

CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT IN POLICY DIALOGUE IN ARMENIA



*The study was conducted in the framework of the project “Civil Society: Dialogue for Progress”, supported by the European Union.
Views and opinions expressed in the study do not necessarily reflect official opinions of the European Union.*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
COMPONENTS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	5
STUDY REPORT	9
APPENDICES	20

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 research project 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 study and evaluate the patterns of the Armenian civil society engagement in policy dialogue. The findings of the research 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 research was designed as a comprehensive framework which included all the principle stakeholders and expertise in the field. It was built on the following research methods:

- 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 EaP Civil Society Forum Armenian National Platform.

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 CS 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.

COMPONENTS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In the framework of the study 20 in-depth interviews were conducted in 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 take 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?
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 will not?

FOCUS GROUPS DISCUSSIONS

In the framework of the study 5 focus group discussions were conducted in March 11-20 with 30 participants (6 in each group), including representatives of civic groups, 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. We tried 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 of 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.

The monitoring covered 6 media outlets of Armenia: 3 national TV channels - **First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1)**, **“Armenia”**, **“Yerkir Media”**; 3 online

media - **Aravot.am**, online version of “Aravot” daily (<http://www.aravot.am>), **Lragir.am** (<http://www.lragir.am>) and **News.am** (<http://www.news.am>).

The subjects of the monitoring were:

- from broadcast media - the main newscasts, information-analytical and social-political programs (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-program 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 documented:

1. Total number of studied materials.
2. Number and connotation (positive, negative or neutral) of references to representatives 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:

- Events dedicated to centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915 (April 24, 2015)
- 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 references 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 authorities, civil society, international/donor community/diplomatic missions, other).

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.

STUDY REPORT

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON of the results of all the study components revealed attitudes of CS 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 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 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 not competent, whereas their opponents accuse them for imitative dialogue, and creating an illusion of cooperation with the civil society¹. 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 are its 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 formulation of a resource that can counter the monopoly of the government

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

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 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 compromised in the society, especially since, according to one of the participants of the interviews, "perhaps 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 in the networks that "pocket NGOs" will take the lead there, which will allow the authorities to use the CSO networks to reduce the impact of the true civil society. In fact, CSO 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.

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 be to 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.

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 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 programs) raises serious concerns among the CS sector. “The government gets in touch with the civil society only when the premise 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 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. Speaking of effectiveness of street protests, 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 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, as 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 relevant sectors.

Participants of the study divided in their opinion 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, most of the respondents agree that concessions achieved through pressure not always yield the best solutions.

Actions like flash 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.

Majority of the respondents also agree that civilized and legitimate forms of participation in policy making commonly employed in democratic society, i.e., elections, representative government structures, referendums are mostly discredited in Armenia.

ACCORDING TO PARTICIPANTS OF THE RESEARCH, 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 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 take 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 the voters.

One of the participants made an interesting observation that: “It might sound strange but when a Republican² 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 Pashinyan³...”

This statement implies that there are certain opportunities for those MPs who are ready to use the parliamentary platform to raise issues of concern to 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 Partnership⁴ 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 THERE IS POLICY DIALOGUE between the CS and the authorities, 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 openness 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 little to no 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.

² Republican Party of Armenia (RPA) - ruling party of the country

³ Opposition MP, Board Member of “Civic Contract” party

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

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 participants of dialogue with the government (primarily labor unions) should have had a say, certain steps by the government to meet the interests of citizens were 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 areas where there are reputable, principled and competent NGOs, there are better chances of dialogue.

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 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 environmental issues, where results, if obtained, are 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 the respondents 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 RA President.

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 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 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 to 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 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 they are politically dependant (online 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.

In all six studied media, representatives of civil society were in some extent present in 11.2% of all materials dealing with the current topics of March 2015. For online media, the figure is 11.1% and for television - 11.4%. Representatives of civil society were most frequently present in Lragir.am materials - 14.1%, followed by TV channels "Armenia" - 13.8% and "Yerkir Media" - 12.6%, as well as Aravot.am - 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 cooperate with international organizations (particularly, Lragir.am, "Yerkir Media", Aravot.am almost always produce content supported by 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 materials. For "Armenia" TV the figure is 11%, Lragir.am - 10.3%, Aravot.am - slightly below 10%. The most accentuated presence of civil society was in materials (100%) about legislation on NGOs. Also high percentage of mentions of CS institutions was recorded in materials regarding the issue of wage arrears of "Nairit" plant employees (25.5%), and the initiative to change tax policy in Armenia (26.4%). However, those mentioned were mostly informal civic initiatives and self-organized groups, while Armenian labor unions were referred quite rarely, which confirms the above stated observation about their insignificant role, although by definition, they are the principal institutions protecting the rights of employees in the public life of the country. Media coverage reflects this phenomenon.

Quite a high percentage of references 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 (23.8%) - significantly more frequent than other monitored media whose corresponding figures are almost 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.am) 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 references 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.

All monitored six media referred civil society institutions for 25 times per day. 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 is Aravot.am both for civil society references and policy dialogue coverage. It authored around one third of references out of the six media monitored in this study. Aravot.am and News.am published almost half of all the references 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.am by the number of references to the six selected topics. Therein, only one topic (Armenian Genocide) made for 62% of the total number of News.am references to the six selected topics, while Aravot.am references to that topic are less than 50%.

In general, results of the monitoring and discussions of the media related topics with the respondents suggest three main conclusions:

1. topical social-political issues of the country are not a priority of media coverage;
2. involvement of civil society in the policy dialogue is not getting enough coverage;
3. CS representatives 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 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”.

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 activists, 2015 is different from 2013. They believe that civil society developed starting from 2009-2010. First, 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 CS 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 was an opinion that the pressure by law enforcement bodies can silence the voice of people, but only those 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 temporarily.

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 us to build 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.

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 Farmanyanyan, 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” state non-commercial organization
6. Aghvan Vardanyan, Member of the RA National Assembly, Secretary of the faction of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation “Dashnaktsutyun”
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
14. Aram Safaryan, Political Specialist, 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 Sciences
19. Hovik Musayelyan, Director of “Synopsis Armenia” CJSC
20. Ruben Babayan, Art Director of 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

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

1. Varuzhan Sedrakyan, Human Rights Defender’s Expert Council of the National Mechanism to Prevent Violence, Children’s Association of Armenia
2. Liana Doydoyan, Member of 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 Ministry of Justice, “Protection of Rights without Borders” NGO
4. Zhanna Aleksanyan, Head of “Journalists for Human Rights” NGO, journalist, human rights activist
5. Gegham Vardanyan, Editor of Media.am website of the Media Initiatives Center
6. Gegham Manukyan, Director of news and current affairs 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 Soghomonian, Assistant of the National Coordinator of Erasmus+ Program in Armenia, Armenian Lifelong Learning League

4. Elen Harutyunyan, Child Protection Network, Fund for Armenian Relief Children's Support Center Foundation
5. Tamar Abrahamyan, Public Network, "Araza" NGO
6. Naira Arakelyan, Anticorruption Centers National Network, Armavir Development Center

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

Focus Group Discussion 5. Participants of non-formal initiatives, movements

1. Haykak Arshamyan
2. Sarhat Petrosyan
3. Gayane Arustamyan
4. Zara Hovhannisyan
5. Suren Saghatelyan
6. Anna Shahnazaryan

APPENDIX 3.
TABLES

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 studied materials		12021				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	3	3	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	87	23	64		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	150	12	119	120	6	13
Total	150	12	119	120	6	13

**COVERAGE OF THE POLICY DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY
BY THE ARMENIAN BROADCAST 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 studied materials		2214				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	2	2	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	30	10	20		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	64	3	54	57	4	5
Total	64	3	54	57	4	5

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

First Channel of the Public Television of Armenia (h1)

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		917				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	1	1	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	9	3	6		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	15	1	14	13	1	1
Total	15	1	14	13	1	1

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

“Armenia” TV Channel

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		650				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	1	1	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	9	5	4		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	24	1	19	21	2	3
Total	24	1	19	21	2	3

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

“Yerkir Media” TV Channel

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		647				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	0	0	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	12	2	10		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	25	1	21	23	1	1
Total	25	1	21	23	1	1

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

Aravot.am, Lragir.am, News.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		9807				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	1	1	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	57	13	44		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	86	9	65	63	2	8
Total	86	9	65	63	2	8

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

Aravot.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		2753				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	1	1	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	19	7	12		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	57	1	44	45	1	4
Total	57	1	44	45	1	4

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

Lragir.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		1356				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	0	0	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	12	1	11		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	11	2	7	7	0	3
Total	11	2	7	7	0	3

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

News.am

March 1-31, 2015

Content categories		Total (in units)				
Total number of studied materials		5698				
Materials containing references to civil society representatives	Number of mentions of 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 centennial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915	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 legislation on non-governmental organizations	0	0	0		
5.	Initiative to amend tax policy in Armenia	26	5	21		
6.	The issue of payment of wage arrears to 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				
		Journalist	Representative of the authorities	Representative of the civil society	Representative of international, donor organization, diplomatic mission	Other
	18	6	14	11	1	1
Total	18	6	14	11	1	1