economic and environmental activities.

As part of its comprehensive approach to security, environmental matters have always been part of the agenda of OSCE as a tool that can contribute to peace, prosperity and stability. Within the OSCE region, three different aspects of environment and security interactions are observed to be relevant to the specific conditions of countries undergoing economic and political transition. These are:

- *Security implications of environmental problems:* situations in which scarcity and degradation of natural resources or environmental hazards increase the risk of tensions and exacerbate external and internal security challenges.
- *Improving security through environmental cooperation:* cases in which environmental cooperation might alleviate existing tensions, and foster stability and mutual trust.
- *Environmental implications of security measures:* circumstances in which security policies and measures have significant environmental implications and require special attention from this perspective.

Through its involvement in the Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative covering the Central Asia, South Eastern Europe, the Southern Caucasus and Eastern Europe regions, OSCE has been addressing a variety of environmental problems which pose security risks to communities within and across national borders. OSCE has also taken various initiatives in the areas of hazardous waste management, management of transboundary waters, environmental governance and environmental public awareness.

OSCE, within the framework of its mandate, has a growing engagement with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in both operational and policy work that cuts across the three dimensions of security, namely the politico-military, the economic-environmental and the human. Issues related to “environment and security” offers a distinctive entry point for OSCE to establish a strategic, mainstreamed partnership with CSOs as well as to facilitate partnerships of CSOs with Governments, academia, business community and donors.

In this respect, OSCE has developed and launched **CASE – Civic Action for Security and Environment**, which has been designed as a small grants programme.

CASE will initially be implemented in the following four pilot countries, whose selection has been done on a demand-driven basis:

- Albania,
- Armenia,
- Azerbaijan, and
- Georgia.

## 1.2. Objectives and Target Outputs

The overall objective of CASE is to create an enabling environment for CSOs to be a strong partner primarily to the governments as well as to other stakeholders in collaboratively addressing environment and security challenges, particularly in a transboundary context.

This objective is intended to be achieved primarily through awareness programmes on the linkages between environment and security, capacity building of CSOs particularly on these linkages, and providing grants for projects that demonstrate such linkages.

In line with these basic means of attaining its overall objective, the target outputs of CASE are identified as follows:

- **Output 1:** Increased public and political awareness on the linkages between environment and security;
- **Output 2:** Strengthened technical and administrative capacity of CSOs in the field of environment and security; and
- **Output 3:** Financial and technical support to CSOs for projects that demonstrate environmental cooperation as a tool for conflict prevention and resolution at national, sub-regional and regional levels.

## 1.3. Target Beneficiaries

Primary target beneficiaries of CASE are intended to be the CSOs operating in Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. For the purposes of CASE, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are defined as non-state actors whose aims are neither to generate profits nor to seek governing power. They comprise the full range of formal and informal organizations within civil society, including but not limited to Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community-based Organizations (CBOs), academia, journalist associations, trade unions, and trade associations.

Besides local and national CSOs, the OSCE will also partner with the internationally recognized, professional CSOs in design and implementation of transboundary projects and training and capacity building activities.

## 1.4. Implementation Modality

CASE will be implemented at two levels: regional and country.

At the regional level, the primary focus will be on awareness-raising and capacity building activities, as well as on projects that require multi-country involvement. These are expected to be implemented mainly through partnership arrangements with the relevant regional/international organizations and professional CSOs that are active in respective fields.

At the country level, CASE will focus on the thematic issues that are to be identified in line with the national priorities in the area of environment and security, and through participatory processes that involve relevant government agencies and CSOs, as well as local authorities, academia and the private sector.

Partnership building will be one of the main features of CASE. While governments and CSOs in pilot countries will be its key partners, CASE is expected to develop relationships with donors, the United Nations agencies, International Financial Institutions, the European Commission and related institutions, the business community, and academia.

Integration of youth and gender concerns into "environment and security" initiatives and demonstrating and enhancing the role of youth and women in environmental cooperation and conflict prevention will be a priority cross-cutting theme that will be addressed by CASE.

## 1.5. Purpose and Objective of the CASE Guidelines

The CASE Project Document lays down that Technical and Administrative Instructions will be formulated by OCEEA in order to provide guidance for strategic and operational implementation of CASE at the regional and country levels. In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 1.5*), OCEEA has obtained the services of a Consultant to assist in the formulation of these Instructions.

These instructions will be instrumental for development of CASE Country Strategies and eligibility criteria, capacity building initiatives, monitoring and evaluation and resource mobilization, and provide basic information about the structure, implementation, and administration of CASE as well as the project cycle and funding disbursement.

In this context, the purpose of these Guidelines is to provide OCEEA with a draft framework for the implementation of CASE, comprising technical and administrative aspects, as well as operational procedures to facilitate their practical application at regional and national levels.<sup>1</sup>

These Guidelines have the following complementary Attachments:

- **Communications Strategy** (Attachment 1) is intended to establish and maintain clear and regular channels of communication with the broad spectrum of OSCE partners at all levels, including CSOs in pilot countries as well as other stakeholders towards attaining the goals and target outputs of the CASE Initiative.
- **Capacity Building Framework** (Attachment 2) is intended to provide a basis for consideration by OCEEA (and its country networks), with a view towards improving the operational aspects and contributing to the successful conduct of the capacity building activities planned under CASE, with particular reference to the Target Outputs delineated under “Results and Resources Outline for CASE” in the Project Document.
- **Sustainability Framework** (Attachment 3) is intended to provide a basis for consideration and discussion by OCEEA (and its country networks) for ensuring the sustainability of the CASE Initiative and its successful conduct in the subsequent phases, in the light of the evaluation of the first phase implementation of CASE.

---

<sup>1</sup> These Guidelines, prepared pursuant to the Terms of Reference drawn up by OCEEA, reflect the views and recommendations of the CASE Consultant, and are not intended whatsoever to be presented as a binding document for the CASE Initiative of OSCE.

## **2. STRATEGIC BACKGROUND FOR CASE**

### **2.1. Strategic Outputs of OSCE**

#### **2.1.1 OSCE Strategy Document**

The OSCE *Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension* adopted at the 2003 Maastricht Ministerial Council identified the challenges and threats in these areas and provided the direction for OSCE response and actions. Cooperation for enhanced development, security and stability, strengthening good governance, capacity building, ensuring sustainable development and protecting the environment are the major areas where OSCE has been tasked to take action.

The Maastricht Strategy identified, among various other issues, the multi-faceted problems in governance, and highlighted in this context the weakness of civil society as one of the primary challenges in the economic and environmental dimension and in turn, called OSCE to promote enhanced cooperation with civil society in addressing governance and sustainable development challenges.

The section of the Strategy entitled “Enhancing the role of the OSCE” outlines various modalities for OSCE to promote training and capacity building on the environment and security, not only for the central government organizations, but also and particularly for the CSOs. Special emphasis is laid upon providing advice and assistance to participating States on the implementation of commitments, *inter alia*, by launching appropriate programmes and projects in areas where it can add value. OSCE is also called upon to promote regional and cross-border co-operation among interested participating States on economic and environmental issues. This significant framework drawn by the OSCE Strategy Document has apparently paved the way for the shaping of the CASE Initiative in due course.

#### **2.1.2 OSCE Economic and Environmental Forums**

The OSCE *Economic and Environmental Forums* provide an annual focus for activities by targeting major issues of economic or environmental concern by bringing together high-level representatives of the OSCE participating States.

The Maastricht Strategy (OSCE Strategy Document) adopted in 2003 assigns a specific task in Section 3 entitled “Enhancing the role of the OSCE” to enhance the dialogue among participating States on economic and environmental issues through the better use of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forums. The Strategy lays down in this context that the Forum “remains the major annual event of, and provides the annual focus for activities in, the OSCE economic and environmental dimension. It should be made more effective by ensuring a better targeting of its theme(s) on issues of major concern, an improved preparatory process and an effective procedure for ensuring follow-up of its deliberations.”

In line with OSCE Strategy Document, these forums have addressed the need for cooperation between different actors (Government agencies, NGOs, private sector, international finance institutions) and have promoted political dialogue between these actors on various topics of the Forums. Through these forums, OSCE has been advised to ensure effective involvement of NGOs on various sustainable development and environmental security related initiatives.

Forum participants exchange views and identify practical solutions to specific issues related to a chosen theme, which is proposed by the Chairmanship and agreed upon by the 56 participating states. The focus of the Forum in 2007-08 was identified as “Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: increasing security and protecting the environment” and in 2008-09 was identified as “Migration management and its linkages with economic, social and environmental policies to the benefit of stability and security in the OSCE region”.

### **2.1.3 Sixth Ministerial Conference on “Environment for Europe”**

As the output of the Sixth Ministerial Conference on “Environment for Europe” held in Belgrade in October 2007, the Declaration entitled “Building Bridges to the Future” contains a number of provisions having particular significance for CASE. Among others, the Declaration:

- Underlined that a more effective results-based, action-oriented and differentiated approach is needed, tailored to the specific needs of the region.
- Recognized that addressing common environmental problems offers opportunities for cooperation amongst governments diffusing tension and contributing to a greater cooperation and security, and that environmental cooperation may contribute to peace-building process.
- Noted the work of the Environment and Security Initiative in participating countries, and urged the continuation of the initiative towards reducing environment-related security risks.
- Called on international organizations to pursue action-oriented partnerships among government and civil society organizations as a mechanism for advancing their objectives and implementing their commitments concerning the environment and sustainable development.
- Reaffirmed the commitment to continue supporting the efforts of countries of the region to improve their environmental situation based on their specific needs, commitments and requests, which has its direct reflections upon the demand-driven nature of CASE.

### **2.1.4 Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security**

The *Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security*, adopted at the 2007 OSCE Ministerial Council, established firm bridges with 2003 OSCE Strategy Document (Maastricht Strategy). The Madrid Declaration has pioneered in the sense that for the first time the linkages between environment and security have been recognized at the Ministerial level. Through the Madrid Declaration, the Ministerial Council affirmed that co-operation on environmental issues may serve as a tool to prevent tensions, to build confidence and to promote good neighbourly relations in the OSCE region. The Ministerial Council also called OSCE to utilize more effectively its institutional capacity and its transboundary co-operative arrangements in environmental matters and to work towards raising awareness on the potential impact on security of environmental challenges.

The Ministerial Council has also taken note of the OSCE Action Plan on the Threats and Opportunities in the Area of Environment and Security. Main components of the Action Plan presented to the 2007 Madrid Ministerial Council are as follows:

- Refocusing OSCE institutions and mechanisms on environmental matters.
- Raising awareness on environmental challenges, including climate change and its security implications.
- Promoting environmental co-operation as a tool for conflict prevention and confidence-building.
- Improving environmental governance: Supporting legal and institutional arrangements.
- Promoting access to information, public participation and justice; and strengthening the sustainable management of natural resources.
- Addressing social and economic aspects of environmental security: Addressing social impacts of environmental degradation; addressing environmental impacts of industrial legacies and man-made disasters; technology transfer; promoting sustainable energy policies and practices; and reducing negative impact on the environment of transport activities, including maritime and inland waterways transport.

## 2.2. UNECE Environmental Conventions

UNECE has negotiated five environmental treaties, all of which are now in force. CASE regional initiatives are expected to contribute to the implementation of these UNECE Environmental Conventions ([www.unece.org](http://www.unece.org)) which include the following:

- **UNECE Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution** has addressed since 1979 some of the major environmental problems of the UNECE region through scientific collaboration and policy negotiation. The Convention has been extended by eight protocols that identify specific measures to be taken by Parties to cut their emissions of air pollutants. The aim of the Convention is that Parties shall endeavour to limit and, as far as possible, gradually reduce and prevent air pollution including long-range transboundary air pollution. The priority activities include review and possible revision of its most recent protocols, implementation of the Convention and its protocols across the entire UNECE region (with special focus on Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-East Europe) and sharing its knowledge and information with other regions of the world.
- **UNECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context** (Espoo Convention) was drawn up in 1991 in Espoo (Finland) and entered into force in 1997. (The first amendment to the Convention was adopted in 2001, and the second amendment was adopted in 2004.) The Espoo Convention is a key step to bringing together all stakeholders to prevent environmental damage before it occurs. It sets out the obligations of Parties to assess the environmental impact of certain activities at an early stage of planning. It also lays down the general obligation of States to notify and consult each other on all major projects under consideration that are likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact across boundaries.
- **UNECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes** (Water Convention) is intended to strengthen national measures for the protection and ecologically sound management of transboundary surface and ground waters. The Convention obliges Parties to prevent, control and reduce water pollution from point and non-point sources. The Convention also includes provisions for monitoring, research and development, consultations, warning and alarm systems, mutual assistance, institutional arrangements, and the exchange and protection of information, as well as public access to information. Under the Convention, the *Protocol on Water and Health* was adopted in London on 17 June 1999, and the *Protocol on Civil Liability* was adopted in Kiev on 21 May 2003. OCEEA works in close co-operation with the UNECE Secretariat of the Water Convention.
- **UNECE Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents**, entering into force in 2000, was created to protect human beings and the environment from the consequences of industrial accidents. The Convention's main objectives are to prevent these accidents where and whenever possible and to mitigate their effects should they occur. The Convention devotes particular attention to the transboundary context, since cross-border coordination is more difficult. An Assistance Programme was launched in 2004 for countries with economies in transition, which often face problems in implementing the sometimes complex requirements of the Convention. The Assistance Programme is characterized by a bottom-up approach in which assistance activities are organized according to the needs expressed by participating countries.
- The **UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)** was adopted on 25 June 1998 in the Danish city of Aarhus at the Fourth Ministerial Conference in the "Environment for Europe" process. By setting principles for "access to information", "public participation in decision-making" and "access to justice", the Aarhus Convention provides OSCE with a unique tool to support environmental governance processes at the national level which in turn contributes to the countries' efforts in addressing environment and security challenges. OSCE, as part of its support to the implementation of the Aarhus Convention, has been supporting the creation of Aarhus Centres in various countries, in close co-operation with the Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative.

## 2.3. OSCE-Supported Initiatives

### 2.3.1 ENVSEC Initiative

The Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative ([www.envsec.org](http://www.envsec.org)) is an inter-agency partnership which facilitates co-operation on critical environmental issues as a way to promote peace and security in four regions: Eastern Europe, the Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, and Southeastern Europe. Recognizing that environmental problems do not stop at national borders, ENVSEC partners (OSCE, UNDP, UNEP, REC, UNECE, and associate partner NATO) have developed a platform that turns the potential for conflict between states into opportunities for confidence-building and co-operation.

The CASE Initiative is expected (and targeted to) benefit significantly from the experience and outcomes of ENVSEC. In fact, CASE has the potential of constituting the “*civil society leg*” of the ENVSEC Initiative. The multi-faceted linkages and important lessons to be drawn in this context include but not limited to the following:

- The ENVSEC Assessment for the Southern Caucasus would provide guidance to the regional CASE initiatives, as well as providing input to the identification of country level thematic areas.
- The partnership approach on which ENVSEC is based brings explicit benefits of improved coordination and comprehensive approach on regional activities as well as enhanced synergies and coherence with other donor initiatives at the country and sub-region level. A similar approach has also been adopted by CASE.
- The development of the activities of ENVSEC is based on the outcomes of environment and security risk assessments and consultations with governments, academia and the civil society, which may serve as a useful guide for the CASE Initiative.
- ENVSEC operates through national focal points in participating countries. The analyses of their role and functions (including the justification for adjustments thereof that became necessary during the course of implementation) would provide the CASE National Focal Points with a valuable framework to evaluate and refine their potential role and functions.
- During the course of implementation, the project development and selection procedures and criteria of ENVSEC have been revised for achieving a clearer and more systematic framework. The analyses of this process and the due consideration of current outputs would enable the CASE Initiative to make a relatively advanced start in the light of the accumulated experience of ENVSEC.
- ENVSEC contributed to increasing public awareness and participation in environmental affairs, primarily through the establishment and operation of Aarhus Centres, which constitute one of the potential pillars of CASE at the national level, as delineated below.

### 2.3.2 Aarhus Centres

OSCE, as part of its support to the implementation of the Aarhus Convention, has been supporting the creation of Aarhus Centres and Public Environmental Information Centres (PEICs) ([www.osce.org/eea](http://www.osce.org/eea)) in various countries, in close co-operation with the ENVSEC Initiative. These centres provide a bridge between civil society and governments on the issues related to the three pillars of the Aarhus Convention, namely access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice.

In this context, Aarhus Centres and PEICs, where they exist<sup>2</sup>, are expected to play a facilitation role in the country level implementation of CASE. Such facilitation role may include but not be limited to the following:

- Aarhus Centres, providing suitable platforms for collaboration and partnership among CSOs in addressing environmental issues, would be able to draw the attention and interest of the constituents of their networks to the CASE Initiative.
- Considering that most of the Aarhus Centres are managed by boards that bring together the representatives from government and civil society, their experience in the operation of such participatory platforms may provide a valuable frame of reference for the establishment and effective functioning of CASE National Screening Boards.
- In the same manner, the analyses of the operational framework of the National Focal Points for the Aarhus Convention may provide significant strongholds in reviewing and refining the roles and functions of the CASE National Focal Points.
- Considering that there are many well-established and experienced CSOs and international organizations in pilot countries, the Aarhus Centres may serve as a suitable bridge in enabling CASE to benefit from their know-how, experiences and resources, and to develop and strengthen networks and partnerships in each pilot country.
- The Aarhus Centres can also facilitate and contribute to the activities of OCEEA and CASE Focal Points in organizing multi-purpose capacity building programmes envisaged under CASE in a number of ways, including the programme content, communication with target CSOs, enriching the spectrum of participants, etc.
- In turn, their involvement and participation in CASE activities may contribute to the further improvement of Aarhus Centres themselves by expanding their outreach, increasing their visibility and strengthening their role and value in addressing the challenges associated with the three pillars of the Aarhus Convention.
- In the light of the discussion points above, it is apparent that the CASE Initiative has the potential of serving as a very effective operational tool for the Aarhus Centres.

---

<sup>2</sup> Currently, Aarhus Centres operational in pilot countries include the following: Tirana, Shkodra and Vlora in Albania; Yerevan, Vanadzor, Idjevan, Dilijan, Goris, Kapan, Gavar, Hradzan and Gumri in Armenia; Baku, Ganja and Gazakh in Azerbaijan; Tbilisi, Gardabani and Marneuli in Georgia.

### 3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Under the overall supervision of the Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA), CASE will operate in a decentralized and country-driven manner through a National Focal Point and National Screening Board (involving representatives of government agencies, CSOs, academia, business community and donors, where appropriate) in each pilot country, and with management, and administrative support from the OSCE field operations. Each country will be expected to formulate its own CASE Country Strategy.

In line with the Management Structure identified in the CASE Project Document, the different yet mutually-reinforcing roles and responsibilities expected to be assumed by OCEEA, OSCE Field Operations, National Focal Points and National Screening Boards, as well as the formulation of CASE Country Strategy are provided hereunder.

#### 3.1. OCEEA

In November 1997, the participating States agreed to establish the **Office of the Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA)** within the OSCE Secretariat. Based on OSCE's comprehensive concept of security, the overarching objective of OCEEA is to strengthen security and stability in the OSCE region by promoting international co-operation on economic and environmental issues.

OCEEA will have the responsibility for overall supervision of CASE implementation and provision of political and technical support and guidance. This responsibility is expected to include, *inter alia*, the following:

- Providing sub-regional and regional perspectives.
- Ensuring the preparation of efficient, transparent, flexible and broad-based guidelines to facilitate the regional and country-level implementation of CASE.
- Assisting in the formulation of CASE Country Framework Strategies.
- Ensuring coherence among the CASE project portfolios of different countries.
- Guiding/leading the formulation and implementation of multi-country CASE initiatives that address transboundary issues.
- Guiding the establishment and functioning of CASE National Screening Boards.
- Preparing standard formats (fiches) separately for project concepts and project proposals, as well as for project reports.
- Preparing user-friendly formats separately for the evaluation of Project Concepts and Project Proposals for facilitating, as well as ensuring the consistency of the process in different contexts.
- Participating in and providing guidance to the decision-making process to be conducted by the National Screening Board(s) in relation to the review and selection of the project concepts submitted by CSOs.
- Reviewing the approved project proposals in each pilot country.
- Providing guidance and assistance to respective National Focal Points in disbursing grant instalments to grantee CSOs on the basis of performance reporting.
- Promoting the establishment of partnerships with relevant international organizations/donors, and the mobilization of additional resources in relation to CASE.
- Overseeing and coordinating the general implementation of CASE Communications Strategy. Communicating the Strategy to the National Focal Points and providing guidance in the appropriate incorporation of this Strategy within the Country Framework Strategies.

### 3.2. OCSE Field Operations

**OSCE Field Operations** in pilot countries, within the context of their mission to promote the implementation of the OSCE principles and commitments in all OSCE dimensions, including the human, political, economic and environmental aspects of security and stability, are expected to provide administrative and programmatic support to CASE.

Such support is expected to include but not be limited to the following:

- Providing support in establishing and maintaining contacts with governmental agencies, local authorities and the full range of CSOs in relation to CASE implementations.
- Facilitating contacts and promoting information exchange and co-operation with international and national organizations and potential donors.
- Providing support in the organization of capacity building programmes, regional events and site visits to be organized under CASE.
- Ensuring the linkages of CASE with other OSCE-supported programmes and projects in the country.
- Providing support to respective National Focal Points in relation to project-level Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).
- Providing support to respective National Focal Points in disbursing grant instalments to grantee CSOs on the basis of performance reporting.

### 3.3. National Focal Points

**CASE National Focal Points**<sup>3</sup> in each pilot country are expected to have the overall responsibility for country-specific CASE implementations, including the coordination and M&E of the country programme to ensure the technical and substantive quality of CASE grants and projects. This responsibility is expected to include, *inter alia*, the following:

- Identifying programming areas and requirements at the country level.
- Coordinating and contributing to the drafting (and revision) of the respective CASE Country Strategy (to be subsequently discussed and finalized by the respective CASE National Screening Board).
- Coordinating and contributing to the process of the establishment (and subsequently, effective functioning) of the respective CASE National Screening Board (including the identification of potential constituents, forwarding of invitations, preparing the agenda and minutes of meetings, making logistical arrangements, etc.)
- Announcing the CASE “call for project concepts” through CSO networks, Aarhus Centres, media and other channels.
- Working in close partnership with CSOs to help them formulate their project concepts.
- Responding to requests for information and guidance from CSOs in relation to CASE implementations.

---

<sup>3</sup> The “Focal Point” title may lead to confusion and mixing up, as the same title has been adopted by the ENVSEC initiative. A title such as “Coordinator” on the other hand, may lead to a further confusion, as it can be associated with the GEF Programme. Since the OSCE Economic and Environment Officers (EEOs) are suggested in the CASE Project Document to perform the CASE National Focal Point function in pilot countries, at least for the first year of CASE implementation, a different title such as “CASE Country Officer” may be used to avoid the mixing up of CASE with similar initiatives.

- Reviewing/pre-screening the project concepts and informing the relevant CSOs (if needed) to revise and complete their project concepts before their evaluation by the National Screening Board.
- Subsequent to the selection of project concepts, notifying the proponent CSOs of this decision and asking to develop their full project proposals.
- Providing assistance to CSOs in the formulation of full project proposals (if required).
- Reviewing/pre-screening the project proposals and informing the relevant CSOs (if needed) to revise and complete their proposals before their final evaluation by the National Screening Board.
- Subsequent to the selection of projects, notifying the grantee CSOs of this decision and providing guidance on the next steps of the CASE project cycle.
- Signing respective Memoranda of Agreement with grantee CSOs (copies to be forwarded to OCEEA).
- Authorizing and disbursing grant instalments to grantee CSOs on the basis of performance reporting.
- Ensuring sound programme monitoring and evaluation, in particular on the basis of the criteria and indicators developed/refined in relation to CASE.
- Coordinating and contributing to the organization of country-specific capacity building programmes under CASE.
- Overseeing the implementation of the country-level Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework.
- Promoting the goals and activities of CASE at the country level.
- Promoting the establishment of partnerships and the mobilization of additional resources in relation to country-specific CASE implementations.
- Organizing regular and occasional site visits (to be accompanied by relevant members of the respective National Screening Board) to overview and support the grantee projects.
- On the basis of the CASE Communications Strategy, coordinating the development and implementation of country-specific Communications Strategy.

### **3.4. National Screening Boards**

**CASE National Screening Boards** are targeted to be established in each pilot country as a broad-based participatory mechanism for policy guidance, project screening and programme promotion.

#### **3.4.1 Constituents of Boards**

Members of CASE National Screening Board are expected to serve on a voluntary basis and represent the government; the CSO community, academic and technical institutions, OSCE Field Operations and donors (where applicable).

As a key factor in complying with the targeted implementation modality of the CASE Initiative, special attention is recommended to be given during the preparatory activities (identification of potential constituents, forwarding of invitations, etc.) to ensure that when the Boards are fully constituted and operational, the majority of Board members represent the CSO community.

In order to ensure that the technical and substantive quality of projects be adequately evaluated in the light of the complex nature of the identified priority themes, the technical capacity of the Boards may be strengthened, as appropriate, by inviting academicians and/or experts with relevant backgrounds from universities, public agencies and specialized institutions.

In order to avoid potential overlaps and duplications with similar grant programmes (such as GEF/SGP or SECTOR) and with other OSCE supported initiatives (such as ENVSEC and Aarhus Centres), the representatives of such initiatives and programmes should also be invited to participate in the Boards, as appropriate.

### **3.4.2 Roles and Responsibilities of Boards**

CASE National Screening Boards are expected to have, among others, the following roles and responsibilities in relation to CASE:

- Participating in and contributing to the development and revision of the respective CASE Country Strategy.
- Establishing country-specific eligibility criteria for projects on the basis of the general CASE Guidelines.
- Evaluating/selecting the project concepts on the basis of the country-specific selection criteria to be developed in the light of the general CASE Guidelines.
- Subsequent to the selection of the project concepts, evaluating/selecting the grantee projects on the basis of the country-specific selection criteria to be developed in the light of the general CASE Guidelines.
- Ensuring that the relevant Board members participate in and contribute to site visits to be conducted by the respective National Focal Point in relation to grantee projects.
- Contributing to and taking active part in the development and implementation of country-specific CASE Communications Strategy.

## **3.5. CASE Country Strategy**

A CASE **Country Strategy** will be formulated for each pilot country based on the national policies, strategies and priorities in the area of environment, sustainable development and security, taking into consideration regional and global commitments of the country.

### **3.5.1 Formulation of CASE Country Strategy**

In order to ensure that the process of formulating the Country Strategy is participatory to the possible extent, the active involvement of the broad spectrum of the constituents of the CASE National Screening Boards should be encouraged.

Although the process of formulating the Strategy is expected to manifest variations from one pilot country to the other in the light of their particular characteristics, the following general steps may provide guidance in the planning and conduct of the respective process:

- Determining the general scope of the Strategy-formulation exercise, and identifying key activities and a respective calendar.
- Establishing a core group/team to coordinate and guide the overall Strategy-formulation effort, and to integrate the results of discussions, comments and contributions into the Strategy document.

- Organizing a Workshop with the participation of the constituents of CASE National Screening Board (and other stakeholders, as appropriate) to discuss and formulate, on the basis of the CASE Project Document and CASE Guidelines, the specific content of the Country Strategy. Within the context of the Workshop, consideration may be given to holding topical Working Group meetings (with appropriate facilitation) to focus on priority components of the Strategy.
- Preparing the initial draft of CASE Country Strategy document and its circulation to all Workshop participants and other partners and key stakeholders for their review and comments.
- Preparing the final draft of the Strategy document in the light of the comments and recommendations received as a feedback from the review of the initial draft.
- Reviewing of the final draft by the respective National Focal Point to ensure its consistency with OSCE framework.
- Reviewing and endorsement of the final draft by the respective National Screening Board.
- Submission of the final draft of CASE Country Strategy to OCEEA for approval. (If necessary, make final adjustments, as appropriate).
- Completion and circulation of the final version of the CASE Country Strategy.

### **3.5.2 Content of CASE Country Strategy**

In the light of the general CASE Guidelines, the Country Strategy is expected to identify, in detail, all technical and operational issues related to the country-level implementation of CASE, including but not limited to the following:

- Congruence of country project portfolios and operational modalities with the overall objectives and implementation modalities of CASE.
- Country-specific thematic focus, including the prioritization of the general themes identified for CASE.
- Focus on cross-cutting themes, in particular on the integration of youth and gender concerns and perspectives into environment and security initiatives.
- Relevant UNECE Environmental Conventions (emphasis will be given on contributing to their implementation in the respective country).
- Outcomes of the ENVSEC and other relevant regional initiatives (due consideration will be given to avoid duplications and overlaps with these initiatives, and clear distinctions will be made as to the role and scope of CASE as compared to other similar programmes).
- Roles of the Aarhus Centres/PEICs in the respective country, and the potential of CASE in serving as an effective operational tool for these Centres.
- Roles of different stakeholders in the respective country.
- Target beneficiaries in the respective country.
- Capacity building needs of different types of CSOs in the respective country.
- Country-specific eligibility criteria for projects.
- Grant-making procedures for the respective country.
- Mechanisms for Monitoring and Evaluation of country-specific CASE implementations.
- Strategies and mechanisms for resource mobilization in relation to country-specific CASE implementations.
- Country-specific Communications Strategy.

## **4. FRAMEWORK FOR SMALL GRANTS**

### **4.1. Thematic Priorities for Small Grants**

As a primary consideration with regard to the framework for small grants, thematic priorities shall be identified in light of the regional multilateral environmental agreements, regional initiatives and trends, and country level programmes and trends. It is equally important to ensure that the grantee projects addressing these thematic priorities pave the way for the development of a CASE project portfolio (both at the regional and country levels) that collectively reinforces the emphasis of OSCE on the interface of environment and security rather than reflecting a support to unrelated and distant individual initiatives.

In this context, providing a list of priority themes relevant to the pilot countries would be important, but remain insufficient. Since a comprehensive list of possible thematic priorities has already been provided in the CASE Project Document, the emphasis should not be on attempting to add new themes to this list, but rather on identifying and highlighting a number of themes that display a relatively higher degree of priority for each pilot country in the light of the overarching goals and target outputs of CASE. Such further prioritization would also provide a more focused and concerted action to address these themes at the level of the pilot countries.

#### **4.1.1 Possible Thematic Priorities**

The CASE Project Document provides a preliminary list of possible thematic priorities, including the following:

- Sustainable management of natural resources (water, biodiversity, mountains, etc.)
- Combating land degradation.
- Natural and man-made disasters.
- Hazardous waste management.
- Management of hazardous chemicals.
- Mining.
- Maritime and inland waterways co-operation.
- Sustainable transportation.
- Early warning.

This list, albeit comprehensive, is recommended to be revised by the merging as well as the exclusion of a number of existing topics, and reinforced/enriched by the inclusion a number of new topics, as follows:

In the light of the generality of topics, it is recommended to combine the two separate yet similar topics of “Hazardous waste management” and “Management of hazardous chemicals” under a single topic.

It is also recommended that the topic of “early warning” (although bearing particular importance for OSCE) be excluded from the scope of CASE due to the restricted room for manoeuvre of the CSOs under this theme, whereby their result-based and action-oriented involvement would be more problematic and hampered in comparison to other identified themes.

On the other hand, it is recommended to include “energy” as a possible new priority theme, in the light of the importance and the priority assigned to it in the OSCE region, particularly with respect to the interface of environment and security issues.

Furthermore, considering that the Declaration of the Sixth Ministerial Conference on Environment for Europe recognizes that “our region needs to address the urgent challenge of climate change”, and that the Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security also recognizes that climate change is a long-term challenge and stipulates that OSCE “has a complementary role to play within its mandate in addressing this challenge in its specific region”, it is recommended to include “climate change” as a priority theme in this section rather than as a cross-cutting topic as indicated in the CASE Project Document.

In the light of the recommended changes, omissions and additions above, the revised framework of thematic priorities is provided below.

#### 4.1.2 Framework for Thematic Priorities

As a very important and appropriate modality, it is underlined in the CASE Project Document that, on the basis of national priorities, thematic areas of CASE in each country will be identified at the country level through participatory processes that involve governments and CSOs as well as other stakeholders. In this context, the CASE National Screening Boards are expected to play a major role in identifying the priority topics for respective pilot countries, and accordingly the Country Strategy Documents are expected to include country-specific prioritization of the general themes identified for CASE.

The primary focus should be on building the capacities of CSOs and encouraging networking and multi-stakeholder partnerships in addressing the priority topics, rather than bringing forward the technical aspect of these themes. Such an emphasis, consistent with and in fact a reflection of the emphasis of CASE on the capacity building of CSOs in relation to the interface of the environment and security issues, would constitute the **distinguishing characteristic** of CASE, enabling this initiative to have a distinctive identity of its own and avoid overlaps and duplications with other grants programmes of a similar nature. (In fact, the previously underlined potential of CASE in constituting the “*civil society leg*” of ENVSEC may be realized in this manner).

In order to facilitate the identification of the priority themes for small grants at the country level by CSOs and other stakeholders participating in the process (as well as ensuring the incorporation of the capacity building and networking aspect of CSOs in all priority themes), the content of the proposed/possible themes could be enriched by providing relevant components and guiding information, as exemplified below:

- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in addressing the **sustainable management of natural resources** (including integrated water resources management, protection of water sources and water quality, fostering co-operation for river basin management, sustainable development of mountain ecosystems, biodiversity conservation, development of forest resources/reforestation, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in **combating land degradation** (including the improvement of soil management, preventing, controlling and reversing desertification/land degradation, combating soil contamination, combating salination, promoting sustainable agricultural practices, improving soil fertility management, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in addressing **natural and man-made disasters** (including earthquake-based environmental risks, potential impacts of disasters on migratory pressures, reducing flood risks, strengthening community-level disaster preparedness, reducing disaster-prone health risks, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in addressing the **management of hazardous wastes and chemicals** (including the mitigation of risks from cross-border wastes, reducing pollution from heavy metals, recycling/disposal of hazardous wastes and chemicals, reducing the pollution of soils due to oil exploitation/spills and toxic waste, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in addressing **mining** (including the reduction of the negative impacts of mining on the environment, encompassing soils, water and vegetation, as well as air pollution, etc.)

- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in **maritime and inland waterways co-operation** (including raising awareness and effective implementation of pertinent conventions, legal instruments, regulations and standards, promoting an integrated approach related to maritime and inland waterways co-operation, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in **sustainable transportation** (including the addressing of transboundary and country-level transportation security issues, promoting environmentally sustainable means of transportation such as bicycle pathways, pedestrian walkways, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in addressing **climate change** (including the strengthening of partnerships that foster exchanges of experience and expertise on climate change, public awareness-raising, promoting carbon offsetting programmes, local climate change activities that are linked to market mechanisms and policy interventions, etc.)
- Capacity building/networking of CSOs in **energy** (including the improvement of energy efficiency in order to meet sustainable energy objectives, integrating policies on energy, focusing on alternative renewable energy resources, demonstrations of energy efficient technologies and practices at the community level, etc.)

In terms of projects to be submitted to CASE, each of the possible priority themes delineated above is expected to display explicit linkages between environment and security issues.

#### 4.1.3 Cross-cutting Themes

Coupled with the possible priority themes listed above, a number of all-important cross-cutting themes have been identified in the CASE Project Document, including the following:

- Climate change.
- Environmental governance.
- Social aspects of environmental security, including migration, gender equality etc.
- Role and participation of women.
- Role and participation of youth.

As indicated above, the topic of “climate change” is recommended to be included as a possible priority theme rather than being a cross-cutting theme.

The cross-cutting theme of **environmental governance** may be addressed by the proponent CSOs through, *inter alia*, seeking improved dialogue between different stakeholders on priority themes, targeting incremental improvements likely to pave the way for longer-term institutional and policy changes, streamlining with the activities of the Aarhus Centres, stimulating the implementation of relevant UNECE Environmental Conventions, seeking tangible improvements in the rather fragmented and incoherent areas of environmental governance in the respective pilot country, introducing innovative tools and approaches to strengthen co-operation for addressing environmental sources of stress, etc.

With regard to **social aspects of environmental security**, this cross-cutting theme may be addressed through, *inter alia*, considering the potential impacts of environmental security on migration, seeking to contribute to the initiatives toward transforming environmental risks into co-operation in pertinent areas, introducing innovative tools and approaches to highlight social aspects of environmental security, etc.

The **role and participation of women** is recommended to be considered not as an optional but as a pre-conditional cross-cutting theme in terms of the assessing the eligibility of projects. The proponent CSOs may address this cross-cutting theme through, *inter alia*, ensuring that women’s organizations are consulted during the course of the project, ensuring that the project design provides opportunities for women to participate equally, highlighting the gender perspective in all events, incorporating gender perspectives/analysis in projects, obtaining women’s opinions and perspectives on environment/security issues and concerns, etc.

In the same manner, the **role and participation of youth** is also recommended to be considered as a pre-condition for the eligibility of projects. The proponent CSOs may address this cross-cutting theme through, *inter alia*, ensuring that youth organizations are consulted/involved during the course of the project, targeting the youth as a major group amongst the beneficiaries of the project, obtaining the opinions and contributions of the youth on environment/security issues and concerns, involving special activities for awareness-raising and capacity building of the youth in pertinent priority themes, etc.

It is further recommended that project proposals addressing the special needs of **vulnerable groups** (including the children, the disabled and the elderly) in terms of the interface of environment and security issues should also be regarded as having achieved the integration of cross-cutting topics.

## 4.2. Eligibility

The eligibility framework identifies at the regional and national levels the CSOs that are eligible to apply for small grants, as well as the projects that eligible (and ineligible) for receiving small grants under CASE.

### 4.2.1 CSOs Eligible for Application

As the primary target beneficiaries of CASE, the full range of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) operating in Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia will be eligible to apply to the CASE Small Grants Programme.

In line with the definition of CSOs provided in the CASE Project Document, the primary eligibility criterion for a CSO is to be a **non-state actor whose aim is neither to generate profits nor to seek governing power**.

In this context, CASE shall be open to applications at the regional and country levels from CSOs comprising the full range of formal and informal organizations within civil society, including but not limited to Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), academia, journalist associations, trade unions, and trade associations.

However, with respect to the general framework of eligibility delineated above, the following points should be taken into consideration:

- In the case of “informal” CSOs that are not legally registered (such as “platforms” or “civil initiatives”) that serve as an umbrella for individual (formal/registered) CSOs, due to the lack of a “legal personality” of such CSOs, the respective proposal should be submitted by a suitable legally registered CSO with the consent and on behalf of the whole platform.
- Although applications by individual CSOs should not be rejected categorically, applications by CSOs through a partnership arrangement should be encouraged, and be appropriately weighed/favoured in the evaluation of project proposals.
- Besides local and national CSOs, the partnership of internationally recognized CSOs should also be encouraged. On the other hand, such CSOs (particularly, local branches of international CSOs) should be expected to be involved as supporting partners, and not as lead institutions and/or direct beneficiaries.
- In order to avoid potential conflicts of interest, albeit complying with the general eligibility criteria, project applications by CSOs that are constituents of National Screening Boards should not be deemed as eligible.
- With regard to regional-level projects that encompass activities in more than one pilot country, the application should be expected to include the partnership of at least one eligible CSO from each country intended to be covered by the project.

### **4.2.2 Eligible Projects**

CASE shall be open to project applications at the regional and country levels within the following context:

- The project is submitted by CSO(s) eligible for application, as identified above in Section 4.2.1. (In case the project partners include institutions that do not have a CSO status, the lead/signatory institution is expected to be an eligible CSO.)
- Problem to be addressed by the project is linked to at least one of the priority themes identified by the respective Country Strategy Framework in relation to the interface of environment and security issues.
- The project adequately addresses cross-cutting themes, in particular the integration of youth and gender concerns under the targeted priority theme(s).
- The nature of the project is either one or a combination of the following types of projects: “demonstration project”, “capacity building and networking project”, “awareness-raising project”, “dissemination of lessons learned project” and “policy dialogue project”.
- The project is developed (and designed to be implemented and monitored) through a participatory process involving the partner CSOs, as well as (to the possible extent) the representatives of target groups and stakeholders.
- The project incorporates mechanisms for “partnership” with other CSOs, private sector, academia, etc. (Such mechanisms are expected to be based on written agreements or protocols describing the nature and sustainability of partnerships.)
- The project provides a practical opportunity to build and strengthen a network of CSOs (also encompassing other stakeholders, as appropriate) around the identified priority theme(s).
- The project complies with, and/or compliments, the respective policies of the Government and/or OSCE in the specific area of activity.
- The project aims at establishing direct linkages between CASE and ENVSEC Initiatives.
- The project aims at contributing to the activities of the Aarhus Centre(s) in the respective country.
- The project does not duplicate other ongoing efforts. In particular, projects previously supported (or considered to be supported) by similar grant programmes will not be deemed as eligible.
- The project introduces an innovative approach to the interface of environment and security issues, and has the potential of constituting a “best practice” in developing and expanding such an approach within the country and in the region.
- The project incorporates basic tools and mechanisms for ensuring the sustainability of its impacts.

### **4.3. Provision of Small Grants to Projects**

CASE is essentially designed a Small Grants Programme. In this context, OCEEA will make available a certain amount of CASE funds to be channelled as grants to support relevant CSO projects in pilot countries. CASE will also make available a certain amount of grant funds to support relevant partnership initiatives by CSOs at the regional level.

### **4.3.1 Guiding Principles in the Provision of Grants**

The following key principles shall provide guidance in the allocation of small grants under CASE to the eligible CSOs in pilot countries:

- Grants shall be provided with the understanding that the goals and targets of CASE and its implementation modality have been based upon *empowering* the CSOs.
- Grants shall be provided within the context of an integrated, strategic framework so as to maximize coordination and continuity and functional interdependencies both at the regional and country levels.
- Grants shall be provided through an evaluation/selection process based upon clear and explicit criteria.
- Grants shall be provided in such a way as to take into consideration a relatively balanced geographical distribution within each pilot country, the nature and urgency of priority topics identified for each country, and the nature and scope of partnership/network established in relation to the project.
- Grants shall be awarded and administered in a decentralized, participatory and transparent manner as possible, ensuring the flow of information and accountability at all levels during implementation.
- Grants will be provided with a view towards promoting decentralized co-operation at the regional and country levels, and contributing to capacity building of CSOs in the interface of environment and security issues.
- Grants will be provided with a view towards enhancing the role of youth and women in environmental co-operation and conflict prevention.
- Grants will be provided in such a way as to maximize the possibilities of sustainability and replicability.

### **4.3.2 Amount of Small Grants**

The CASE Project Document provides grant allocations separately for regional and country-level initiatives. On the other hand, the specific breakdown of these general allocations (namely, the maximum amount of small grants to be provided to each selected project) remains as a basic challenge/policy issue that needs to be addressed by OCEEA prior to making a call for project proposals.

In this respect, a number of key questions that need to be considered/decided upon by OCEEA include the following:

- What should be the optimum level of small grants (or rather, the “ceiling”) to be provided to each project?
- Should a specific ceiling to be determined for grantee projects be applicable for all pilot countries, or should separate ceilings be determined for each country?
- Should a specific ceiling to be determined for grantee projects be applicable both at the regional and country levels, or should the maximum amount of small grants be determined separately for regional-level and country-level projects?
- Should the provision of co-funding by the grantee CSOs be a determining factor (i.e. higher the cost-sharing provided, higher the ceiling of the grant) in specifying the amount of the small grants?

With regard to the question concerning the optimum level of small grants, it needs to be underlined that the specification of such a ceiling is directly linked with the overall consideration to agglomerate a critical mass of projects sufficient to justify and reinforce the overarching goal of CASE. In other words, each pilot country should be able to support a minimum number of projects that would collectively constitute a “CASE projects portfolio”.

If the ceiling is set proportionally high to the total amount of grant allocation for that country, there would be no room left to support such a bottom-line number of projects. To this purpose, although specific bottom-line numbers may vary from one pilot country to the other in the light of their particular characteristics, it may be argued that if the total number of beneficiary projects be no more than 2-3, this figure will most likely be inadequate to constitute a sufficient project portfolio. More realistic figures would be attained when 7-8 projects, and preferably around or more than 10 projects could be supported to compile a critical mass of projects for any country.

In this context, it is recommended that a ceiling range of EUR 10,000-15,000 (or alternatively, a more specific ceiling of EUR 12,500) be endorsed as the maximum amount of the grant to be provided to individual projects. In the light of the total grant allocations at the country level, such a ceiling is anticipated to be adequate to compile a project portfolio in each pilot country that collectively reinforce CASE output targets, and provide adequate justification for the continuation of CASE in subsequent phases.

As it is not realistic to assume that every selected project will receive grants at or around the ceiling (albeit pertinent claims for maximum grants will most likely to be made in the project proposals), there would be room to provide grants significantly below the ceiling. In this respect, it is recommended that special consideration should be given to provide “*micro grants*” for small-scale projects with a potential triggering effect in relation to the priority themes to increase the number of projects, as well the impact of the programme.

With regard to the question as to whether a specific ceiling to be determined for small grants be applied in all pilot countries, it is recommended that a degree of flexibility be allowed for each pilot country to determine its own grant ceiling in the light of the above-mentioned considerations. In this manner, necessary adjustments could be made by the pilot countries to accommodate their particular needs. On the other hand, since the same basic considerations would be valid for each country, it is most likely that eventually a consistent and similar framework of grant ceilings in different pilot countries would be attained.

With regard to the question as to whether the grant ceilings should be determined separately for regional-level and country-level projects, it would indeed be more appropriate to increase the grant ceiling for regional initiatives. The projects to be conducted at the regional level are anticipated have a comparatively larger budget because of their wider scope (transboundary activities, multi-country partnership, etc.) and relatively high unit costs (travel, logistics, etc.) On the other hand, considering that the total grant allocation for regional initiatives should also be able to accumulate a reasonable project portfolio, the ceiling for regional initiatives cannot be too distant from the ceiling for country-level projects. In this context, it is recommended that a ceiling range of EUR 15,000-25,000 (or alternatively, a more specific ceiling of EUR 20,000) be endorsed as the maximum amount of the grant to be provided to individual regional projects.

With regard to the question concerning the provision of co-funding, it would not be realistic in the initial phase of CASE implementations to request cost-sharing from the grantee CSOs. Those that could provide such co-funding would most likely be the already strong CSOs, whereby the imposition of co-funding as a precondition to the grant would result in the categorical elimination of relatively weak CSOs targeted by CASE. On the other hand, although cost-sharing should not be requested from the grantee CSOs, they should be expected to make substantial voluntary and in-kind contributions to magnify the impact of the CASE grant.

## 5. CASE PROJECT CYCLE

This Section encompasses the Summary of Basic Steps, Application for Small Grants, Preparation and Selection of Projects, Implementation of Projects, and the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework in relation to CASE Project Cycle.

### 5.1. CASE Project Cycle: Summary of Basic Steps

CASE Project Cycle will consist of the following basic steps:

- Preparing the ground for CASE announcement (i.e. completion of the establishment of National Screening Board, and the formulation of Country Strategy in each pilot country).
- Announcement of the “Call for Project Concepts”.
- Submission of the Project Concepts by CSOs.
- Review of the Project Concepts by National Screening Board (endorsement/elimination).
- Formulation and submission of full project proposals by CSOs.
- Review of Project Proposals by the National Screening Board (endorsement/elimination).
- Signing of the Memoranda of Agreement with CSOs for approved projects.
- Release of the first grant instalment.
- Commencement of project implementation.
- Interim project reporting and subsequent grant disbursements.
- Site visits by the National Focal Point and/or members of the National Screening Board.
- Final project report, followed by the final grant disbursement.

### 5.2. Application for Small Grants

In line with the Framework for Small Grants provided in Section 4 above, the application for small grants under CASE will be open to the full range of CSOs in pilot countries.

The process of announcement of the call for Project Concepts, preparation and submission of Project Concepts and their review (endorsement or elimination, as appropriate) by the respective National Screening Board is delineated hereunder.

#### 5.2.1 Call for Project Concepts

Subsequent to the formulation and endorsement of respective CASE Country Strategies, the announcement of the CASE call for Project Concepts will be made by the National Focal Points through CSO networks, Aarhus Centres, media and other channels.

The announcement for the call for Project Concepts should include, *inter alia*, the following:

- Background information on CASE.
- Eligibility criteria for applications (eligible CSOs).
- Eligibility criteria for projects.
- Priority (and cross-cutting) themes.

- Deadline for applications.
- (Country-specific) ceiling of grants to be provided to projects.
- (Country-specific) amount/percentage of cost-sharing/co-funding to be required from applicants (if applicable).
- Evaluation criteria in relation to Project Concepts.
- Information on the evaluation process and calendar in relation to the review/selection of Project Concepts.
- Standard fiche for Project Concepts (to be filled out by proponent CSOs).
- Guidance/complementary information on how to prepare and submit Project Concepts.

### 5.2.2 Preparation of Project Concepts

The Project Concepts<sup>4</sup> should include the following:

- Basic information on the proponent CSOs (separately for the lead and partnering CSOs, including the allocation of responsibilities under such partnership).
- Curriculum Vitae of the Project Manager.
- Priority theme(s) targeted by the project.
- Primary goals/objectives and targeted outputs.
- Summary description on how the project would contribute to the interface of environment and security issues under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Summary description on how the project would address cross-cutting themes, in particular the integration of youth and gender concerns under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Brief description of the linkages of the project with the respective CASE Country Strategy.
- Brief description of the linkages with OSCE-supported initiatives in the respective country, in particular with ENVSEC and Aarhus Centres.
- Summary of project activities and timetable/work plan.
- Brief description of how the sustainability of project would be achieved.
- Assessment of cost-sharing/co-funding arrangements by the beneficiaries (if applicable).
- Summary project budget (distribution of the project budget in terms of main expenditure items should be indicated).

Project Concepts to be prepared by CSOs will be submitted before the indicated deadlines to the designated addresses of respective National Focal Points.

Prior to their evaluation by the National Screening Board, the Project Concepts will be reviewed by the respective National Focal Point to ensure their compliance with the required format and content. Project Concepts that are incomplete in certain aspects will not be categorically rejected, but instead, the applicant CSOs will be notified of the deficiencies and be requested to remedy them within a given deadline. Regardless of the extent to which the applicant fully addresses the deficiencies (or, if no revisions are made by the applicant in due time), the Project Concepts will be submitted to the Board in their present state.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is proposed that a **standard form for Project Concepts (project application fiche)** be developed by OCEEA to ensure the consistency between project concepts and to facilitate their evaluation by different Screening Boards in pilot countries.

### 5.2.3 Evaluation of Project Concepts

Project Concepts submitted by CSOs to the respective National Focal Point will be subject to the review and selection by the National Screening Board in each pilot country.<sup>5</sup>

Based upon its review, the National Screening Board will decide to eliminate or endorse, as appropriate, the Project Concepts. Evaluation and selection of Project Concepts by the National Screening Board will be done on the basis of the following criteria:

- Eligibility of the proponent organizations (pursuant to Section 4.2.1 above).
- Eligibility of the project (pursuant to Section 4.2.2 above).
- Conformity of the project to the respective CASE Country Strategy.
- Relevance of the targeted priority theme(s) of the project to the priorities of the respective country.
- Assessment of the potential contribution of the project to the interface of environment and security issues under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Relevant background/experience of the Project Manager with the technical and substantive aspects of the proposed project.
- Assessment of the collective strength and potential synergy of the partnership established by the proponent CSOs in relation to the project.
- Assessment of whether the project is based on participatory processes (in terms of project development, as well as its envisaged implementation and M&E modalities).
- Assessment of whether the project provides a practical opportunity to build a network and strengthen constituent CSOs.
- Overview of the summary of proposed project activities with regard to whether they would be adequate to attain target outputs.
- Overview of the summary of the timetable/work plan with regard to whether a realistic time frame is provided to undertake the proposed activities.
- Assessment of whether linkages have been adequately established with OSCE-supported initiatives in the respective country, in particular with ENVSEC and Aarhus Centres.
- Assessment of whether the project adequately addresses cross-cutting themes, in particular the integration of youth and gender concerns under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Assessment of the budget summary, in particular with regard to whether the cost estimates are realistic vis-à-vis the activities, and that the proposed expenditures primarily relate to the project content rather than reflecting institutional overheads of proponent CSOs.
- Assessment of cost-sharing/co-funding arrangements by the beneficiaries (if applicable).
- Assessment of whether the project introduces an innovative approach to the interface of environment and security issues, and has the potential of constituting a “best practice” in developing and expanding such an approach within the country and in the region.
- Assessment of whether a serious consideration has been given in the project concept to achieving the sustainability of the proposed project.

---

<sup>5</sup> It is proposed that a **user-friendly format for the evaluation of Project Concepts** (preferably providing a check-list of the evaluation criteria delineated herein, with an appropriate scaling/grading range for each criterion) be developed by OCEEA to facilitate the selection of Project Concepts by the Boards, and to ensure the consistency of the process in different contexts.

### 5.3. Preparation and Selection of Projects

Subsequent to the selection of Project Concepts by the National Screening Board, the proponent CSOs will be notified of this decision by the respective National Focal Point, and be asked to develop their complete Project Proposals.

The process of preparation of Project Proposals and their evaluation (to eliminate or endorse, as appropriate) by the respective National Screening Board is delineated hereunder.

#### 5.3.1 Preparation of Project Proposals

The notification to be made by the National Focal Point to the proponent CSOs (whose Project Concepts have been selected) in relation to the preparation of their complete Project Proposals<sup>6</sup> will include, *inter alia*, the evaluation criteria and process, and deadline for application, as well as guidance on how to prepare and submit the Project Proposals.

The National Focal Points will provide guidance and assistance to the proponent CSOs in the formulation and preparation of their full Project Proposals, if required/requested. However, such guidance and assistance should by no means be interpreted as an assurance for the selection of the respective Project Proposals.

The Project Proposals should include the following:

- Basic information on the proponent CSOs (separately for the lead and partnering CSOs, including the allocation of responsibilities under such partnership).
- Signatures of consent of all the partners (non-signature parties will not be deemed as “partners” of the proposed project).
- Name and communication details of the Project Manager (if different from the Project Concept fiche, justification will be provided for the respective change).
- Description of how the project would contribute to the interface of environment and security issues under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Description of primary goals/objectives and targeted outputs of the project.
- Description of how the project would address cross-cutting themes, in particular the integration of youth and gender concerns under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Description of the linkages of the project with the respective CASE Country Strategy.
- Project implementation framework (Target outputs, indicative activities and inputs in relation to the project should be written in a complete, balanced and explicit manner.)
- Project calendar/workplan (timing should be provided on a monthly basis for each activity indicated in the project implementation framework).
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, together with resources allocated for this purpose.
- Description of how communications and outreach activities have been incorporated in the project.
- Description of how the sustainability of project would be achieved subsequent to its completion.

---

<sup>6</sup> It is proposed that a **standard form for Project Proposals (project fiche)** be developed by OCEEA to ensure the consistency between project proposals and to facilitate their evaluation by different Screening Boards in pilot countries.

- Summary project budget (distribution of the project budget in terms of main expenditure items should be indicated.)
- Assessment of cost-sharing/co-funding arrangements by the beneficiaries (if applicable).
- Project budget (distribution of the project budget in terms of different budget items should be indicated in a detailed and explicit manner.)

As in the case of the Project Concepts, the full Project Proposals will also be reviewed by the respective National Focal Point to ensure their compliance with the required format and content prior to their evaluation by the National Screening Board. Project Proposals that are incomplete in certain aspects will not be categorically rejected, but instead, the applicant CSOs will be notified of the deficiencies and be requested to remedy them within a given deadline. Regardless of the extent to which the applicant fully addresses the deficiencies (or, if no revisions are made by the applicant in due time), the Project Proposals will be submitted to the Board in their present state.

### 5.3.2 Selection of Projects

Project Proposals submitted by CSOs will be subject to the review and selection by the National Screening Board in the respective pilot country.<sup>7</sup>

Based upon its review, the National Screening Board will decide to eliminate or endorse, as appropriate, the Project Proposals.

In relation to the Project Proposals selected/endorsed by the Board, the following alternative paths may be followed: (1) The Board may finalize its decision to award a grant to the selected project; or (2) the Board may only provisionally select the Proposal, subject to its reformulation for further improving its content and remedying the identified deficiencies. In the latter case, the National Focal Point will notify the proponent CSOs of the Board's request and provide them with appropriate guidance and assistance for the reformulation of the Proposal within the specified deadline. Regardless of the extent to which the deficiencies are remedied, another request for reformulation will not be asked, and the Board will make its final decision on the basis of the reformulated Proposal as to select or eliminate the project, as appropriate.

Evaluation and selection of projects by the National Screening Board will be done on the basis of the following criteria:

- Assessment/cross-checking of whether the key information provided in the respective Project Concept that enabled its selection manifests a basic continuity in the Project Proposal (i.e., whether there are changes in the lead organization, composition of partnership, theme, objectives, etc.)
- Assessment of whether the Project Proposal clearly articulates its potential contribution to the interface of environment and security issues under the targeted priority theme(s).
- Assessment of the proposed project activities as to whether they would be adequate to attain its objective(s) and target outputs.
- Assessment of the project calendar/workplan as to whether a realistic time frame and deadlines are provided to undertake the proposed activities.
- Assessment of the project budget as to whether it is adequate to attain its objective(s) and target outputs, and whether the budget items and cost estimates are realistic vis-à-vis the activities.

---

<sup>7</sup> As in the case of Project Concepts, it is proposed that a **user-friendly format for the evaluation of Project Proposals** (preferably providing a check-list of the evaluation criteria delineated herein, with an appropriate scaling/grading range for each criterion) be developed by OCEEA to facilitate the selection of grantee projects by the Boards, and to ensure the consistency of the process in different contexts.

- Assessment of cost-sharing/co-funding arrangements by the beneficiaries (if applicable).
- The overall evaluation of the Project Proposal (general quality of the Project Proposal, its comprehensiveness in addressing environment and security challenges, the coherence and integrity of its content, etc.)

In addition to the criteria delineated above, the following points are recommended to be taken into consideration as an integral aspect of the evaluation and selection process, with a view toward providing extra or “bonus” points, and having a positive impact on the “score cards” to the extent of their realization:

- *Participation*: The extent to which the project has been developed (as well as designed to be implemented and monitored) through a participatory process involving the partner CSOs, constituents of relevant CSO networks, and the representatives of target groups and stakeholders.
- *Partnership*: The extent to which the project is based upon a “partnership” arrangement (i.e. the collective strength and potential synergy of the proposed partnership should be considered during evaluation.)
- *Networking*: The extent to which the project provides a practical opportunity to build and strengthen a network of CSOs (and other stakeholders, as appropriate) around the identified priority theme(s) should be considered in this respect.
- *Cross-cutting themes*: The extent to which the project adequately addresses the cross-cutting themes identified in the CASE Guidelines and in respective Country Strategy, and particularly the integration of youth and gender concerns under the targeted priority theme(s) should be considered during evaluation.
- *Innovative approach*: Whether and the extent to which the project introduces an innovative approach to the interface of environment and security issues should be considered as a justification for warranting CASE support to the project.
- *Outstanding features*: Whether and the extent to which the outstanding features of the project display a potential for being a “best practice”, as well as a potential to augment the visibility and credibility of the CASE Initiative should be considered.
- *Explicit/direct linkages with OSCE-supported initiatives*: The extent to which the project includes specific activities/component aimed at establishing direct linkages between CASE and ENVSEC Initiatives, as well as specific activities/components aimed at contributing to the activities of the Aarhus Centre(s) in the respective country.
- *Sustainability*: The extent to which adequate means and mechanisms are introduced to ensure the sustainability of the project subsequent to the termination of CASE grant should be given due consideration.

## 5.4. Implementation of Projects

### 5.4.1 Signature of the Memorandum of Agreement

Subsequent to the finalization of the selection process, the National Focal Points shall promptly notify in writing all proponent CSOs about the outcome. (The CSOs whose projects were rejected should also be notified, preferably accompanied by justification thereof.)

Along with this notification, the CSOs whose projects have been selected shall be provided with the necessary information and guidance in relation to the next steps to be taken prior to actual implementation of their projects. The **Memorandum of Agreement** to be signed between the grant recipient CSOs and the respective National Focal Point shall also be forwarded.

The Memorandum of Agreement, whose general format shall be prepared by OCEEA to regulate all aspects of project implementation, shall be signed by the designated representative of the lead/grantee CSO(s) and returned (within a given deadline) to the respective National Focal Point for signature by the Head of Mission. A copy of the Agreement will be forwarded to OCEEA by the National Focal Point subsequent to the completion of its signature by the parties.

#### **5.4.2 Disbursement of Grants**

On the basis of the maximum grant amount that is to be set at the country and/or corporate level, the National Focal Points shall be responsible for the disbursement of grants for selected projects in pilot countries. The schedule indicating the grant disbursements for each selected project shall be included in the respective Memorandum of Agreement.

Prior to the release of the grant instalments, each National Focal Point shall prepare a table indicating the total grant disbursements for that country, and forward it to OCEEA for consent. The grant disbursements table should include, *inter alia*, project names, project identification numbers, grant recipients, total amount and the breakdown of grants, and copies of Memoranda of Agreement encompassing the duration of projects/grants, disbursement schedules, etc.

On the basis of the endorsed grant disbursement tables, grants shall be disbursed by the National Focal Points in instalments based on performance reporting, as delineated in Section 5.5 below.

For practical reasons, alternative arrangements for grant disbursements may be considered for longer/larger projects and shorter/smaller projects. In this context, projects encompassing 3-4 or more quarters of actual implementation (as well as having a budget near to the specified ceiling), the following typical disbursement schedule may be considered:

- 30% upon signature of the Memorandum of Agreement, as advance payment.
- 30% upon the review and acceptance of the first interim quarterly technical and financial reports.
- 30% upon the review and acceptance of the second interim quarterly technical and financial reports.
- 10% upon the review and acceptance of the final technical and financial reports, as the final instalment under the project.

With regard to projects encompassing a relatively short duration (around or less than 6 months) of actual implementation (as well as having a considerably smaller budget), it would not be practical to apply the schedule above, and therefore the following typical disbursement schedule may be considered:

- 40% upon signature of the Memorandum of Agreement, as advance payment.
- 40% upon the review and acceptance of the first (and only) interim technical and financial reports.
- 20% upon the review and acceptance of the final technical and financial reports, as the final instalment under the project.

#### **5.4.3 Project Execution**

Projects supported under CASE shall be executed by the Project Manager, whose name has been provided in the respective Project Proposal. The responsibilities of the Project Manager shall include the issuing of payment orders under the project. To this purpose, the Memoranda of Agreement are expected to include provisions on the means of changing the Project Manager by the grantee CSOs, if deemed necessary.

The transfer of the grant instalments shall be made to the specific project account to be opened by the grantee CSO. (In case of partnerships or an unregistered CSO platform, the account is expected to be opened by a leading partner or a CSO designated to act on behalf of the whole platform.) All payments under the project shall be made exclusively from this account. The Project Manager shall be the only person authorized to issue payments from this account. The project account shall not be used for purposes other than the project.

All expenditures to be made from the project account shall be based upon the payment order to be signed by the Project Manager. The payment order is expected to include the date of issue, accountancy number, budget item, description of expenditure and other relevant information, as well as the amount of payment in local currency and its equivalent in EUR, calculated on the basis of the exchange rate to be specified by OSCE. Each payment order is expected in turn to be supported by attachments, including the bank receipt, the invoice, bids received, tickets, contracts with experts and other supporting documents, as appropriate.<sup>8</sup>

The implementation of the project shall commence upon the release of the first grant instalment by the respective National Focal Point, and the confirmation by the Project Manager that the pertinent advance has been received and recorded in the project account.

Interim project reporting shall constitute the basis for evaluating project progress, and releasing the next grant instalment. Pertinent evaluation to be made by the National Focal Points shall be based on the required content of the reports (as delineated in Section 5.5 below), as well as on the M&E Framework (as delineated in Section 5.6 below), including the site visits.

Upon the completion of project activities, the final technical and financial reports shall be prepared and submitted by the Project Manager. (In case the full amount of the grant that has not been utilized for any reason during the approved implementation period of a project, the balance shall be returned to the main account from which the grant instalments have been forwarded by the National Focal Point.)

The project(s) shall be deemed to be completed subsequent to the review and acceptance of the final technical and financial reports by the National Focal Point, and the disbursement of the final grant instalment.

## **5.5. Project Reporting**

### **5.5.1 Function and Importance of Project Reporting**

Project reporting will be a key determining factor in the efficient and smooth functioning of the CASE project cycle during the implementation of grantee projects. In relation to M&E aspects, reporting would provide OCEEA and National Focal Points with the essential information to assess whether the level of project progress justifies the channelling of the next disbursement of the grant or there is a need for remedying the deficiencies.

On the other hand, it needs to be underlined that, if such evaluation is excessively delayed, the grantee CSOs would face a very difficult situation in terms of sustaining their activities, which may necessitate the postponement or even suspension of their activities, eventually resulting in the dissolution of their partnerships and networks. Thus, during this interim stage, CASE should be able to function with sufficient flexibility and efficiency to maintain a balance between not rushing the instalments prior to an adequate evaluation, and not delaying the transfer of grants beyond a reasonable time. In this context, project reporting should not be looked upon merely as an obligation that needs to be fulfilled, but a dynamic aspect of overall CASE management.

---

<sup>8</sup> It would be very difficult to retroactively adjust the procedures that are not in full compliance with OSCE regulations once the transactions are made by the Project Manager/grantee CSOs. Thus, in order to provide guidance in relation to the utilization of the grant in accord with the administrative and financial procedures of OSCE, a user-friendly check-list is recommended to be prepared by OCEEA and be made available to the grantee CSOs.

## 5.5.2 Technical and Financial Reports

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 4.8*), grantee CSOs are expected to submit quarterly technical and financial reports (interim project reporting and subsequent grant disbursements, as well as the final project report followed by the final grant disbursement).<sup>9</sup>

The Technical Reports should include but not be limited to the following:

- A brief statement on whether the project is progressing as initially planned.
- Description of activities conducted during the reporting period, including an account of the differences between planned and realized activities (on the basis of the project implementation framework delineated in the project proposal).
- Description of project outputs achieved during the respective period (on the basis of the project implementation framework delineated in the project proposal).
- An account of major problems encountered during project implementation, and what has been done to overcome them.
- Description of activities planned to be conducted during the next quarter (in the format of a Work Plan).
- Any request for a revision/change in the duration and/or activities of the project, and their justification.
- Supportive material at attachments to the report (as appropriate, copies of the publications, brochures, visual material, newspaper articles, etc.)
- (Although not directly linked to the project progress, it is recommended that a separate section may be included in the standard reporting fiche for obtaining the suggestions and contributions of the grantee CSOs in relation to further developing and refining CASE Implementations.)

The Financial Reports should include but not be limited to the following:

- A brief statement on whether the level of project expenditures conform to the project budget provided in the project proposal.
- Description/statement of expenditures made during the reporting period (in spreadsheet format), including an account/display of the differences between planned and realized expenditures.
- Project expenditures summary (in a cumulative format, including the amount indicated in the approved project budget, expenditures in previous quarters of implementation, expenditures in the current quarter, total expenditures made to date, and the remaining balance in the budget.)
- Any request for a revision/change in the budget items (provided that a request for increasing the total amount of grant is not made).

---

<sup>9</sup> It is proposed that a **standard form for Reporting (Financial & Technical Progress Reports and Final Report)** be developed by OCEEA to ensure consistency in project reporting process and to facilitate their M&E by the National Focal Points during different stages of implementation.

## 5.6. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

In order to establish a comprehensive basis for assessment of CASE achievements and impacts, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will be conducted at three levels, namely project level, country level, and corporate level, as delineated below.

### 5.6.1 Project-Level M&E

The efficiency, flexibility and timeliness of CASE project-level M&E is crucial in terms of the overall success and sustainability of the whole initiative. Without a process whereby the project progress is closely monitored and be responded in time, the resultant bottlenecks and problems would discourage CSOs, undermine the credibility of CASE, and jeopardize its viability in the next phases of implementation.

The quarterly technical and financial reports to be submitted by grantee CSOs will serve as the primary tool for project-level M&E, reinforced by other M&E activities to be conducted mainly by CASE National Focal Points.

The following points should be taken into consideration with regard to M&E of the grantee CSO's reporting and presentation of financial statements in connection with the project:

- Compliance of the project with CASE National Strategy.
- Overall quality of the report, including adequate description and documentation of project activities.
- Level of performance and timeliness of project activities, as well as the achievement of target outputs, on the basis of the project implementation framework and workplan.
- Level of expenditures and their consistency with the project budget and workplan.
- Reasons for diverging from the planned activities and budget, if any.
- Consistency of the activities planned to be conducted in the subsequent quarter (next steps) with the project implementation framework and workplan.
- Assessment of major problems encountered during project implementation, and what has been done by the grantee CSOs to overcome them.
- Assessment of any request of the grantee CSOs for a revision/change in the project.
- In relation to the Final Project Report in particular, assessment of the overall success of the project, and identification of best practices and lessons learned.

Project-level M&E should also include the following:

- Site visits to the projects at least once in the project life-time and report on their findings, to be conducted by the respective National Focal Point and/or members of the National Screening Board.
- Assessment of the extent to which women and youth (and their organizations) are consulted for their opinions and perspectives during the course of each project.
- Identification of innovative approaches introduced in the interface of environment and security issues in connection with the projects supported under CASE.
- Assessment of the extent to which the projects supported under CASE display notable differences from projects supported under other similar initiatives.
- Press/media coverage and visibility of the projects supported under CASE.

### **5.6.2 Country-Level M&E**

The technical and financial reports to be prepared by the National Focal Points on a 6-monthly basis in relation to the implementation of CASE in respective pilot countries will serve as the primary tool for country-level M&E. These reports are expected to include, *inter alia*, information on the following:

- Information on country-level activities conducted within the framework of CASE.
- Information on the CASE projects under implementation (including the level of progress, achievements, problems and bottlenecks and solutions to overcome the problems).
- Assessment of the overall technical content and quality of the country-specific CASE projects portfolio and the identification of significant lessons learned, in the light of periodic project reporting as well as pertinent site visits.
- An overview of the general interest of target CSOs in the CASE Initiative.
- Progress on the involvement of women and youth and gender mainstreaming in country-level activities.
- The extent to which CASE has responded to the specific needs of CSOs in the respective country.
- The quantifiable impact of CASE on the establishment of CSO networks in the respective country.
- Number of stakeholders and the quality of their involvement in national-level capacity building activities.
- The extent to which capacity building programmes have contributed to the improvement in the development and management of projects on priority areas.
- Direct linkages of CASE with the ENVSEC Initiative in the respective country.
- Direct linkages of CASE with the Aarhus Centres/PEICs in the respective country.
- The status of implementation of the CASE Communications Strategy adopted for the respective country.
- Addressing of relevant UNECE Environmental Conventions in the respective country.
- Progress achieved in country-specific resource mobilization.
- A breakdown of country level expenditures (including grant disbursements) during the reporting period and commitments for the next reporting period (financial report).

### **5.6.3 Corporate-Level M&E**

The annual reports to be prepared by OCEEA in relation to overall CASE implementations will serve as the primary tool for corporate-level M&E. These reports are expected to include, *inter alia*, information on the following:

- Progress achieved with respect to programme outputs and workplan delineated in CASE Project Document.
- Progress achieved with respect to implementations at the country level (based upon the pertinent reports of National Focal Points in each target country).
- Impact of programme activities at the country and regional levels (on the basis of specific criteria to be adopted for this purpose).

- Linkages of CASE with larger scale OSCE programmes.
- Linkages of CASE with other initiatives of a similar nature.
- Linkages of CASE with ENVSEC.
- Linkages of CASE with Aarhus Centres.
- Linkages of CASE with the projects and programmes of governments and donors in pilot countries.
- Contribution to the implementation of relevant UNECE Environmental Conventions.
- Progress achieved in partnership building at the country and regional levels.
- Progress achieved in resource mobilization at the country and regional levels.
- Progress on the involvement of women and youth and gender mainstreaming in regional-level activities.
- Best practices and lessons learned at various levels of programme implementation.
- Challenges and problems faced and possible measures planned/introduced for coping with them during the report period.
- Progress achieved in the implementation of the CASE Communications Strategy.
- Financial expenditures compiled on country-regional basis.

Annual National Focal Point meetings as well as meetings with programme partners, donors etc. will also contribute to the M&E process.

CASE will be subject to audit by the Office of the Internal Oversight as well as an independent audit and necessary financial allocation has been made within the programme budget for this purpose.

## **6. ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Communications Strategy

Attachment 2: Capacity Building Framework

Attachment 3: Sustainability Framework

## **ATTACHMENT 1: CASE Communications Strategy**

This Attachment contains the purpose, target groups, key communication principles, challenges, opportunities and strengths, means, messages, outreach and visibility, implementation arrangements, monitoring and evaluation, funding and other considerations in relation to the Communications Strategy, coupled with proposals on an Action Plan.

### **A1.1 Purpose of CASE Communications Strategy**

The CASE Communications Strategy is intended to establish and maintain clear and regular channels of communication with the broad spectrum of OSCE partners at all levels, including CSOs in pilot countries as well as other stakeholders toward attaining the goals and target outputs of the CASE Initiative.

The Communications Strategy seeks to attain the following key objectives:

- Disseminating and sharing a common understanding of the goals of OSCE in general and the CASE Initiative in particular.
- Informing all target audiences, including the OSCE network and CSOs in pilot countries as well as external organizations, in relation to the goals and target outputs of CASE.
- Promoting collaboration with strategic partners, and developing and strengthening regional and country level networks.
- Augmenting the visibility and credibility of the CASE Initiative, particularly on the side of the broad spectrum of CSOs in pilot countries.
- Promoting the emphasis of CASE on the interface of environment and security issues, and enhancing community-level understanding of respective linkages.
- Promoting the special and exclusive importance given by the CASE Initiative on CSOs and their networks.
- Enhancing the sharing of experiences, learning from each other and networking among CSOs in pilot countries, particularly in relation to the interface of environment and security issues.
- Promoting the effective sharing of the lessons learned from the CASE Initiative, not only within each pilot county but also in other countries in the OSCE region.
- Sensitizing decision-makers to policy measures and legislative/operational improvements required for the integrated approach to environment and security issues.
- Raising the media's level of interest and responsiveness to the CASE Initiative in order to increase and sustain positive media coverage.
- Identifying the outstanding challenges and opportunities in relation to CASE.
- Meeting the time frame and deadlines identified to attain the target outputs of CASE.
- Meeting resource mobilization targets of CASE, both in the initial stage of implementation, as well as in subsequent phases.

## A1.2 Target Groups

For the purposes of CASE, the target groups (or “audiences”) of the Communications Strategy should encompass the full spectrum of institutions, networks and other stakeholders at the local, national, regional and international levels with whom the pertinent information is intended to be shared and a synergy is sought to be developed.

The importance of defining the target groups cannot be overstated. Taking into consideration that the specific characteristics of target groups at different levels and contexts would often be varying from one group to another, a specific communication strategy may be needed to adequately address each level or group. Instead of preparing a list of potential institutions relevant for CASE (which would apparently be distant from being all-inclusive, with little functional value), it would be more useful to broadly identify the target groups that are directly linked with and expected to be an integral part of the CASE Initiative (“internal” groups), and other groups that do not necessarily have direct linkages but for varying reasons and multi-purpose benefits, need to be kept informed in all stages of CASE implementations (“external” groups).

The “internal” target groups in this context consist of the OCEEA staff, OSCE Field Operations in pilot countries, CASE National Focal Points, the constituents of National Screening Boards, and the full range of CSOs in pilot countries, including but not limited to NGOs, community based organizations, academia, journalist associations, trade unions, and trade associations, as well as the internationally recognized, professional CSOs that are partnering with the OSCE. Due to their significant envisaged roles and functions under CASE, the ENVSEC Initiative and Aarhus Centres should also be considered as “internal” target groups.

In the light of the general purpose of the Communications Strategy delineated above, the internal communications strategy should be based upon keeping these internal groups well-informed, contributing to the strengthening of the dialogue and networking between them, and promoting “ownership” of the CASE Initiative.

The “external” target groups include in general the United Nations agencies, International Financial Institutions, the European Commission and related institutions, other potential donors, the business community, and academia, other grant programmes such as GEF/SGP, etc., and other regional and sub-regional programmes such as the Black Sea Environmental Programme, Danube Environmental Programme, Mediterranean Action Plan, etc.

In the light of the general purpose of the Communications Strategy delineated above, the external communications strategy should be based upon keeping these external groups well-informed, establishing linkages between similar programmes, building upon existing partnerships and developing new partnerships, organizing joint programmes particularly on capacity building of CSOs, and mobilizing additional resources to support and sustain the CASE Initiative.

## A1.3 Key Communication Principles

Key communication principles underlying the Communications Strategy include the following:

- The Strategy must be functionally-driven whereby any particular communications activity should not be seen as an end in itself but serve and be aligned with the targets of CASE.
- The OSCE/OCEEA leadership should share the understanding that by effectively informing its own network and stakeholders/target groups, it is actually *empowering* them.
- The OSCE/OCEEA leadership should acknowledge that, efficient communication is not just giving out information, but it is just as important to encourage *exchange* and *feedback*.
- All communications under CASE should be open, honest and factual, and directed to the target audience.
- All communications under CASE (spoken, written, and/or electronic) should be clear, easily understood, timely and up-to-date.
- Communication should take multiple forms as appropriate, in reaching different levels and groups of the target audience.

## **A1.4 Challenges and Bottlenecks**

A number of outstanding challenges and bottlenecks in relation to the CASE Initiative that needs to be addressed include the following:

- Potential challenges/bottlenecks in effectively developing, conveying and sharing a common understanding of the objectives and strategic goals of CASE at the regional and country levels.
- Challenges in relation to ensuring that the CASE Initiative indeed goes beyond the mere replication of existing programmes, particularly with regard to avoiding potential overlaps and duplications with other grants programmes of a similar nature.
- Potential challenges in programme management/coordination in the face of launching a “new” initiative (i.e. compared to similar initiatives with an accumulated experience, the initial CASE implementations may have to cope with frequent questions, differences in interpretation, addressing ambiguities, etc. until the operational framework settles down.)
- Conception of the CASE Initiative by target beneficiaries and other stakeholders as a part or continuation of ENVSEC or similar small grants programmes, and the consequent difficulties in rendering a distinctive identity for CASE.
- Disillusionment by target beneficiaries and other stakeholders resulting from their over-expectations from CASE that is most likely to stem from the excessive amplification of the benefits of CASE (i.e. making promises over what the CASE Initiative can realistically fulfil, in terms of both capacity building and financial support).
- Coping with the drawbacks of the project selection/awarding process (awarding certain projects under CASE would mean on the other side of the coin more numerous CSOs disillusioned because their project proposals are turned down).
- Different levels of success in pilot countries in relation to CASE implementations (i.e. in the formulation of CASE Country Strategies, formation and functioning of Screening Boards, number and nature of applicant CSOs, implementation of projects, etc.)
- Regardless of the reasons, considerably low level of interest among CSOs in pilot countries, which may jeopardise the overall justification of launching and sustaining of the CASE Initiative.
- Deficiencies and weaknesses in establishing direct and concrete linkages between environment and security issues in the projects submitted under CASE, which may erode the credibility and justification of the whole initiative.
- Difficulties in identifying concrete and tangible means of integrating youth and gender concerns into environment and security initiatives.
- Difficulties in drawing the attention of potential donors/partners to the first phase of CASE implementations, which may result in potential bottlenecks in mobilizing and securing adequate financial resources to support the subsequent phase(s) of CASE.

## **A1.5 Opportunities and Strengths**

CASE can effectively address the challenges indicated above, and confidently build its future communications activities on the following opportunities and strengths:

- Positive reputation, credibility and high visibility of OSCE at the regional and country levels, and its significant experience and leadership in conducting and/or partnering in similar grants programmes.

- The special focus of CASE on CSOs, based particularly upon and reinforced by the **OSCE Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension** adopted at the 2003 Maastricht Ministerial Council, which identified, among other issues, weak civil society as one of the challenges in the economic and environmental dimension and called for enhanced co-operation with civil society in addressing governance and sustainable development challenges.
- The special focus of CASE on the interface of environment and security issues, based particularly upon and reinforced by the **Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security** adopted at the 2007 OSCE Ministerial Council, which has pioneered in the sense that for the first time the linkages between environment and security has been recognized at the Ministerial level. The Ministerial Council also called the OSCE to utilize more effectively its institutional capacity and its transboundary co-operative arrangements in environmental matters and to work towards raising awareness on the potential impact on security of environmental challenges, which paved the way for the CASE Initiative.
- **OSCE Action Plan on the Threats and Opportunities in the Area of Environment and Security**, presented to the 2007 Madrid Ministerial Council, providing a comprehensive framework for action for OSCE institutions and mechanisms to refocus on environmental matters, which culminated in the launching of the CASE Initiative with the full support and commitment of OSCE.
- The declaration of the **Sixth Ministerial Conference Environment for Europe**, providing additional opportunities and strengths for CASE as it reinforced the linkages between environment and security, and called on international organizations to pursue action-oriented partnerships among government and civil society organizations as a mechanism for advancing their objectives and implementing their commitments concerning the environment and sustainable development.
- Exceptional position of CASE to build upon and benefit from the outcomes of the ENVSEC Initiative at the regional level, as well as in relation to country-specific activities.
- Exceptional position of CASE to build upon and benefit from the activities of the Aarhus Centres, which are expected to play a facilitation role in the country-level implementation of CASE.
- Remarkable capacity of OSCE Field Operations in pilot countries to provide administrative and programmatic support to CASE.
- Remarkable capacity of OSCE Economic and Environment Officers who will function as CASE National Focal Points in each pilot country.
- Potential strength and capacity of CASE National Screening Boards to be established in pilot countries as a broad participatory mechanism for policy guidance, project screening and programme promotion.
- Presence of effective mechanisms and methodologies for the Monitoring and Evaluation of CASE implementations at the project, country and corporate levels.
- Presence of a Communications Strategy which would facilitate the maintenance of clear and regular channels of communication with the broad spectrum of OSCE partners at all levels, including CSOs in pilot countries as well as other stakeholders.
- By virtue of its decentralized, demand-driven and country-driven operating structure, the strategic position of CASE that provides opportunities for the development of partnerships with other donors pursuing similar missions but who lack the institutional means to reach CSOs in pilot countries.

## A1.6 Means

With regard to the means of the CASE Communication Strategy, it is apparent that there are many possible tools for communicating internally and externally, including but not limited to the following: **printed material** (Training Tool Kit, brochures, newsletters, calendars, etc.), **audiovisual material and visual support** (powerpoint presentations, posters and banners, CDs, videos, transparencies, etc.), **electronic communications** (website, e-mails, electronic newsletters, e-forums, etc.) **meetings and events** (workshops, seminars, public information meetings, award events, etc.), **consultation tools** (feedbacks, surveys, site visits, study tours, etc.) and specifically **media-oriented tools** (news conferences, press releases, media visits, advertisements, etc.)

Each of these tools/means can be utilized effectively and in an innovative manner, with *imagination* and *budgetary constraints* being the only limitations for their usage. However, in terms of the effective implementation of this Communications Strategy, it is extremely important for OCEEA to identify the specific means/tools that are more appropriate for the target audience of the CASE Initiative.

In relation to the process of identifying the appropriate means, it should be underlined that there is much to be gained by developing the Communications Strategy through a collective, participatory process. The outline and contents of the Strategy should be shared to the possible extent with all partners, particularly those that will be responsible for its implementation, to obtain their comments and contributions, as well developing a sense of “ownership”.

Once the Strategy has been established, it must be communicated to the partners and target groups intended to be reached, particularly in the pilot countries. This will make it easier to integrate them into the process of identifying and developing country-specific communications tools.

In this context, the following points may be considered in identifying the means of implementation of the Communications Strategy:

- Developing and presenting consistent messages about the CASE Initiative to all partners and stakeholders.
- Identifying the specific communication tools to be used for various/different target groups delineated above.
- In the light of priority actions, identifying the timeframe and deadlines in relation to the implementation of the Strategy.
- Identifying the key CSOs and other institutions that are expected to play an important role in the effective implementation of the Strategy.
- Considering the capacities and the potential role of CSO networks, universities and the press in the implementation of the Strategy.
- Considering the language or languages spoken in pilot countries with regard to the specific tools that are decided to be utilized.
- Ensuring that all grantee projects include communications and outreach activities, as appropriate.
- Making adequate financial provisions for communications and outreach activities in the general CASE budget, as well as in the budgets of grantee projects, as appropriate.

## **A1.7 Messages**

The Communications Strategy should underline and amplify the main message(s) that is intended to be given by the CASE Initiative.

The overriding message that CASE should convey through the implementation of this strategy may be the following:

- CASE is a unique initiative that focuses on building and strengthening bridges between environment and security, between similar initiatives in the region, and between the full range of CSOs in pilot countries through a decentralized, demand-driven, enabling and participatory approach.

Other messages supporting the overriding goal of CASE and attaining its target outputs may include the following:

- CASE has an exceptional position in reinforcing and building upon the capacities of similar initiatives in the region (such as ENVSEC, Aarhus Centres/PEICs, GEF, etc.)
- CASE will have a positive demonstration impact in establishing concrete linkages between environment and security issues.
- CASE is designed to strengthen the technical and administrative capacity of CSOs in the interface of environment and security, particularly by promoting partnerships and networking between not only homogenous but also different types of CSOs.
- CASE is not a “one-shot” venture but a long-lasting and sustainable initiative to support the full range of CSOs for projects that demonstrate environmental co-operation as a tool for conflict prevention and resolution.

## **A1.8 Outreach and Visibility**

CASE can expand its outreach and enhance its visibility by effectively utilizing specific communications tools and means in an intertwined manner, which should be built into its regional and national-level activities. These include but not limited to the following:

- The CASE Small Grants Programme should have an identity, preferably highlighted by a distinctive and attractive logo, to be easily recognized when seen. This logo may be designed, as appropriate, to reflect integrity/interface (environment and security) and networking/partnerships (particularly CSOs) concepts.
- As a common identity, the CASE logo should be utilized in all regional and country-level events (such as capacity building programmes, information exchange and coordination meetings, etc.) and visual material (such as posters, banners, brochures, publications, powerpoint presentations, etc.) that are directly linked with CASE implementations.
- In order to enhance the visibility of CASE particularly vis-à-vis the governments of the participating States, donors, the United Nations agencies, the International Financial Institutions, the European Commission and other related institutions who may not be familiar with this initiative, the CASE logo (and pertinent informative material) should also be promoted to the possible extent during the major and high-profile events organized by OSCE (such as Economic and Environmental Forums, conferences, regional meetings of Aarhus Centres, etc.)
- Coupled with the site visits, regional and country-level information exchange programmes should be organized for stimulating the exchange of experience and information amongst the partners/networks of CASE projects. These programmes are also expected to contribute to the development of a sense of “ownership” of CASE, as well as promoting co-operation and collaboration between different networks.

- The development of special programmes with international media organizations, albeit very difficult, is likely to have significant impacts in terms of outreach and visibility. As importantly, the promotion of the coverage of CASE in general and the grantee projects in particular in national and local TVs, newspapers and magazines, radios etc. should be a primary target in this respect.
- Special capacity building programmes should be designed, particularly for promoting the development of networks amongst the representatives of national and local media in pilot countries who are sensitive to and supportive of CASE targets.
- Capacity building programmes to be organized at regional and country levels should not be confined with technical aspects, but also be utilized for outreach and visibility purposes.
- Due consideration should be given to the organization of special and high-profile events such as “best practice awards” to promote outreach and visibility. The organization of site visits with the participation of key stakeholders (donors, government officials etc.) to flagship projects may also be considered in this respect.
- In terms of outreach and visibility, visual and printed materials should also be effectively utilized. Such material is expected to include the CASE brochure (and specific brochures of each pilot country), the Training Tool Kit, TV spots, CDs, powerpoint presentations, electronic/printed newsletters, reports, publications, etc. (Such key informative materials should be prepared and printed not only in English, but also in the languages of pilot countries.)
- Visual and printed materials produced in each project supported by CASE should be used as inputs to reinforce regional outreach activities. Lessons learned from projects, to be compiled in the form of best practices, should be utilized also for the purposes of outreach and visibility.
- The CASE website should be utilized effectively for outreach and visibility. In order to increase its appeal and attractiveness particularly for the broad spectrum of partners and relevant stakeholders, an interactive format should be developed to foster information exchange, communication and collaboration at all levels, coupled with reports and publications, audio-visual materials, communication details of networking CSOs and other useful information on regional activities as well as on projects supported under CASE.
- In addition to the CASE website, innovative ways should be sought for the effective utilization of mobile technologies (particularly the cellular phones) for developing the communication and information flow amongst the CASE stakeholders in general, and CSOs in particular.

## **A1.9 Implementation Arrangements**

The implementation arrangements in relation to the Communications Strategy are envisaged to be as follows:

- OCEEA, charged with the responsibility for overall supervision of CASE implementation, will be the responsible body for ensuring, coordinating and overseeing the general implementation of the Communications Strategy. As part of this responsibility, OCEEA will be responsible for communicating the strategy to CASE National Focal Points, and will provide guidance in the appropriate incorporation of this Strategy within the CASE Country Framework Strategies.
- CASE National Focal Points in each pilot country are expected to ensure the appropriate incorporation of the Communications Strategy in respective CASE Country Strategies. In this context, each National Focal Point is expected to coordinate the preparation of a National Communications Strategy to be incorporated into the respective CASE Country Strategy. Subsequent to the preparation and incorporation of a National Strategy, CASE

National Focal Points are expected to internalize this Strategy in their regular reports on implementation and monitoring, and to effectively utilize it in building partnerships, mobilizing additional resources and promoting CASE activities at the country level.

- CASE National Screening Boards to be established in each pilot country as a broad participatory mechanism for policy guidance, project screening and programme promotion are expected to take the Strategy into consideration in fulfilling their envisaged functions.
- OSCE Field Operations in pilot countries are also expected to take the Strategy into consideration as an integral part of their significant role in providing administrative and programmatic support to CASE.

In line with the implementation arrangements above, the division of responsibilities under the Communications Strategy should be shared with the whole network, including the title(s), position(s) and name(s) of the staff member(s) responsible for communications in the OCEEA and in OSCE Field Operations, the responsibilities of each member of the communications team, the overall budget assigned for the implementation of the Communications Strategy, etc.

### **A1.10 M&E of the Communications Strategy**

As an integral aspect of the CASE Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process, special emphasis should be placed on M&E of the implementation of the Communications Strategy.

As a crucial aspect of M&E of the CASE Communications Strategy, OCEEA, through National Focal Points, should ensure the appropriate reflection and adoption of the Communications Strategy in CASE Country Strategies of pilot countries.

Under the umbrella of OCEEA, regular coordination meetings should be organized with the participation of National Focal Points and relevant members of National Screening Boards, not only to evaluate progress but also to pursue a joint strategy to implement the recommendations and inputs of the Communications Strategy.

The following indicators may provide a basis in relation to the M&E of the Communications Strategy, including M&E of country-specific strategies:

- Number of press conferences and briefings by OCEEA (and CASE National Focal Points) in line with the Strategy.
- Number of coordination meetings by OCEEA (and CASE National Focal Points) on the status of implementation of the Strategy/country strategies.
- Level of the utilization of CASE logo in the regional and country-level events and visual material that are directly linked with CASE implementations, as well as in other major events organized by OSCE.
- Number and scope of regional and country-level information exchange programmes organized for stimulating the exchange of experience and information amongst the partners/networks of CASE projects.
- Number and scope of the coverage of CASE in general and the grantee projects in particular in international media organizations, and in national and local TVs, newspapers and magazines, radios, etc.
- Number and scope of programmes geared toward the development of networks amongst the representatives of national and local media in pilot countries.
- Number and scope of special and high-profile events geared toward promoting outreach and visibility of CASE.

- Number and scope of site visits organized with the participation of key stakeholders (donors, government officials etc.) to flagship projects.
- Number and nature of visual and printed materials produced in relation to CASE.
- Number and nature of visual and printed materials prepared/printed in the languages of pilot countries.
- Level of utilization of the CASE website (particularly, on the basis of statistics for different components).
- Level of feedbacks from local stakeholders/partners (constituents of National Screening Boards, grantee CSOs, etc.)
- Reflection/coverage of the Strategy in the Annual Report(s) to be prepared by OCEEA.
- Reflection/coverage of the Strategy in the technical and financial reports to be prepared by the National Focal Points on a 6-monthly basis in relation to the implementation of CASE.
- Reflection/coverage of the Strategy in project reporting (Progress Reports and others).
- Number of Discussions Reports prepared specifically on the Strategy.
- Number and nature of awards received by projects supported under CASE.
- Number of national awareness-raising and publicity campaigns launched in relation to or by virtue of CASE.
- Number and nature of local communications activities carried out by grantee CSOs.
- Number of institutions and/or individuals reached as a result of the campaigns and other communications activities.
- Amount of co-funding and other contributions mobilized.

The tangible outcome and results of these indicators should be further assessed (in general, as well as at country level) to qualify their impact. (For example, assessing the quality of articles and trying to estimate their overall impact in an informal manner.)

Subsequent to the conclusion of the initial implementation stage of CASE, the OCEEA should overview the realization of the Communications Strategy on the basis of the feedback from CASE National Focal Points in each pilot country to review and improve the Strategy, as appropriate, to be more functional in the next implementation phase of CASE.

### **A1.11 Funding of the Communications Strategy**

An appropriate portion of the CASE budget should be allocated to support the realization of the Communications Strategy.

Considering the limitations of the CASE budget however, in order to keep administrative costs to a minimum, various modalities could be utilized for implementing pertinent activities, including but not limited to the following:

- Identification of a CASE Communications Officer is not a luxury, but a necessity. On the other hand, in the first phase of implementation, without having to resort to hiring a communication expert specifically for the purposes of CASE, the organizational/institutional capacity of OSCE could be utilized for a pertinent inter-departmental assignment, as appropriate.

- CASE National Focal Points, as part of their responsibilities, are expected to coordinate the development and implementation of country-specific Communications Strategy. In this context, as in the case of OCEEA, the tasks of the CASE National Communications Officer would be performed by the perspective National Focal Point in each pilot country, thereby significantly economizing on staff costs.
- Voluntary and in-kind contributions, particularly by the constituents of CASE National Screening Boards, could be utilized for the efficient and cost-effective implementation of each country-specific Communications Strategy.
- CSOs with capacity to design and implement communications and outreach activities should be identified, and be encouraged to present proposals for grants to implement components of the respective country-specific Communications Strategy.
- Each approved CASE project should include specific activities for the dissemination of results and the sharing of experiences and lessons learned, and any other appropriate communications and outreach activities. These activities should appropriately be accommodated in respective project budgets.

## **A1.12 Other Considerations**

Other communication and outreach elements of a more general nature need to be taken into consideration, particularly in relation to the publications and printed materials produced in relation to CASE.

With regard to the publications and printed materials produced directly by OCEEA (and CASE National Focal Points) in relation to CASE (such as the “Training Tool Kit” to be prepared, informative brochures, “best practice” case studies, etc.), the following points may be utilized as a checklist:

- The pertinent publications and other printed materials should indicate copyrights and any required permits for reproduction (copyrights shall be those of the OSCE/OCEEA).
- Such publications and other printed materials should visibly bear the OSCE logo, as well as the specific logo of CASE.
- The funding source(s) for the publication should be acknowledged.
- The contributions by various partners should be acknowledged.
- The sources of photographs, illustrations, drawings, etc. should be acknowledged.
- Disclaimers should be included to indicate that views in the publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of OSCE.
- Information in relation to the identity of the publication (ISBN number, date of publication, address of the publishing house, etc.) should be included.

The points above shall also apply, as appropriate, with regard to the publications and printed materials produced by the grantee CSOs. On the other hand, the following additional points need to be taken into consideration:

- Copyrights are expected to be retained by CSOs unless otherwise agreed previously in writing. However, the right for OSCE/OCEEA to freely reproduce and disseminate in part or in whole the publications and other printed materials produced under CASE should be secured.
- The publications and other printed materials should visibly contain the acknowledgement of the financial contribution provided under CASE.
- Obtaining sufficient copies of publications and other printed materials produced by the grantee CSOs for direct OCEEA dissemination should be secured.

### A1.13 Communications Strategy Action Plan

Based upon the main ingredients of the Communications Strategy provided in this Attachment, the OSCE/OCEEA is expected to prepare an Action Plan for the implementation of the CASE Communications Strategy.

This process of Action Plan preparation is recommended to be conducted in a participatory manner, involving to the extent possible the full range of target groups delineated above, and seeking to achieve a consensus upon the respective activities and other issues.

In order to facilitate the preparation of the Action Plan, an example on the possible format and contents of the Action Plan is provided below:

Activity	Responsible person	Target audience	Time frame/ deadline	Recommendations	Performance indicators	Budget
Communicating with the local media and journalists in (country)	Communications Officer & CASE Focal Point for (country)	Key media contact persons & journalist	Regular activity	One of the efficient ways to establish good communication and co-operation is to organize visits with the media	List of media visited List of journalists met Press coverage resulting from the visits Increased contacts with the journalists	EUR xx
Establishing a network of journalists in (country)	Communications Officer & CASE Focal Point for (country)	Journalists in the national and local media	Launching of CASE	Developing a network of key media persons and journalists in the national and local media will contribute to raising awareness on CASE objectives and their promotion, as well as benefiting from the synergy of this network.	Number of contacts with local media Creation of a mailing list of local media Creation of a network of local journalists Assessing the effectiveness of the network	EUR xx

## **ATTACHMENT 2: Capacity Building Framework**

This Attachment contains integrated and intertwined sections in relation to the Capacity Building Framework, including the start-up of CASE, increased public and political awareness, strengthening capacities of CSOs, and supporting the projects of CSOs, complemented by a proposal for conducting a Needs/Capabilities Assessment.

### **A2.1 Purpose of the Capacity Building Framework**

The purpose of the Capacity Building Framework is to provide a basis for consideration and discussion by OCEEA (and its country networks), with a view towards improving the operational aspects and contributing to the successful conduct of the capacity building activities planned under CASE, with particular reference to the Target Outputs delineated under “*Results and Resources Outline for CASE*” in the Project Document.

### **A2.2 Output 1: Start-up of CASE**

#### **A2.2.1 CASE Introduction Meeting**

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 1.2*), during the Start-up Phase, CASE will be introduced to the Economic and Environment Officers in pilot countries (who are expected to serve as CASE National Focal Points and perform the pertinent significant functions) through a meeting. During this meeting, among other issues, the technical and operational aspects of implementation (including these Guidelines) will be elaborated in detail for further development and refinement.

It needs to be underlined that this meeting is of crucial importance for the smooth and well-coordinated conduct of CASE implementations. As highlighted in the Communications Strategy, one of the primary challenges that may have adverse impacts is associated with launching a “new” initiative. The technical and operational guidelines of small grants programmes of a similar nature (such as GEF) were built on experience, gradually being improved and refined in the face of the problems and bottlenecks encountered during the course of implementation. The CASE Initiative, on the other hand, not having the “luxury” of trial-and-error, should make every effort to draw lessons from other relevant programmes and have a clear picture for implementation from the very beginning.

The CASE management, particularly the Economic and Environment Officers (CASE National Focal Points) will most likely be facing a wave of questions and requests from the CSOs during the course of the project cycle. Due to the possibility of a work overload as well as eroding the decentralized nature of the CASE Initiative, the channelling of this “traffic” to OCEEA would not be a viable option, but instead, each Focal Point should be in a position to respond to questions and clarify ambiguities in their locality. On the other hand, possible differences in the interpretation and addressing of such questions and issues may lead to diverse, unbalanced and problematic implementations in pilot countries that do not conform to the goals and targets of CASE.

In this context, it is crucial to have a clear understanding and a common/shared conception of the CASE operational framework. Thus, the introduction meeting should not be limited with information exchange, but be fully designed as a *capacity building* program, allowing interactive, step-by-step elaboration of the project cycle, clarifying the respective roles and responsibilities, and discussing potential problems in the light of possible scenarios.

Since the CASE National Focal Points are expected to play the leading role in the establishment of CASE National Screening Boards, the pertinent capacity building programmes should also focus on the means and modalities to ensure the appropriate establishment and functioning of the Boards in line with their envisaged functions under CASE.

## **A2.2.2 Capacity Building for National Screening Boards**

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 1.4*), during the Start-up Phase, CASE National Screening Boards will be established, which are envisaged to include the representatives of government, CSO community, academic and scientific institutions, OSCE Field Operation and donors, as well as the ENVSEC, Aarhus Centres and other similar initiatives, as appropriate.

National Screening Boards, on the other hand, are expected to play a key role that will determine the level of success of the whole initiative, including the formulation of the CASE Country Strategy (*Indicative Activity 1.6*), the selection of project concepts (*Indicative Activity 4.3*) and the selection of grantee projects (*Indicative Activity 4.6*). The performance of these crucial functions necessitates a special emphasis on capacity building of National Screening Boards.

Effective functioning of the Boards would require in the first instance that the institutional and technical capacities of participating CSOs and other constituents be adequate to the demanding tasks at hand. While there may be a strong commitment, many of the CSOs in pilot countries (as underlined in the section on “Conceptual Framework” of the CASE Project Document) are institutionally and technically weak, and thus may not be in a position to confidently accommodate the functions expected from them.

In this context, it is recommended that a special capacity building programme in each pilot country should be incorporated within the planned sequence of events during the Start-up phase (in particular, prior to the development of CASE Country Strategies), geared toward the specific (identified) needs of each National Screening Board.

## **A2.3 Output 2: Increased Public and Political Awareness**

### **A2.3.1 Regional Campaign**

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 2.2*), a campaign will be launched to promote CASE at regional level, targeting donors, European Commission, international CSOs, private sector and media.

During the launching and conduct of the regional campaign, relevant tools identified in the CASE Communications Strategy should be taken into consideration.

In terms of capacity building, it needs to be underlined that the country-level campaigns would to a large extent be built around and based upon the regional campaign. In this respect, the envisaged activities under the regional campaign should be reviewed and appropriately revised to include capacity building programmes geared towards key persons and institutions that are expected to play a major role in the conduct of country-level campaigns in their respective contexts.

### **A2.3.2 Country-Level Campaigns**

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 2.4*), country-level campaigns will be initiated in pilot countries, targeting various government agencies, parliamentarians, local administrations, CSOs, bilateral and multilateral donors, private sector and media.

In the same manner as the regional campaign, relevant tools identified in the CASE Communications Strategy should also be taken into consideration during the launching and conduct of country-level campaigns.

With a view towards firmly integrating the capacity building activities within each campaign, the following points may be taken into account in the conduct of country-level campaigns:

- Identifying/adopting (and effectively utilizing) attractive campaign slogans, particularly reflecting the main goals/messages of the CASE Initiative.
- Targeting the involvement of well-known/respected/eminant figures (politicians, artists, TV stars, newspaper columnists etc.) as the spokespersons/champions of the campaign to ensure a high profile and a positive image for the campaign.
- Organizing special awareness-raising programmes (particularly as high-profile events) to raise the awareness of various levels of decision-makers on environment/security issues, and to promote increased support to and “ownership” of the CASE Initiative.
- Organizing awareness-raising/publicity programmes and events under the campaign geared toward increasing broad-based public participation. (Collaborating with women and youth organizations and CSO networks in launching special “signature” campaigns to seek community support on priority themes may be considered in this respect).
- Targeting the increased visibility and coverage of CASE in national and local TVs & media by virtue of the campaign (preparation of TV spots for awareness-raising, participating in media forums, “working breakfast” with columnists/TV producers, etc., may be considered in this respect).

## **A2.4 Output 3: Strengthening Capacities of CSOs**

### **A2.4.1 Training Tool Kit**

The importance of the comprehensive **Training Tool Kit** to be developed under CASE (*Results and Resources Outline, Indicative Activity 3.1*) cannot be overstated. In fact, the Tool Kit is expected to serve as the key document in terms of the capacity building of the full range of target CSOs, particularly in the interface of environment and security issues.

A primary means of achieving the overarching goal of CASE is identified as “increasing public and political awareness on the linkages between environment and security”. These linkages, as interpreted and defined by OSCE, should be clearly laid down, both as a guidance to CSOs as well as for developing a common understanding and terminology. The Tool Kit could serve as a very effective tool in sharing and disseminating these linkages at the regional and country levels.

As importantly, considering that the integration of youth and gender concerns into environment and security initiatives and demonstrating and enhancing the role of youth and women in environmental co-operation and conflict prevention will be among the cross-cutting themes that will be addressed by CASE, the Tool Kit may be instrumental in introducing a set of criteria for assessing such integration, as well as providing guidance on the possible mechanisms and means through which such integration may practically be achieved.

In line with the CASE Project Document the Training Tool Kit will be introduced to the Economic and Environment Officers in pilot countries (*Indicative Activity 3.2*). As in the case of the introduction meeting (*Indicative Activity 1.4*) this activity should also be designed as a *capacity building* program, and be carried out preferably in conjunction with the training workshops envisaged under CASE (*Indicative Activity 3.4*).

The launching of the Tool Kit in these workshops however, should not be looked upon as a completed task, but as the initial step of a long-lasting capacity building initiative. Considering that the Tool Kit will include information on conceptual framework, thematic and cross-sectoral areas, project formulation, implementation, M&E and reporting, as well as specific chapters on integration of gender and youth perspectives, it becomes apparent that each chapter of the Tool Kit is in fact the subject of a separate and comprehensive capacity building activity. Thus, it is crucial to take the necessary steps to convert the Tool Kit into a “living document” that finds its practical implementation through a continuous series of capacity building initiatives, reinforcing and mutually-supportive of each other.

## **A2.4.2 Training Workshops**

In line with the CASE Project Document (*Indicative Activity 3.4*) at least two training workshops are planned to be organized in each pilot country. In terms of the sequence of events, the workshops are planned to be organized subsequent to the translation of the Tool Kit into local languages and printing (*Indicative Activity 3.3*), which would enable these workshops to serve as effective local capacity building programmes in relation to different components of the Tool Kit.

It is indicated in the Project Document that the assistance of international CSOs and relevant professional institutions “may be sought” in the technical design and implementation of these workshops. Yet, considering the particular significance of these workshops, it is recommended that the necessary steps should be taken to ensure that such assistance is indeed obtained from relevant institutions.

Furthermore, the door left open in the CASE Project Document for expanding this framework by indicating that there will be “at least” two workshops is recommended to be utilized to the possible extent. In particular, the organization of an additional training workshop in each target country that aims at bringing together the key representatives of grantee projects would provide a unique opportunity to share experiences and learn from each other, as well as establishing the basis of an essential network under CASE.

In the same manner, although the youth and gender dimensions may have been recognized as an integral aspect of CASE, its practical application would constitute a major challenge, particularly on the level of project implementation. Many of the proponent (and grantee) CSOs may not have previous experience in the integration of youth and gender perspectives in projects. In order to strengthen gender mainstreaming aspect and to provide guidance on the involvement of the youth, training workshops focusing exclusively on these topics should be organized, and if this would not be possible under the current scheme, the training workshops programmed to be organized under Indicative Activity 3.4 should give due emphasis to pertinent topics.

## **A2.5 Output 4: Supporting the Projects of CSOs**

In line with Output 4 of the CASE Project Document, not only financial but also (and as importantly) technical support will be provided to CSOs for their projects that demonstrate environmental co-operation as a tool for conflict prevention and resolution, reinforced by capacity building activities planned under CASE.

### **A2.5.1 Technical Assistance for Projects**

Subsequent to the announcement in relation to CASE (*Indicative Activity 4.1*) eligible CSOs are expected to submit their Project Concepts (*Indicative Activity 4.2*), followed by the review and selection of project concepts (*Indicative Activity 4.3*). Provision of assistance to CSOs is envisaged to commence subsequent to the selection of project concepts, focusing on project formulation (*Indicative Activity 4.4*). On the other hand, consideration should be given to the significant capacity building need between Activities 4.2 and 4.3, namely *after* the submittal of project concepts and *before* their evaluation.

In this context, the provision of technical assistance to CSOs (in particular, by Focal Points) may be needed to upgrade the technical and substantive quality of their proposals subsequent to their submittal. Technically weak proposals/concepts with potentially good ideas/content should not be turned down categorically, but be given a specific time for their improvement and backed up with appropriate technical assistance. Otherwise, only the capacitated CSOs would be awarded, with relatively weak CSOs (as a primary target group of CASE) being pushed aside. Thus, this interim stage should be looked upon as a full-fledged capacity building package in itself.

In the same manner, the provision of assistance and support to CSOs in developing their project proposals (*Indicative Activity 4.4*) should not be concluded at the evaluation/selection stage. Since complete proposals would be prepared only by CSOs whose Project Concepts have been

endorsed by the respective National Screening Board, such encouragement will inevitably pave the way for high expectations in relation to receiving CASE grants for their projects. Thus, the (rather disillusioned) proponents of eliminated projects should be provided with convincing justification for respective elimination, coupled with guidance on possible improvement areas, with a view towards building their capacities for future projects and initiatives.

Project reporting is expected to play a key and critical role in terms of the efficient and smooth functioning of the CASE project cycle, including the assessment of the level of progress, quality and timeliness of activities, and the flow of grant instalments. On the other hand, in the light of the identified weakness of target CSOs in general, it may not be realistic to assume that the quality of reporting would meet the anticipated standards. The capacity building activities therefore should also encompass the essential reporting aspect. In this context, it is recommended that at least one capacity development programme should be organized in each pilot country with a specific focus on the management and reporting under the grantee projects.

### **A2.5.2 Capacity Building for Networking**

A precondition for the success and sustainability of the CASE Initiative is the development and strengthening of networks that reflect productive and effective co-operation amongst the full range of CSOs and other stakeholders (including NGOs, local authorities, universities, private sector organizations, etc.) to respond to the wide spectrum and complexity of environment/security issues and problems encountered in each pilot country.

There is as a result, a pressing need for designing and implementing capacity building activities for strengthening decentralized co-operation in pilot countries, focusing on a series of network-building and institutional development activities geared toward the various types of constituents of these networks.

Technical assistance under CASE to be provided to CSOs for the development of their project concepts and full proposals should also focus on establishing linkages with network building and institutional development programmes.

In collaboration with relevant national, regional and international organizations partnering with OSCE, the CASE Initiative could serve as a catalyst for the varying types of capacity building activities in pilot countries via promoting and supporting the development of special and tailor-made programmes by the media (particularly by TVs), as well as by relevant training and academic institutions (particularly by the universities). Such initiatives may include, *inter alia*, the following:

- Promoting the preparation of documentaries, organization of topical short film festivals, etc. on the interface of environment and security issues, and highlighting the role of CSOs in addressing these issues.
- Promoting the development of special certificate programmes by the universities for CSOs, focusing on the interface of environment and security.
- Promoting the inclusion of environment/security topics in the official training curricula of academic institutions.
- Encouraging/providing incentives for scientific researches and publications to focus on topics directly related to the interface of environment and security issues.
- Specifically encouraging thesis topics (via scholarships and other incentives) to focus on the interface of environment and security in higher education/degree programmes.

## A2.6 Needs/Capabilities Assessment

The Capacity Building Framework delineated above is recommended to be complemented and reinforced by a Needs/Capabilities Assessment Study, whose scope may be more modest in the initial phase of CASE implementation, and be gradually expanded in due course.

In this context, for the purposes of developing a reliable and updated information and data base in relation to CSOs in pilot countries upon which capacity building programmes of CASE are to be based, the initial focus is recommended to be placed on conducting such a Needs/Capabilities Assessment Study on a country basis.

In particular, the Needs/Capabilities Assessment is anticipated to include, *inter alia*, the following:

- Identification of different types of CSOs in pilot countries.
- Identification of the expectations of relevant CSOs from the CASE Initiative.
- Assessment of the capabilities of relevant CSOs in each pilot country, with particular emphasis upon the integration of environment and security issues.
- Assessment of the overall role and functions of CSOs in their respective context, and the level of their participation and effectiveness in the networks engaged in the integration of environment and security issues.
- Identification and assessment of institutional weaknesses of different types of CSOs, and assessment of capacity building, training and information needs to remedy deficiencies and weaknesses.
- Assessment of policy development needs for the integration of environment and security issues, as well as for the development of country legal frameworks.
- Identification and assessment of case studies or “best practices” on community participation in integrated environment and security issues.

The Needs/Capabilities Assessment(s) should not be conceived as a one-time event, but must be continuously updated and expanded. In this respect, the scope of CASE activities in subsequent phase(s) should also include the updating of country-specific Needs/Capabilities Assessment, preferably on an annual basis.

## **ATTACHMENT 3: Sustainability Framework**

This Attachment contains integrated and intertwined sections in relation to the Sustainability Framework, including the purpose, achieving project and programme sustainability, the need for a Strategic Framework, performance appraisal, and resource mobilization.

### **A3.1 Purpose of the Sustainability Framework**

The purpose of the Sustainability Framework is to provide a basis for consideration and discussion by OCEEA (and its country networks) for ensuring the sustainability of the CASE Initiative and its successful conduct in the subsequent phases, in the light of the evaluation of the first phase implementation of CASE.

### **A3.2 Achieving Project and Programme Sustainability**

Taking into consideration that CASE is in essence a Small Grants Programme, the sustainability of the programme will be directly linked to (or rather, be determined by) the successful conduct and sustainability of the projects that it supports.

The capacity building activities and technical assistance planned to be delivered under CASE are anticipated to have a significant positive impact on the conduct and completion of the grantee projects in a satisfactory and successful manner. On the other hand, there is apparently a greater challenge in terms of ensuring the sustainability of grantee projects (as well as the networks and partnerships established by virtue of these projects) beyond the grant period.

In this respect, the Strategic Framework recommended to be formulated (in Section A3.3 below) for the revision and improvement of regional and country-level strategies and implementations should include specific strategies geared toward achieving the sustainability of projects supported under CASE. In the formulation of such specific strategies, the following points, *inter alia*, may be taken into consideration:

- Emphasis should be given to ensure that each grantee project includes realistic and adequate means and mechanisms geared toward achieving the sustainability of the project subsequent to the termination of CASE grant.
- During the course of implementation, specific technical assistance and capacity building efforts may be devoted to work together with the partners and stakeholders of the grantee projects to overview/monitor and appropriately revise the particular sustainability framework for each project.
- Each CASE Country Strategy may include specific strategies geared toward achieving the sustainability of projects in the respective country, drawing parallels with the resource mobilization framework to generate additional funding for enhancing sustainability.
- Depending upon the nature of the grantee projects, enhancing sustainability may be sought through exploring alternative modalities of utilizing the project outputs and products, including marketing opportunities, self-sustaining training courses, etc., as appropriate.
- Relevant experience of small grants programmes of a similar nature in trying to achieve the sustainability of projects may be closely examined for drawing lessons (to this purpose, for example, the Terms of Reference of a consultancy assignment for the formulation of the CASE Strategic Framework may include specific provisions to focus on such an examination/analysis.)
- In addition to, or coupled with learning from the experiences of other similar programmes, collaboration and partnerships may be developed with these programmes (in particular, with OSCE-supported initiatives) to create a synergy in enhancing sustainability.

### A3.3 Need for a Strategic Framework

One of the preconditions for ensuring the sustainability of the CASE Initiative and its successful continuation in the subsequent phases is to develop a **Strategic Framework** to provide guidance to OCEEA (and country networks) for the revision and improvement of regional and country-level strategies and implementations.

During the formulation of the Strategic Framework, the following points, *inter alia*, may be taken into consideration:

- Ensuring that the evaluation of the first phase implementation clearly identifies the strengths and weaknesses, and challenges and opportunities of the CASE Initiative both at regional and country levels to provide a firm ground to build upon for the subsequent phase(s) of implementations.
- In the light of the feedback from regional and country-level implementations, reviewing (and appropriately revising) the CASE Guidelines, including but not limited to the priority topics, evaluation criteria, disbursements, M&E Framework etc., as well as the Communications Strategy, Capacity Building Framework, and Sustainability Framework (particularly the resource mobilization strategy.)
- In the light of the feedback particularly from the constituents of National Screening Boards and other stakeholders, reviewing (and appropriately revising) the respective CASE Country Strategies.
- Focusing on the development of project portfolios in pilot countries that collectively reinforce CASE output targets and provide adequate justification for the continuation of CASE in the subsequent phase(s).
- Ensuring that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) functions (encompassing the project, country and corporate levels) become fully integrated and internalized within the administrative/operational framework of CASE.
- Ensuring that the Strategic Framework incorporates a *Resource Mobilization Strategy* to be prepared to assist OSCE/OCEEA to establish new partnerships and to have access to additional co-financing in a more systematic manner.
- Ensuring that the Strategic Framework incorporates specific strategies geared towards achieving the sustainability of the projects supported under CASE, as well as the sustainability of the programme itself.
- Overseeing that CASE implementations promote and support decentralized co-operation via CSO networks at the regional and country levels, and create a synergy in addressing the interface of environment and security issues.
- Ensuring that the CASE Initiative is equipped with, and maintains the essential flexibility to respond promptly and adequately to the changing needs and circumstances in the pilot countries.

### A3.4 Performance Appraisal

As an integral aspect of sustainability, a **performance appraisal system** is recommended to be developed for evaluating the impact of the CASE Initiative, and providing constructive management feedback to OCEEA (and its country networks).

The framework of the performance appraisal should involve the development of a performance measurement system for monitoring and supervising CASE implementations, both at the regional and country levels.

Performance appraisal should provide adequate input for enabling OCEEA to identify areas of improvement and to cope with problem areas. The criteria to be used in performance appraisal should indicate the extent to which the identified outputs of CASE are satisfactorily attained. The resulting appraisal should enable OCEEA to recognize the required changes and revisions in the overall framework of the CASE Initiative.

Performance appraisal should also enable the Monitoring and Evaluation of ongoing and completed activities in terms of both quantitative indicators (constituents of local networks established, number of volunteers involved, number of hours trained, etc.) and qualitative indicators (gender perspective, involvement of the women and youth, mobilization of local communities, etc.)

It is important that the concept of performance measurement be fully integrated into the overall framework of CASE so that, among other numerous benefits, the subsequent phases be effectively planned to attain its overarching goals and targets.

### **A3.5 Resource Mobilization**

In terms of sustainability of the CASE Initiative, considerable efforts should be devoted to resource mobilization and thereby having access to additional funds from non-OSCE sources, in particular from other international organizations, to complement CASE funds and amplify the impacts and outreach of the programme.

The crucial aspect of CASE operations would be to provide adequate and sustained justification for the relevant international organizations and donors to be convinced of the value of this initiative, and thus confidently providing additional funds to support the subsequent phase(s) of CASE.

In this context, it is recommended that the Strategic Framework to be developed in the light of the first phase implementations of CASE should also incorporate a **Resource Mobilization Strategy** to assist OSCE/OCEEA to establish new partnerships and to have access to additional co-financing in a more systematic manner.

During the formulation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy, the following points, *inter alia*, may be taken into consideration:

- Should the CASE Initiative be credited for and positively identified with the effective functioning of CSO networks specialized in the interface of environment and security issues in pilot countries, it would apparently be in a prime position vis-à-vis international and other organizations aiming to benefit from these networks in relation to pursuing their own policies and programmes.
- In terms of having access to external funds, the “networking” approach is anticipated to play a key role. Although networking is the “harder way” of conducting activities in respective pilot countries, one of the main areas that this approach would pay its dividends is the drawing of the attention of the international community and the funding agencies to the pertinent activities in the region.
- The involvement of international organizations should not be sought in the form of passive donors, but rather, as encouraging them to become “stakeholders” in environment-security related areas that are in accord with their own priorities, and thereby benefit from their involvement and partnership.
- Additional resources should not necessarily be sought outside the OSCE region, but special efforts should be devoted to collaborating with relevant ongoing and/or planned programmes in the region, such as ENVSEC, GEF, etc, with a view towards creating a multiplying effect and synergy.

- In-kind and voluntary contributions particularly by NGOs and other CSOs should be valued (a monetary value to be assigned, as appropriate) and recorded in formal financial reporting under CASE.
- A fundamental longer-term objective of the decentralized co-operation policy of CASE should be to encourage the local networks to be more self-reliant, and to strengthen their own resource mobilization.
- Taking into consideration that strong and effective communications are important elements in facilitating resource mobilization, the linkages between CASE Communications Strategy and the Resource Mobilization Strategy should be firmly established.