POLICY PAPER

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

Yerevan Press Club

EASTERN PARTNERSHIP
Civil Society Forum

CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT
IN POLICY DIALOGUE
IN ARMENIA

ICCN   Konrad Adenauer Stiftung   DIS   DNA   AKT   TRANSTEC   Асамблея

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

CONTENTS

ICCN   Konrad Adenauer Stiftung   DIS   DNA   AKT   TRANSTEC   Асамблея

Armenia

INTRODUCTION

This study is conducted by Yerevan Press Club and the Secretariat of the Armenian National Platform of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum with the support of the project "Civil society dialogue for progress" financed by the European Union. The goal of the study is to enhance the civil society (CS) participation in policy dialogue as an essential element to insure democratic, transparent and accountable policy making processes.

The project aimed to examine and evaluate the patterns of the Armenian civil society engagement in policy dialogue. The findings of the study lead to recommendations and policy advice as how to contribute to strengthening of the CS role in the reform process specifically in the frames of EU-Armenia cooperation. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

a) to gain a better understanding of how CSOs engage in policy making;

b) assess the achievements, relevance, effectiveness and outcome of their work, as well as to collect some best practices of CS participation in policy dialogue;
c) identify the enabling and disabling factors affecting CSO willingness and ability to play an effective role in the reform process;

d) discuss strengths and weaknesses of respective support strategies;

e) assess the public and media environment enabling Armenian civil society to be an influential actor in various areas of social-political life;

f) provide recommendations for future support to CSOs in the area of policy dialogue.

The study was designed as a comprehensive framework which included principal stakeholders and expertise in the field. It was built on the following methods:

Armenia

• qualitative in-depth interviews with competent persons (government, CS representatives, social scientists, intellectuals, journalists) dedicated to various aspects and tools of policy dialogue;

• focus group discussions with civil society representatives to identify patterns of CS participation in policy dialogue, learn about the existing perceptions as to the level of efficiency of CS participation, factors hindering a constructive dialogue between the CS and authorities as well as suggestions on how to improve CS participation.

The focus groups discussions included:

– sector-specific NGO representatives (human rights, democratic governance, equal opportunities, environmental protection, education, etc.);

– representatives of public councils adherent to public institutions, intellectual circles and media;

– representatives of NGO networks, alliances;

– members of the Armenian National Platform of the EaP Civil Society Forum A specific component of the research was the media monitoring intended to study the coverage of civil society activities and its engagement in the policy dialogue which to a certain extent demonstrates the importance of the SC as an institute in the various fields of public life.

The one-month monitoring conducted in March 2015 covered 6 leading media outlets and determined:

– the frequency and dynamics of references to the CS activity;

– patterns of CS participation coverage;

– factors influencing media attention and attitude towards the civil society.

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COMPONENTS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In the framework of the study 20 in-depth interviews were conducted on March 1-10, 2015.

The standard questionnaire comprised of 15 questions was employed in the interviews with 20 representatives of the following groups: RA Government and the ruling party, opposition parties, NGOs, media, experts, intellectuals. Later, the answers of the respondents were summarized, analyzed and combined with the results of focus group interviews and media monitoring.

See Appendix 1: List of participants of the interviews.

The following questions were included in the standard questionnaire:

1. In which sectors in Armenia do you see an opportunity for policy dialogue between the government and the civil society?

2. Have you ever taken part in an initiative of policy dialogue between the government and the civil society? What is your experience in this regard?

3. What examples of productive cooperation in policy dialogue between the government and the civil society can you bring from the past? What are the success stories?

4. Are you aware of any ongoing process of policy dialogue between the government and the civil society?

5. How would you assess the policy dialogue between the RA government and the civil society in Armenia?

6. How would you assess the accountability of the state bodies to the public?

Armenia

7. Are you aware which legislative acts or agreements provide for policy dialogue between the RA authorities and the civil society? Are those provisions sufficient for ensuring policy dialogue between the government and the civil society?

8. How would you assess the role of public conscience and national peculiarities in the process of promoting policy dialogue between the government and the civil society: is it rather negative or positive?

9. To what extent referendum can be considered as public participation in decision-making and policy-making processes?

10. Do you consider rallies an effective platform for civic activism and raising public issues? And what about the street protests of the civic activists?

11. Do brutal force and violence of the law enforcement bodies during the rallies and against dissidents silence the voice of the public?

12. Does the National Assembly realize its mandate of public dialogue and public participation in decision making through meetings with the voters?

13. Do the media allocate due attention to the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society?

14. How would you assess the performance of the public councils?

15. Are you aware of the experience of other countries in the field of policy dialogue, both successful and not? Are there practices that can be implemented in Armenia? What is more appropriate for Armenia? What will work here and what will not?

Armenia

FOCUS GROUPS DISCUSSIONS

In the framework of the study 5 focus group discussions were conducted in March 11-20, 2015 with 30 participants (6 in each group), including representatives of civic groups, government structures, movements, journalists, intellectuals and civic activists who play a certain role in different spheres of public life of Armenia.

The topics of focus group discussions were developed on the basis of the initial analysis of in-depth expert interviews' results which were conducted with a standard questionnaire. The aim was to create a free and easy environment for group discussions, to bring out the issues of public participation in policy making in Armenia, and collect opinions of different public groups regarding the opportunities of policy dialogue between the government and the society.

Thereafter, the results of the focus group discussions were edited and summarized; all the expressed opinions were compared and combined with answers obtained during in-depth interviews and the results of the media monitoring, to get the overall picture of the public opinion and come up with conclusions and recommendations based on that data.

See Appendix 2: List of participants of focus group discussions.

MEDIA MONITORING

Yerevan Press Club conducted a monitoring of the coverage of civil society engagement in policy dialogue between the Armenian government and the civil society by the Armenian media from March 1 to March 31 of 2015.

The objective of the monitoring was to conduct a qualitative analysis based on the acquired quantitative data and to find out how actively the Armenian media cover the activities of the civil society organizations and the policy dialogue between the RA government and the civil society, as well as to determine the main accents of the coverage of these topics in the Armenian media.

Armenia

The monitoring covered 6 media outlets of Armenia: 3 national TV channels –
First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1), "Armenia" TV, "Yerkir
Media" TV; 3 online media – Aravot.am, online version of the of "Aravot" daily
(http://www.aravot.am), Lragir.am (http://www.lragir.am) and News.am
(http://www.news.am).

The objects of the monitoring were: from broadcast media – the main newscasts,
information-analytical and social-political programmes (talk shows in the
format "guest in the studio", etc.) of the above mentioned TV channels aired from
19.00 to 24.00, except the commercial, political, social advertisement and
announcements, cross-programme announcements and ticker; in the online
media – all archived pieces (from the previous day) of the above mentioned
online publications, except for commercial /political / social advertisement and
announcements, "plain" photographs (out of publications and without titles or
captions).

METHODOLOGY OF THE MONITORING

The primary subject of the study was TV and online material.

During the monitoring data on the following categories was obtained and docu-
mented:

1. Total number of studied materials.

2. Number and connotation (positive, negative or neutral) of references to repre-
sentatives of Armenian civil society (NGOs, coalitions, groups, including those of
informal civil society activists / individual civil society activists, trade unions,
associations of employers and entrepreneurs, etc.).

3. Number of references to current topics in the studied materials and mentions
of the representatives of civil society in them.

Several urgent issues which were topical in the period of the monitoring from
the perspective of policy dialogue were selected for the study.

Armenia

- Events dedicated to centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915

- European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations

- Eurasian integration of Armenia

- Initiative to change the legislation on non-governmental organizations

- Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia

- The issue of payment of wage arrears to employees of "Nairit" plant.

The number of referrals to the above mentioned topics in the studied materials, and if they contain any kind of references to the representatives of civil society (their role, objectives, opinions, positions, etc.) were determined.

Number of studied materials about policy dialogue between the RA government and the civil society of Armenia (information about meetings of civil society representatives with authorities, about common projects and events, cited statements, description of activities related to such dialogue, etc.), as well as sources of information mentioned in the materials who spoke about policy dialogue (journalists, representatives of international/donor community, diplomatic missions, etc.).

Quantitative data obtained from the monitoring were presented on each of the media which were monitored as well as combined into tables by type of media (broadcast and online) and total rates of the 6 media *(see Appendix 3)*.

A qualitative analysis of media coverage was conducted based on the results of the obtained data, and was further correlated with the results of in-depth interviews and focus group discussions.

Armenia

STUDY REPORT

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON of the results of all the study components revealed attitudes of SC sector, government, political opposition, intellectuals and media towards the engagement of the civil society in policy dialogue. The report presents generalized perceptions about areas where civil society participated in decision making in this or that way, as well as regarding the forms of that participation. Assessments are given to institutions designed to ensure policy dialogue, its legislative basis and the level of accountability of the authorities. The report summarizes opinions of the study participants regarding the influence of national peculiarities (mentality) and external political factors on fostering CS participation in reforms, and opportunities of implementation of advanced foreign practices in Armenia. Special attention is given to the role of the media in promoting CS engagement in policy dialogue and public assessments of that role.

THE STUDY SHOWED that all the active social groups included in the research (representatives of government bodies, political opposition, civil society, media, intellectuals) allocate a great importance to policy dialogue. According to views and opinions expressed during in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, all the respondents believe that there cannot be an effective state policy without dialogue between the authorities and the society in all the spheres of public life. At the same time, government representatives and respondents sharing their positions assess the situation in this field a lot more positively compared with the other participants who hold more critical views about the situation in the country and the reform process. The former group views the existing obstacles to the dialogue as natural yet temporal factors, whereas the latter group tends to see a systematic problem which cannot be overcome by itself and requires fundamental changes.

In particular, CS representatives accuse the authorities for absence or lack of dialogue, whereas the government representatives believe that the shortcomings will be overcome with the further development of the civil society. The majority of the representatives of government bodies think that NGOs are often

Armenia

not competent, whereas their opponents accuse the government bodies for imitational dialogue, and creating an illusion of cooperation with the civil society[1]. There is lack of mutual confidence; constructive suggestions are very few. A number of respondents noted a deficit of the culture of dialogue in the Armenian society in general, while suggesting different ideas as to how it should be built and what should be the priorities. Some government officials interviewed during the study said that in some areas (environment, human rights) NGOs are too radical, and on the opposite side radicalism was justified by particularly unacceptable situation in these sectors.

According to the prevailing opinion, government-civil society discussions are held in the form of "top-down communication", wherein the officials simply inform the civil society about their decisions, or at best, listen to alternative suggestions but never take them into account. Consequently, given that discussions are never transformed into tangible results, the attitude towards the process of the dialogue is increasingly cold.

Representatives of opposition parties state that there exists an artificial confrontation between the civil society and political forces, whereas only the cooperation of the two would allow for formation of a resource that can counter the monopoly of the government in decision making. Some of the intellectuals, to an extent sharing the opinion of common citizens, expressed the view that there shouldn't be dividing lines between the political forces and the civil society, as only the joint effort of the two can insure good results.

The majority of the NGO representatives, though, traditionally is skeptical about cooperation with political parties, and simply did not comment on this issue during the interviews. Thus, on one hand we observe clear division between political and civic sectors due to various factors which is also reflected in the relevant legislation. On the other hand, it can be implied that although in the recent years the political opposition has repeatedly expressed willingness to

[1] Unwillingness of some officials to be interviewed in the framework of this study also indicates about the existing attitudes towards the policy dialogue, as an important process

Armenia

closely cooperate with the civil society sector, the latter rejected the idea, due to lack of consistent action on behalf of opposition parties.

The study confirmed that in the recent years there is a common opinion that CSOs influence the government policies more effectively than the political opposition.

A typical indicator is the personal experience of the respondents of participation in policy dialogue. Out of 20 participants of in-depth interviews 16 had such experience, four of which were disappointed or dissatisfied with it. The interviews also showed relatively low awareness of the respondents about precedents of policy dialogue in Armenia. Mostly, they were aware only of those cases wherein they participated personally or about the cases that were widely covered by media.

AMONG FREQUENTLY MENTIONED FACTORS impeding the policy dialogue of the civil society with the government, is the lack of trust among CSOs and their inability (in some cases unwillingness) to come up with a joint position. Perhaps this is partly because of the existing competition in the CSO field, the desire to acquire leadership in communication with the government, "copyright" on a particular initiative or influence over policy in a particular area. To an extent, this is a consequence of not only "professional" ambitions, but also the struggle for the sympathy of donors, often encouraged by the latter. This divide, according to a number of study participants, allows the authorities to "negotiate" (or create the appearance of agreement) with the most "convenient", "not-problematic" (read: loyal) segment of the nongovernmental sector.

This practice further deepened mistrust within the civil society, wherein one camp accuses the other for lack of independence, subordination to government circles (the label "GONGO"), and the other camp blames the former for excessive politicization, non-constructive criticism, or worse, for "grant-eating" and serving the interests of the external opponents of Armenia.

Consequently, the reputation of the CSO sector is questioned in the society, especially since according to one of the participants of the interviews "perhaps

Armenia

only 150 out of 5000 registered NGOs are truly functional".

NGOs which are member to networks and alliances, view this segregation as the root cause of the internal contradictions in the CS sector. At the same time, there is a certain concern about the networks that "pocket NGOs" will take the lead there, which will allow the authorities to use these networks to reduce the impact of the true civil society. In fact, SCO coalitions are formed only in the frameworks of projects implemented or supported by international structures, wherein the inclusion of the civil society is compulsory. In some cases, these alliances are formed by the orders from above to create imitation of participation and nothing more. At the same time a positive example of cooperation network of NGOs are Aarhus Centers, which are created without the intervention of the authorities, yet the latter have an obligation to cooperate with them.

ANOTHER COMMON BELIEF is that politicization of issues becomes an obstacle for effective dialogue. CS representatives are often accused for resorting to political provocations instead of productive discussion. At the same time there is no clear understanding as to what "politicization" is, as issues related to human rights, democratic freedoms, free and fair elections, rule of law, are among the priorities of the civil society and inevitably lead to political discussion. Issues like environmental protection and fight against corruption are not directly related to the political system, but still cause major confrontation among the CS sector, and consensus is rarely reached here too.

To put it differently, conflict in the dialogue and in the absence thereof is often what the concept "politicization" is based upon. Politicization is inevitable whenever the position of independent civil society institutions undermine primary interests of the ruling elite which are not always legitimate. To limit the dialogue only to areas where the probability of touching upon those interests is minimal or excluded, would narrow the mission of the civil society to an unacceptably small scale. On the other hand, one cannot deny the cases where political ambitions of some representatives of non-governmental organizations may obstruct mutual understanding and constructive communication.

Armenia

ANOTHER REASON FOR INSUFFICIENTLY EFFECTIVE DIALOGUE, frequently mentioned by the respondents, is the social polarization in Armenia, weakness of the "middle class" as the social base for developed civil society, in its wider sense. That is why, there is no sufficient internal demand for active participation of the civil society in decision making.

Some of the respondents of in-depth interviews, as well as all focus group discussions noted the important role of the international community and international cooperation of Armenia in promoting the dialogue. In particular, it was noted that there has been a positive shift since 2009 (when the EU initiative of "Eastern Partnership" was launched); before the initiative the dialogue was mainly of a formal character, but recently its productivity increased (below this topic is presented more detailed). At the same time, conditionality of inclusion of the civil society in the reform process mainly by external factors (international programmes) raises serious concerns among the CS sector. "The government gets in touch with the civil society only when the promise of big money from the abroad is conditioned by the inclusion of the civil society", said one of the participants of the focus groups.

Summarizing the factors promoting dialogue between the authorities and civil society institutions, another participant of the discussions said that the dialogue will take place "if there are no political consequences for personal interests, if there is a requirement from international partners or when otherwise there is a threat of rebellion".

BEFORE 2008 the possibility of rebellion was discussed only in the context of post-election protests, when the government is not inclined to concessions and dialogue as a rule. In recent years, however, there is increasingly more talk about protests initiated by informal civic movements. In particular, the respondents in this study often referred to protests against public transport fare increase, cumulative pension system, changes in the working conditions of the drivers, etc. In general, participants of the study representing non-governmental sector believe that rallies and street protests are undoubtedly effective. One of the respondents made the following comparison: "When 5000 people sign a letter to the government, it does not have the effect of 5000 people taking the

Armenia

streets". In other words, in the absence of effective institutionalized mechanisms of interaction between the authorities and the citizens, rallies are not only acceptable, but necessary. Rallies are more of an extreme measure but in Armenia, as part of the respondents believe, most of the other measures are exhausted or no longer trustworthy. Notably, even the proponents of street protests realize the associated risks, e.g. such forms of civic participation, as a rule, lack strategic vision and are susceptible to manipulative influences. Additionally, the authorities have an experience in suppressing such protests, including through brutal force of law enforcement bodies. At the same time, representatives of government structures acknowledge the right of citizens to protest and the fact that sometimes the rallies contribute to certain results, nevertheless the attitudes to those actions are ambiguous. According to some of them, if the rallies are political, they normally do not seek to address certain issues or reforms, but are rather aimed at ousting or weakening the current government. If the initiatives are exclusively civil, they can contribute to achieving immediate results, however in cases where consistent action is required to find the best solutions, they bring little to no results. More precisely, the above mentioned protest actions against increase of public transport fare, implementation of cumulative pension system, changes in the working conditions of taxi drivers stopped some processes causing public discontent but did not contribute to necessary reforms in the relevant sectors.

Participants of the study divided in their opinions whether the street protests taking the form of conflict can be considered a dialogue. The respondents answered this question both affirmatively (in any case protest is a way to deliver the position of certain sectors of the society to decision makers) and negatively (protest does not contribute to conscious, mutually acceptable solution). At the same time, most of the respondents agree that concessions achieved through pressure not always yield the best solutions.

Actions like flesh mobs were assessed quite positively. They are not necessarily confrontational but can be quite effective due to creative approaches. Given that strong social ties within the Armenian society, the importance of factors such as self-esteem, reputation in the community, play a great role here, these aspects can be utilized in the design of the flash mobs, making them a promising method of dialogue.

Armenia

Majority of the respondents also agree that street protests became so wide-spread, because civilized and legitimate forms of participation in policymaking commonly employed in democratic society, i.e. elections, representative government structures, referendums, are mostly discredited in Armenia.

ACCORDING TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY, referendum is the most important tool of immediate influence on exercise of power. Amendments to legislation of local referendums and the recent steps taken in that regard give some hope that this tool will be employed. Nevertheless, serious problems remain unaddressed. The trust of citizens in this instrument of expression of will is low; unlike elections, the referendum campaigns are not regulated. 25% of turnout threshold is not enough to make conclusions about public opinion. Respondents stressed the importance of implementing electronic voting system and introduction of mechanisms that will allow to conduct referendums initiated not only by the government but also by citizens.

According to the respondents, National Assembly (parliament) of Armenia does not fulfill one of its functions, which is serving as a communication channel between the MPs and the public. Some participants shared their observation that even when MPs do meet with voters, the latter communicate requests of purely material nature. Substantial policy discussion pertaining this or that sphere almost never takes place between the MPs and the voters, especially given that, according to respondents, only a few MPs have the willingness and the competence to discuss such issues with their electorate.

One of the participants made an interesting observation that "It might sound strange but when a Republican[2] says something it will not be as impressive for the upper circles of the government as when the same idea is expressed by someone like Nikol Pashinyan[3]..."

This statement implies that there are certain opportunities for those MPs who are ready to use the parliamentary platform to raise issues of concern for the

[2] Republican Party of Armenia (RPA) -ruling party of the country
[3] Opposition MP, Board member of "Civic Contract" part

Armenia

society and who do not avoid dialogue with the public, thereby trying to make the legislative body an important instrument for the development of policy dialogue/consultation. However, as it was already mentioned, very few MPs do that. According to some of the participants, MPs should meet with their voters at least twice a month. The latter does not take place, however. There are regions where the voters don't even know the name of their MP. A number of respondents voiced a common belief that MPs and many voters are completely "paid off" to one another already during the elections, as the MPs give out so called "electoral bribes" (in average 5000 AMD) and the voters take them in exchange to their vote. Thereafter, none of the deputies has any obligations to the people.

One of the forms of dialogue increasing the quality of parliamentary work, are hearings with participation of civil society experts. As noted by one of the respondents, "participation of competent NGOs in parliamentary hearings is quite effective". However, CS participation is not always ensured. For example, representation of CSOs interested in enhancement of EU-Armenia cooperation in the parliamentary hearings preceding the Riga summit of Eastern Partnership[4] was quite limited.

Another important form of CS participation in the reform process is its involvement in monitoring of reform implementation. Whenever the monitoring does not turn into imitation, the positive effect is obvious. As positive examples of this process, the participants mentioned the activities of the monitoring group of penitentiary institutions under the Ministry of Justice. This precedent deserves attention, since government was directly involved in the formation of the group, yet the CS representatives involved in the group were given ample opportunity to act independently.

AS SPECIFIC AREAS where policy dialogue between the CS and the authorities was in place, respondents more frequently mentioned freedom of speech and information, Open Governance Partnership, local self-governance, legislation on NGOs, rights of people with disabilities. It was noted that there is certain open-

[4] Eastern Partnership Summit in Riga took place on May 21-22, 2015

Armenia

ness on behalf of the authorities to cooperate in these areas and NGOs dealing with these issues are sufficiently competent. At the same time, it was stressed that it is not so much the willingness of the parties to discuss the problems that matters, but rather achievement of practical results. There is no point in speaking about dialogue, if there are no results. In particular, the above mentioned Open Governance Partnership in spite of involvement of competent CS representatives had very limited practical results in Armenia. Whereas, cooperation of "Unison" NGO with Yerevan municipality and Ministry of Territorial Administration and Emergency Situations contributed to employment of 30 persons with disabilities and more ramps in Yerevan.

Several respondents are impressed with non-formal civic initiatives, which achieved results not due to openness of the government but through protest actions and pressure. This primarily applies to spheres such as urban planning, environmental protection and protection of monuments. Even in issues such as recovery of salary arrears to "Nairit" plant employees or the pension reform, where the institutional party of dialogue with the government (primarily labor unions) should have had a say, certain steps by the government to meet the interests of citizens where taken not due to actions of the unions but rather after street rallies.

Representatives of government agencies taking part in the study acknowledged the need for dialogue in all sectors without exception but, at the same time, referred to deficit of competence among CS organizations in a number of issues which, in their opinion, was the reason of ineffective dialogue. In the areas where there are reputable, principled and knowledgeable NGOs, the chances of dialogue are better.

More specifically, participants mentioned incompatibility of the activeness and desire of NGOs to participate in formation of national security policy with the level of their awareness and knowledge of specifics of relevant issues. Meanwhile, the latter can be due to excessive secrecy, making the information on the respevtive issues unavailable for CS representatives and independent experts.

For their part, CS representatives brought examples when the high level of their competence little contributed to constructive dialogue. This primarily refers to

Armenia

environmental issues, where results, if obtained, are only due to protests and other forms of pressure on central and local government.

ONE OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY was to find out the opinion of the respondents as to what extent the RA legislation encourages policy dialogue. Most of them believe that there is no need for special legislation in this field; effective legislation on NGOs, referendums, local self-governance, etc. creating conditions for participation of non-governmental sector in decision making would suffice. Additionally, there are existing formats in the framework of international cooperation with Armenia which entail dialogue between the government and the civil society.

However, as the participants of the study stressed, citizens, including CSO representatives, are not sufficiently aware about laws and international obligations of RA, or otherwise not always know how to use their rights. More specifically, although legislation on legal acts provides for participation of society in policy making, usually this takes a form of imitation.

Armenia signed European charter on "Participation in local self-governance" which provides opportunity to community members to discuss any issue in the representative body of the local self-governance - council of elders, even on the basis of signatures of 1-2% of the community. Lowest age threshold to sign the petition is 16. However, the respondents were not aware of any precedent of using this opportunity in any of the communities. And the main reason for it is the lack of awareness.

Study participants suggested only one legal act which would be advisable to adopt in Armenia, i.e. Law on the Public Council. In the absence of such, as noted by one of the respondents, it appears that this useful body is perceived by many as a mere pocket council of the president. Although this was far from being widely shared opinion.

In general, the question of public councils caused the most contradictory attitudes among the respondents. Representatives of the authorities assessed their role and activities as mostly positive. Members of these councils involved in the

Armenia

study were unequivocally positive about them. Opposition politicians were mostly sharply critical about public councils. CS representatives who rejected involvement in those councils based on their principles or due to other reasons perceive the mere existence of such councils in their current form as undeniably negative. (Some exceptions in this regard were their attitude towards the public councils under the Ministry of Defense, and - to a lesser extent - the Ministry of Justice.) Intellectuals and journalists, who participated in the study, assessed the public council under the RA President, mainly as a purely fictitious body. As for sector-specific councils, they expressed different opinions, noting different degrees of openness and different work styles, and pointed out, as mentioned above, the public council under the Ministry of Defense as a positive example.

One of the respondents made the following observation about the work of public councils: "Unfortunately these councils often function in the logic of 'mustard after dinner'. Issues of public importance are shaped, develop and reach climax outside of them, and public councils merely refer to them occasionally".

Another respondent compared the role of public councils with Public Television of Armenia, meaning that they are departmental bodies, not public, whether "public in their form but governmental in their content".

Another common opinion is that "Public councils are designed to deliver the public opinion to authorities, but instead they simply legitimize decisions of the government"; "their efficiency equals zero, although members of those councils enjoy certain preferences. 20 members of the public council under the RA Police, for example, feel more protected compared with other citizens".

The following opinion, voiced by one of the participants, contradicts the above mentioned beliefs: "For example, there are no taboos in the Public Council under the RA President. Discussions with the head of the state are usually heated, yet appropriate. Even if this channel of dialogue is not fully established yet, it is on its way of establishment".

SPEAKING OF INSTRUMENTS OF POLICY DIALOGUE, respondents allocated a great role to media. There are opinions that imposition of reforms by the civil

Armenia

society is impossible without media. At the same time there was a view that "there are enough cases when media acts as a provocateur putting sensations and stereotyped thinking before consistency in finding and covering the truth".

Below are the most common and to an extent conflicting opinions about media, articulated in the framework of this study:

a. Armenian media are focused on their own survival, thus we should not have great expectations from them;

b. Armenian media are free and report about everything;

c. Armenian journalists, as a rule, are not competent;

d. Even if media cover the non-governmental sector, it's only because in times of political stagnation NGO representatives become important newsmakers;

e. The premise of involvement in grant projects prompts journalists to cover the activities of the civil society;

f. Media cover the activities of CS representatives, but mostly "not problematic" ones, because of being politically dependent (on-line media are, to some extent, an exception in this regard);

The results of media monitoring carried out in the framework of this study, confirmed some of the above mentioned views about the Armenian media environment and rejected the others.

11.2% of all studied media materials on topical issues of March 2015 referred to representatives of civil society in one way or another. For online media, the figure is 11.1% and for television - 11.4%. Lragir.am most frequently referred to civil society - 14.8%, followed by TV channels "Armenia" - 13.8%, "Yerkir Media" - 12.6% and the online version of "Aravot" daily - 11.9%. The figure is less than 10% only for Public Television of Armenia (9.4%) and web portal News.am - 8.8% (the lowest percentage among all media monitored). Interest of media to

Armenia

cooperate with international organizations (particularly, Lragir.am, "Yerkir Media", "Aravot" almost permanently produce part of their content with the support of grants), characteristic for the "top four", is another important factor. Presence of civil society institutions in media materials on the most discussed topic of the monitoring period (centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915) was observed in 8.4% of the studied materials. For "Armenia" TV the figure is 11.0%, Lragir.am – 10.3%, "Aravot" - slightly above 10%. The most accentuated presence of civil society was in materials (100%) about legislation on NGOs. The fewest mentions of CS institutions were found in materials regarding the issue of wage arrears of "Nairit" plant employees (2.5%), and initiative to change tax policy in Armenia (2.6%). This confirms the above stated observation about the insignificant role of Armenian labor unions, which are, by definition, the principal institution protecting the rights of employees in the public life of the country. Media coverage reflects this aspect.

Quite a high percentage of referrals to CS representatives were observed in the context of issues of European /Eurasian integration of Armenia (12.2%). "Yerkir Media" TV was interested in the attitudes of the civil society towards this issue more than any other media (24.8%) - significantly more frequent than other monitored media whose corresponding figures are twice as low.

CS institutions were predominantly mentioned in neutral context (in 746 cases out of 751), the other 5 times (four times in "Aravot") references were positive, and never with a negative connotation.

However, references to civil society and materials about dialogue in general, were few. In fact, coverage of topics of social and political significance was rare. Each of the 6 media referred to the six selected topics in average 10 times a day (in case of TVs, hours of monitored programs per day), wherein more than half of these referrals were registered in materials about centennial of the Armenian Genocide. I.e. each of the other five topics was covered less than once per day by each of the monitored media. Representatives of government and civil society talked about the dialogue almost with the same frequency. Online media referred to civil society institutions and the topic of dialogue significantly more often than TV channels. The obvious leader of civil society and policy dialogue

Armenia

coverage is "Aravot" daily – it authored more than third of referrals out of the six media monitored in this study. "Aravot" and News.am published more than half of all the referrals to the six selected topics of social/political significance. It is worth mentioning, though, that the intensity of information flow of News.am significantly exceeds all other monitored media, which is why it slightly outstrips "Aravot" by the number of referrals to the six selected topics. Therein, only one topic (Armenian Genocide) made for 62% of the total number of referrals of News.am, while "Aravot" referrals to that topic are less than 50%.

In general, results of the monitoring and discussions of the topic with the respondents suggest three main conclusions: 1) topical social-political issues of the country are not a priority of media coverage. Consequently, the involvement of civil society in the policy dialogue is not getting enough coverage; 2) CS representatives, however, have access to media, and from time to time can speak out on their concerns. To an extent, this is a result of its openness as opposed to passive behavior in the public sphere of the authorities and politicians in general.

LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY and transparent governance on the part of authorities is also translated into the information policy. On one hand, the requirement to hold regular meetings of government bodies to inform journalists and the society about the work of a certain period; websites mandatory for ministries and state agencies were launched. On the other hand, even government representatives taking part in this study expressed dissatisfaction with functioning of those communication channels. Reaction to criticism is also unsatisfactory. In particular, even the report of the RA Control Chamber which revealed numerous violations in government agencies had no impact.

"There are no elections, as such, for the officials to be accountable to their voters", noted one of the respondents, summarizing the topic of accountability.

THE SUBJECT OF NATIONAL MENTALITY as a factor having a significant impact (mainly negative) on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society has been intensively discussed in Armenia for a long time. As noted by the participants of the study, prevailing group interests and intercommunity links impeding transparent and inclusive public policy are largely caused by this

Armenia

factor. At the same time, several respondents believe that closed society is not national but rather Soviet legacy. They see the problem not in the mentality but in the lack of culture of public participation.

According to one of the participants, "the government has been cultivating our national peculiarities deliberately, maliciously and tediously for a long time. This keeps the average citizen in a moderate state of obscurity, which allows the government and the opposition to manipulate the conscious of their compatriots very confidently. Once national stereotypes are destroyed, there will be opportunities for a more rational management of society and the state as a whole".

Call it mentality or social peculiarities, study participants noted some of the characteristics inherent in the relationship between government and citizens in Armenia:

– "We do not respect the government, but want to get something out of it".

– "Law enforcement, national security structures enjoy an exclusive right of secrecy in all their activities, and laws do not apply to them".

– "National stereotypes are obstacles for civil society, policy dialogue and innovation in general".

– "Most of Armenians are willing to express opinions in private, narrow circles, however in open public space they avoid expressing their views, believing they might be used against them. Lustration did not take place in Armenia, and descendants of former leaders continue to rule, by large. We consider our passive behavior traditional and label it 'ethnic' which is, however, groundless".

– "National competitiveness of Armenians is based on their ability to adapt, in its positive and negative meanings. Our people adapt to unfamiliar conditions quite quickly, which is a major competitive advantage. Existence of the Diaspora is a proof itself. In our native country we adjust ourselves to injustice, social relations which do not entail progress, reform, fight for our rights".

Armenia

MANY PARTICIPANTS associate perspective of effective dialogue with influences from external political environment. In the course of negotiations around Association Agreement between EU and Armenia, involvement of the civil society was becoming more real. In the absence of this process, it is difficult to expect any initiative of dialogue from RA authorities. In the framework of the Eastern Partnership the dialogue of cooperation is still a requirement, however, the current uncertainty in EU-Armenia relations holds back the country from the agenda of modernization. As one of the participants said "If you ride in a cart, oil prices will not affect you".

On the other hand, according to an opinion expressed at one of the discussions, the pressure by donors and the international community does not always endorse the reform process. There are cases when revisions of legislation and strategies happen more often than they need to, and the society does not see the results of their implementation.

NEVERTHELESS, certain change of the integration course of the country in 2013 should not disappoint those who seek dialogue: "We should cooperate with the government no matter what", finds one of the respondents, "For example, we used to make documents on cultural heritage based on European standards. After joining the EEU we started to study the relevant legislation of Russia, which turned out to be more progressive in this regard. Thus, we adjusted the existing document with Russian norms without losses".

This kind of optimism is not shared by non-formal civic activists. According to then, 2015 is different from 2013. They believe that civil society was developing starting from 2009-2010. First of all, it was due to the policy of Eastern Partnership, as well as the rise of civic initiatives. Authorities were obliged to agree to dialogue, even if it was imitational. Things changed when RA authorities allied themselves to EEU; there were no longer opportunities of cooperation for the CS sector, and the work of CSOs was made purely artificial. In 2013 civic initiatives had larger influence and scope, as opposed to new times.

According to several respondents, decline of civic activism is partly due to tough attitude of law enforcement bodies to street protests. At the same time, there

Armenia

was an opinion that the pressure by law enforcement bodies can silence the voice only of those people who are wealthy enough to ignore social problems for the sake of their riches. As the factor of social security is absent in Armenia, the society can be suppressed only temporally.

As a positive circumstance, respondents mention the fact that "official Yerevan retains relations with the institutions of the European Union, the Council of Europe in the field of human rights and freedoms, despite joining the EEU. In Russia, as we know, there is an effort to limit foreign funding of NGOs by registering them as 'foreign agents.' Armenia continues relatively soft policy towards NGOs and will not go for confrontation with western organizations which fund the civil society, especially since the Armenian authorities themselves rely on financial support from the West." The described situation, allows building on the experience of policy dialogue of developed countries. At the same time, several participants of the study do not agree with the argument that the Armenian society needs time to develop the culture of transparent public policy: "It is high time to abandon the image of a child; in 20 years other countries achieved everything".

Many respondents recalled the Swiss practice of referendums and mechanism of dialogue, arguing for implementation of those practices in Armenia, although there were also opinions that Armenia does not possess resources for regular referendums.

Even the most progressive practice, as several participants noted, can be discredited when there is severe deficit of trust towards the government. The authorities, in turn, perceive the independent civil society, as a potential threat to themselves. Elimination of these factors requires concentration of effort in order to have effective policy dialogue.

Armenia

APPENDIX 1.
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERVIEWS

1. Suren Krmoyan, RA Deputy-Minister of Justice

2. Anahit Yesayan, Press Secretary of the RA Minister of Urban Development

3. Samvel Farmanyan, Member of the RA National Assembly from the Republican Party of Armenia

4. Margarit Yesayan, Member of the RA National Assembly from the Republican Party of Armenia

5. Ara Saghatelyan, Director of the "RA President's Administration Public Relations and Information Center" SNCO

6. Aghvan Vardanyan, Member of the RA National Assembly, Secretary of the faction of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation

7. Stepan Margaryan, Member of the RA National Assembly from "Prosperous Armenia" party, head of the Standing Committee on Territorial Management and Local Self-Governance

8. Anush Sedrakyan, Deputy President of the "Free Democrats" party

9. Daniel Ioannesyan, Project Coordinator of "Informed Citizen" NGO

10. Gevorg Ter-Gabrielyan, Executive Director of Eurasia Partnership Foundation

11. Grigory Grigoryants, Child Protection Advocacy Manager at World Vision Armenia

12. Armen Alaverdyan, Head of "Unison" NGO

13. Sona Ayvazyan, Deputy Director of "Transparency International" Anticorruption Center in Armenia

Armenia

14. Aram Safaryan, Political scientiist, head of "Integration and Development" NGO

15. Gegham Baghdasaryan, Chief Editor of "Analitikon" journal

16. Aram Abrahamyan, Chief Editor of "Aravot" daily

17. Hranush Kharatyan, ethnographer, PhD in history

18. Gevorg Poghosyan, Academician, Director of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the RA National Academy of Science

19. Hovik Musayelyan, Director of the "Synopsis Armenia" CJSC

20. Ruben Babayan, Art Director of the Yerevan State Puppet Theatre

APPENDIX 2.
LIST OF THE PARTICIPANTS
OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Focus Group Discussion 1. Sector-specific NGO representatives

1. Ashot Melikyan, Committee to Protect Freedom of Expression

2. Artak Kirakosyan, Civil Society Institute

3. Sargis Sedrakyan, "Farmers Movement" NGO

4. Aram Gabrielyan, "Khazer" ecological-cultural NGO

5. Gayane Poghosyan, Foundation for Development of Small and Medium Business
6. Sona Darbinyan, "European Friends of Armenia" NGO

Armenia

Focus Group Discussion 2. Representatives of public councils under state bodies, intellectual circles and media

1. Varuzhan Sedrakyan, HRD Expert Council of the National Mechanism to Prevent Violence, Childrens' Association of Armenia

2. Liana Doydoyan, Member of a Working group of the Open Governance Partnership adjacent to the administration of the RA Government, Freedom of Information Center

3. Haykuhi Harutyunyan, Public Council under the MoJ, "Protection of Rights without Borders" NGO

4. Zhanna Aleksanyan, head of "Journalists for Human Rights" NGO, journalist

5. Gegham Vardanyan, Editor of Media.am website of the Media Initiatives Center

6. Gegham Manukyan, Director of political-social programs of "Yerkir Media" TV company

Focus Group Discussion 3. Representatives of NGO networks, alliances

1. Lilit Chitchyan, Armenian Civil Society Partnership Network, OXFAM-Armenia

2. Hasmik Aslanyan, Civic Cooperation Network for RA Strategic Programs, "Shogher" NGO

3. Edite Soghomonyan, Assistant of the National Coordinator of Erasmus+ Programme in Armenia, Armenian Lifelong Learning League

4. Elen Harutyunyan, Child Protection Network, ARF "Children Support Center" Foundation

5. Tamar Abrahamyan, Public Network, "Araza" NGO

6. Naira Arakelyan, Anticorruption Centers National Network, Armavir Development Center

Armenia

Focus Group Discussion 4. Members of the EaP Civil Society Forum Armenian National Platform

1. Mikayel Hovhannisyan, National Facilitator of the EaP CSF Armenian National Platform, Program Manager at Eurasia Partnership Foundation

2. Karen Chilingaryan, Coordinator of the ANP Working Group 2, head of "Consumers' Consulting Center" NGO

3. Heriknaz Harutyunyan, Director of the Secretariat of the EaP CSF Armenian National Platform

4. Inga Zarafyan, Coordinator of the ANP Working Group 3, President of "Ecolur" NGO

5. Temik Khalapyan, Coordinator of the ANP Working Group 4, President of "Trtu" NGO

6. Lilit Hayryan, Communication officer of the Secretariat of the EaP CSF Armenian National Platform

Focus Group Discussion 5. Participants of non-formal initiatives, movements (The participants chose to be presented in their personal capacity)

1. Haykak Arshamyan

2. Sarhat Petrosyan

3. Gayane Arustamyan

4. Zara Hovhannisyan

5. Suren Saghatelyan

6. Anna Shahnazaryan

Armenia

APPENDIX 3.
TABLES OF MEDIA MONITORING

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1), "Armenia" TV Channel, "Yerkir Media" TV Channel, Aravot.am, Lragir.am, News.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials		12021		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references tp the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	751	5	0	746

Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society		Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
			Yes	No
1.	Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	1098	92	1006
2.	European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	333	44	289
3.	Eurasian integration of Armenia	374	42	332
4.	Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	3	3	0
5.	Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	87	23	64
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	51	13	38
	Total	1946	217	1729

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	150	12	119	120	6	13
Total	150	12	119	120	6	13

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1), "Armenia" TV Channel, "Yerkir Media" TV Channel

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials		2214		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	208	1	0	207
Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society		Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
			Yes	No
1. Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide		384	32	352
2. European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations		66	9	57
3. Eurasian integration of Armenia		79	12	67
4. Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations		2	2	0
5. Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia		30	10	20
6. The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant		10	0	10
	Total	571	65	506

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	64	3	54	57	4	5
Total	64	3	54	57	4	5

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1)

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials	917		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society	
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	64	0	0	64

Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
		Yes	No
1. Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	202	15	187
2. European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	30	3	27
3. Eurasian integration of Armenia	22	3	19
4. Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	1	1	0
5. Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	9	3	6
6. The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	3	0	3
Total	267	25	242

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	15	1	14	13	1	1
Total	15	1	14	13	1	1

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

"Armenia" TV Channel

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)				
Total number of the studied materials	650				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society			
		Positive	Negative		Neutral
	79	1	0		78
Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials			
		Yes		No	
1. Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	82	9		73	
2. European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	24	3		21	
3. Eurasian integration of Armenia	27	2		25	
4. Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	1	1		0	
5. Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	9	5		4	
6. The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	2	0		2	
Total	145	20		125	

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	24	1	19	21	2	3
Total	24	1	19	21	2	3

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

"Yerkir Media" TV Channel

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials		647		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	65	0	0	65

	Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
			Yes	No
1.	Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	100	8	92
2.	European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	12	3	9
3.	Eurasian integration of Armenia	30	7	23
4.	Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	0	0	0
5.	Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	12	2	10
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	5	0	5
	Total	159	20	139

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	25	1	21	23	1	1
Total	25	1	21	23	1	1

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

Aravot.am, Lragir.am, News.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials	9807		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	543	4	0	539

	Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
			Yes	No
1.	Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	714	60	654
2.	European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	267	35	232
3.	Eurasian integration of Armenia	295	30	265
4.	Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	1	1	0
5.	Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	57	13	44
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	41	13	28
	Total	1375	152	1223

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	86	9	65	63	2	8
Total	86	9	65	63	2	8

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

Aravot.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials	2753		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	271	4	0	267

	Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
			Yes	No
1.	Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	269	27	242
2.	European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	129	14	115
3.	Eurasian integration of Armenia	114	11	103
4.	Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	1	1	0
5.	Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	19	7	12
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	14	5	9
	Total	546	65	481

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizatiosn, diplomatic missions	Other
	57	1	44	45	1	4
Total	57	1	44	45	1	4

ICCN   Konrad Adenauer Stiftung   DIS   DNA   AKT   TRANSTEC   Асамблея

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

Lragir.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)		
Total number of the studied materials	1356		
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	96	0	0	96

Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
		Yes	No
1. Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	97	10	87
2. European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	56	11	45
3. Eurasian integration of Armenia	93	12	81
4. Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	0	0	0
5. Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	12	1	11
6. The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	11	4	7
Total	269	38	231

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	11	2	7	7	0	3
Total	11	2	7	7	0	3

ICCN Konrad Adenauer Stiftung DIS AKT TRANSTEC Асамблея

CIVIL SOCIETY.
DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESS

Armenia

COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY BY THE ARMENIAN MEDIA

News.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories	Total (in units)			
Total number of the studied materials	5698			
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of references to the civil society representatives	Character of the references to the civil society		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
	176	0	0	176

Subject of the materials on policy dialogue between the government and the civil society	Number of references to the subject	Presence of the civil society representatives in the materials	
		Yes	No
1. Events dedicated to commemoration of the centennial of 1915 Armenian Genocide	348	23	325
2. European integration of Armenia, EU-Armenia relations	82	10	72
3. Eurasian integration of Armenia	88	7	81
4. Initiative to change the law on civil society organizations	0	0	0
5. Initiative to amend the tax policy in Armenia	26	5	21
6. The issue of payment of wage arrears to the employees of "Nairit" plant	16	4	12
Total	560	49	511

Materials on the policy dialogue between the government and the civil society of Armenia	Total number of materials on the policy dialogue	Sources of information in the materials on the policy dialogue				
		Journalists	Representatives of the authorities	Representatives of the civil society	Representatives of international, donor organizations, diplomatic missions	Other
	18	6	14	11	1	1
Total	18	6	14	11	1	1