

Merhaba Özge aşağıdaki metin onay beklemekte. Onay gelince paylaşabileceğim

Limiting Children right to associate

One of the obstacles we have faced with our sub-granting programmes was that we were not able to fund child groups directly. This due to the EU rule where it stated that we could only distribute grants to “organisations” with legal personality. It is my observation that child organizing will increase in the upcoming years and defining the child’s right to association through legal personality will be dangerous as it will mostly lead to child NGOs set up by adults with political agendas.

- Would require rules facilitating of delivering grants for child groups with Sivil Düşün model
- Would require sub granting terms to be longer

Long-term benefit for the Grantee Organisation

As sub granting modality, Sivil Düşün model seems to be the one with less risks because the following issue does not arise: *when we give the grant to the NGO and it fails to deliver any results how do we get the money back and how will we report it to the donor (EU)*. Although Sivil Düşün model and Micro-funds model are beneficial to small CSOs, in the long term there needs to be mid-size opportunities where part of the grant remains to CSOs for its sustainability in the midterm.

- Would require the donor (EU) to take more responsibility
- Would require more person power on the part of the donor to intervene and facilitate decisions where there is a conflict between the grantee and the NGO that delivers grants

Monitoring

Another issue is that, sub granting by NGOs is not sustainable. If the idea is to strengthen the midsize to big NGOs in their efforts of sub granting in order to transform them into actors where they actually participate to the management of funds in the long run; there need to be possibilities for bigger grants for CSOs instead of consultancy companies.

If that is the case, stronger monitoring mechanisms and incentives for the monitoring of the implementation of both sub grants and grants and monitoring of the potential impact would be needed. Currently programme indicators are determined by the CSOs. A pre-determined rule for conducting project monitoring where its budget is not included in the grant can be proposed. Tailor-cut programme monitoring and developing/adapting indicators require sizable source which cannot always be the priority of the NGO. With regards to the sub-granting, our experience showed that it was easier to independently assess the outputs and outcomes of our Microfunds programme and grantee projects with regards to assessing the outputs and outcomes of the big Project implemented directly by us. For sub-granting programme we hired a full-time monitoring expert and our Grant expert also took an active role in the monitoring programme. Of course in order to better see the outcome on children, child specific methodologies are needed.

Cooperation- mentoring and partnership building

Sub granting programmes that are managed by NGOs in their field of expertise as the advantage of (unlike other sub granting organisations managed by other actors) building stronger networks within civil society and with our constituency. When a CSO is doing the sub-granting it is always more than just following up on deadlines and project reports. We have helped NGOs to get in touch with their constituency at the

local level by proposing methodologies, we have helped them building partnerships at the local level, we have helped them to reach quality information. In return we have learned a lot about specific child rights issues, new modalities for advocacy. Overall, the entire process is leading and will lead to stronger advocacy initiatives. Therefore, it is very important to underline that when the grant programme ends, the partnership between the grantee and granting organisation does not.

Maturity Assessment

If there is going to be a rights based country performance monitoring system,

- The global indicator set need to be open addition of specific indicators by some CSOs or CSO networks. These could be than classified as proxy indicators at the central level if needed.
- Information gathering and fact checking could be problematic when State does not share information. We often do campaigns and lobbying visits and even if we observe minor reforms in these areas we are not in a position to understand the link between our action ad the general outcome.
- Data (official and CSO) in the field of at least violence against children is absolutely not sufficient for a maturity assessment.
- Could UN Independent Experts and convention committees be a source of information for maturity assessment?
- Will the outcome of the maturity assessment effect the funds for civil society? If so won't there be an extra pressure on CSOs?
- The maturity assessment will need to be accompanied by reforms in the national information management and data collection systems (Turkstat, judicial statistics etc)
- Can the performance reports by the State be open to public?
- If the State scores low points in an area does this mean more funds or less funds?
-

Işıl Erdemli

Uluslararası Çocuk Merkezi | International Children's Center

Çocuk Hakları Program Koordinatörü | Child Rights Program Coordinator

Tel: +90 312 290 2714

Fax: +90 [312 266 4678](tel:+903122664678)

Follow us on:

@ICCchildrights

@VACPrevention

@cocuklarlaguclu

