

Pylypko, Kateryna; Adamchuk, Leonora; Antoniv, Artem et al.

Article

Justification of approaches to development of the standard civil society organization based on international experience

Technology audit and production reserves

Provided in Cooperation with:

ZBW OAS

Reference: Pylypko, Kateryna/Adamchuk, Leonora et. al. (2022). Justification of approaches to development of the standard civil society organization based on international experience. In: Technology audit and production reserves 5 (2/67), S. 30 - 37.
<http://journals.urau.ua/tarp/article/download/267575/263537/617605>.
doi:10.15587/2706-5448.2022.267575.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/12810>

Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics
Düsternbrooker Weg 120
24105 Kiel (Germany)
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)
<https://www.zbw.eu/>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte. Alle auf diesem Vorblatt angegebenen Informationen einschließlich der Rechteinformationen (z.B. Nennung einer Creative Commons Lizenz) wurden automatisch generiert und müssen durch Nutzer:innen vor einer Nachnutzung sorgfältig überprüft werden. Die Lizenzangaben stammen aus Publikationsmetadaten und können Fehler oder Ungenauigkeiten enthalten.

Terms of use:

This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence. All information provided on this publication cover sheet, including copyright details (e.g. indication of a Creative Commons licence), was automatically generated and must be carefully reviewed by users prior to reuse. The license information is derived from publication metadata and may contain errors or inaccuracies.



<https://savearchive.zbw.eu/terms-of-use>

Kateryna Pylypko,
Leonora Adamchuk,
Artem Antoniv,
Sedat Sevin

JUSTIFICATION OF APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE STANDARD CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION BASED ON INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The object of the research is the principles of the quality management system and the interaction of different approaches to the quality assessment of civil society organizations (CSOs). In many countries, regulatory documents have not been developed regarding the quality management of the CSO activities. Let's consider this problem using the example of Ukraine, since there has been an increase in the number of public associations by more than 85,000 during the last decade. Along with it, the principles of implementing DSTU ISO 9001:2015 for non-commercial, in particular civil organizations, are not sufficiently clear, given the various socio-cultural and economic prerequisites.

Based on theoretical and analytical methods, it is proposed to conduct an in-depth analysis of the problem and further justification of the implementation of the practice of compliance with Quality Standards and good governance in civil society organizations. That is primarily due to the desire of CSOs themselves to self-organize, reinforced by the need to establish partnership relations with state authorities and commercial organizations, which is accompanied by the fulfillment of requirements for transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of CSOs activities. Adherence to Quality Standards forms a commitment on the part of CSOs to generally accepted ethical principles and standards of behavior, which further contributes to the achievement of social legitimacy.

Based on the analyzed regulatory and technical documentation, the need to develop a Quality Standard of Ukraine for CSOs based on the complementarity of different approaches to evaluating the quality of organizations according to the «Quality Standard of CSOs» and DSTU ISO 9001:2015 is substantiated.

The results of the analysis of registered public associations by organizational and legal forms in Ukraine confirm the tendency to increase their number, which is a prerequisite for the implementation of the international experience of using the CSO Quality Standard. Taking into account the results of a comparative assessment of the principles of the CSO Quality Standard and DSTU ISO 9001:2015, it is possible to state that there are no differences in the main approaches to managing the quality system of organizations. The governance aspects of the Modified Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool are similar to those of the «Quality Standard of CSOs», based on the subcategories: authorities; values, vision, and mission of the organization; management style and leadership; strategic planning.

Keywords: organization standard of Ukraine, enterprise standard, public organization, DSTU ISO 9001:2015, Quality Standard.

Received date: 07.09.2022

Accepted date: 16.10.2022

Published date: 31.10.2022

© The Author(s) 2022

This is an open access article
under the Creative Commons CC BY license

How to cite

Pylypko, K., Adamchuk, L., Antoniv, A., Sevin, S. (2022). Justification of approaches to development of the standard civil society organization based on international experience. *Technology Audit and Production Reserves*, 5 (2 (67)), 30–37. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15587/2706-5448.2022.267575>

1. Introduction

First of all, public society can be characterized as a certain association of citizens within which various types of connections are established for the realization of common interests or the achievement of common goals. Therefore, civil society organizations (CSOs) are a set of organizations, or institutional associations, which together with the state and business form the basis of an open society [1].

Six CSO characteristics were identified for comparison with each other and with other countries. First, CSOs are

organized, that is, institutionalized to some extent [2]. Institutionalization is the process of defining and enshrining social norms, rules, statutes and roles of subjects of civil society and then putting them in a system to meet some public need [3]. Second, CSOs are a private law institution and therefore it exists separately from the government. Third, CSOs are also autonomous organizations that have their own governance, and therefore can control their own actions.

The term «governance» is a commonly accepted equivalent of the English «governance» and mostly means a way of understanding, transferring and implementing authority

in society or an organization [2, 4]. In addition, CSOs are non-profit organizations and do not distribute income among their founders and/or members [2, 4, 5].

It is important to note that CSOs are to some extent volunteer organizations, as their activities are characterized by a significant degree of voluntary participation [2]. The last but identical feature is that CSOs work for their members and/or for the public interest. Given that the global goal of achieving the public good is the same for all CSOs, the core values are common to all such organizations, regardless of their geography or focus [2, 4, 6].

Good governance guidelines and Quality Standards in CSOs are primarily developed for officially registered public and charitable organizations (i. e. institutionalized forms of civil society). However, they do not differ fundamentally from voluntary movements, unregistered associations and other forms of interaction of citizens for the common good [5]. Given this, the core principles of good governance and Quality Standards are universal and can be applied to all forms of civil society [4].

The emergence of a well-established practice on the observance of Quality Standards and proper governance of CSOs is primarily due to the desire of CSOs themselves to self-organization [6]. This desire is also reinforced by the need to establish partnerships with the state authorities, which are accompanied by the fulfillment of the requirements for transparency, accountability and the effective functioning of the CSO. In addition, compliance with Quality Standards forms a commitment on the part of the CSO to generally accepted ethical principles and behaviour standards, which further contributes to the achievement of social legitimacy [4].

The minimum set of Quality Standards for CSOs primarily concerns three aspects, namely the ethical code, good governance, communication and information systems [4, 6].

Most countries have not developed a normative regulation for standardization of quality management of CSO activities [7, 8]. At the same time, the CSO actively participates in politics, distribution of state grants [9] and is included in the governing councils as representatives of communities [8, 10]. New partnerships among governments and CSOs are changing global environmental governance [11]. Legitimacy of the CSO activities is considered an important condition for their further development and functioning [12]. The justification of approaches to the development of the CSO standard in view of the international experience let's consider on the example of Ukraine. Given the fact that the number of registered associations of citizens varies considerably from different sources, it is difficult to obtain accurate information about absolute quantitative indicators of the dynamics of civil society development in Ukraine [1, 13]. However, according to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine, over 85 thousand public associations have been growing in Ukraine during the last decade [13]. However,

we are not known CSO in Ukraine, which would use own SOI (Standard of Organization of Ukraine) or STE (Standard of Enterprise).

Based on this, it is important to study international experience on the quality standards of civil society organizations for their further implementation in Ukraine.

The object of research is the principles of quality management system and the nature of interaction of different approaches to quality assessment of civil society organizations.

The aim of research is to provide a basis for developing the SOI for civil society organizations on the basis of comparison of the «Quality Standard of the CSO» and DSTU ISO 9001:2015.

2. Research methods

The work was carried out on the basis of the department of Standardization and Certification of Agricultural Products of the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine (NUBIP), Ukraine.

For the theoretical research of the issue the scientific and normative-technical information was analyzed, which allowed a systematic and generalized approach to logical processing of received data with the purpose of obtaining their new interpretation. The materials for the study were «Quality Standard of the CSO», DSTU ISO 9001:2015, «Modified organizational capacity assessment tool».

Theoretical, analytical and statistical methods of research were used in the work.

3. Research results and discussion

Analysis of official data of the State Statistics Service of Ukraine [13] allowed to establish that the largest percentage of registered CSOs traditionally occupy public organizations (Fig. 1).

From Fig. 1 it is evident that the number of SCOs has increased in Ukrainian society since 2016, which confirms the need to develop and implement a quality management system.



Fig. 1. Growth dynamics of the number of registered public associations by organizational and legal forms in Ukraine by year (modified from [2, 13, 14])

Good governance for CSOs is a long-established practice in European countries and is an effective tool for promoting institutional development of CSOs. This process began with the self-awareness of the CSO regarding transparency, accountability and effectiveness of the CSO. Given this, the CSO faced the need to define quality criteria for itself [6].

In general, the establishment of quality criteria for CSOs increases the level of trust in civil society by establishing parity between public expectations and the level of CSOs' work. In this respect, existing quality control systems and their correct implementation can promote the commitment of CSOs to common ethical principles and standards of behaviour for responsible practices and activities [4].

Many CSOs are seeking to introduce quality control systems through their own interest in improving the quality of services they provide, or their aim is to implement quality control systems within the organization [4, 6, 15]. Meanwhile, for some other organizations, the push to introduce a quality control system is a desire to obtain access to grants when the quality certificate is evaluated as a positive factor and/or it is a mandatory requirement when applying for such a grant [6].

Despite this, the achievement of sufficient maturity of the CSO [4] is considered to be the ideal starting point for the introduction of the quality control system. This happens when the organization understands that the quality system helps to achieve improvement goals, opens new horizons for establishing effective cooperation with potential stakeholders.

Good governance and compliance with established Quality Standards for CSOs is already a long-term practice in European countries. Thus, the Spanish Institute for the Quality of Non-governmental organizations (Institut para la calidad de las ONG) developed a document establishing technical requirements to the quality management system of the CSO, integrated into the management system [6]. This is a baseline standard, as it is designed to establish the requirements and principles applicable to any CSO. This standard can also be compatible with other additional standards that the organization considers appropriate to implement to improve the effectiveness of its mission [4, 15, 16].

The fifth version of the «Quality Standard of the CSO» (hereinafter referred to as the Standard) is dated 2014 and includes three sections: The introductory part, principles and system of quality management, as well as appendices with the list of normative documents used in the standard and terminology [16].

The goal of the introductory part of the Standard is to acquaint users with the changes made to the fifth version concerning the structure, sphere of application, principles, requirements and appendices of the Standard [16]. In addition, this section also includes a description of the current sphere of application of the standard, according to which the Standard sets technical requirements to the quality management system in the CSO, integrated into the general management system. All requirements set out in the Standard are intended for implementation into an integrated management system of the CSO, although their implementation may depend on the specifics of the organization or its projects, services and products [6, 16].

The Principles section reveals the idea that CSOs should have a quality management standard as the basis for their activities. The idea is to offer them a standard, develop-

ped with the participation of the CSO itself, which will significantly contribute to the constant increase of their efficiency and effectiveness and, as a result, the movement to perfection during the development of their projects and achievement of their goals.

The Standard is based on the belief that each CSO with a desire to act in a quality manner should be guided by certain values and principles, except those that it sets for itself. These principles, together with the methodological guidelines of the Standard, are the main guide in the preparation of different quality requirements [16]. This section contains a list and description of organization-, society-, and people-oriented principles [6, 15, 16].

The third section of the Standard specifies the requirements to the quality management system, which are agreed with the principles from the second section. The requirements to the quality management system, together with their principles, are set out in seven sections of the Standard, which are unevenly distributed in the following four blocks: general requirements to the system, institutional commitments, processes, measurement and improvement.

The general requirements for the quality management system are primarily based on the principles oriented to the person and the organization (Table 1) [16].

According to this Standard, the organization must take into account the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders who directly or indirectly participate in the benefits of the organization. Given this, the organization's quality management system should contain documented procedures to address these needs. In addition, the organization should focus on the identified needs and perceive them as requirements to its activities through projects, services or products. The organization must have documented systems to identify, update, and provide employees with legal requirements that affect their activities. The document management system should include the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the measures to comply with the legal requirements applicable to the organization through its facilities, services and products are clearly defined and implemented [16].

The Standard also regulates the institutional obligations of the organization, the prerequisite for which is the principles of people and organizational orientation. Process planning and management is based on principles oriented toward the people, organization and society. According to the Standard, processes are defined as sequence of actions of the organization [16].

The ISO 9001:2015 Standard and the corresponding DSTU ISO 9001:2015 position themselves as standards for quality management systems, and therefore should organically fit into the general management system of the organization and not contradict its principles [17, 18]. The principles of ISO 9001:2015, as laid out in DSTU ISO 9001:2015, are somewhat correlated with the requirements regulated by the fifth version of the «Quality Standard of the CSO». A comparative analysis of these standards for the points is given in Table 2.

In general, the concept of quality management covers aspects of the overall management function in the area of quality policy, goals, responsibility, planning, provision and improvement. The implementation of standards harmonized with international standards requires the fulfillment of the mandatory requirements for the quality of products and services. This promotes their identification on the

external market and provides the base for the construction of effective quality management systems, regardless of the type of enterprise or organization. Thus, implementation of quality management systems allows covering not only processes of production or service provision, but also all spheres of activity of the enterprise or organization [20].

According to ISO 9001:2015, quality management systems should fit organically into the overall management system of the organization and not contradict its principles. The ISO 9001:2015 standard is based on the principles

of quality management described in ISO 9000:2015 and includes the following seven basic principles: customer orientation, leadership, personnel engagement, process approach, improvement, making decisions based on actual data, and relationship management [17]. The key principle of forming a quality management system, according to ISO 9001:2015 requirements, remains the process approach. Thus, the new version of the international standard ISO 9001:2015 is based on the Deming cycle, which consistently includes four stages: «plan», «do», «check», «act» (Fig. 2) [17, 20].

Table 1

Correlation of the general requirements of the quality management system to the principles of CSO activity

Requirements for the quality management system of CSOs		People-oriented			Organization-oriented						Society-oriented						
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
System requirements	Needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Legal requirements	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Documentation requirements	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Control of documentation	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Record control	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Management responsibility	Obligations and leadership	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Policy and goals	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Resources for quality assurance	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Quality control of the system	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Acceptance of obligations and approval of projects	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
Process-based planning and management	Management representative	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Continuous improvement cycle	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Change planning	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Process definition and planning	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Setting quality goals	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Definition of roles and responsibilities	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Involvement of volunteers, personnel, beneficiaries	–	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Key processes	Relations with stakeholders	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	+
	Quality features of projects, services and products	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Implementation of projects, services and products	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other processes	Rights and obligations of beneficiaries	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Personnel management	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Procurement management	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Economic management	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–	+	+	–	–
Measurement, analysis and evaluation	Internal and external communication	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–
	Productivity of the process	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
	Satisfaction of beneficiaries	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Internal audits	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Data analysis	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Inconsistency	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Improve-ment	The system of complaints, proposals and dunnings	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Corrective and preventive actions	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Improvement groups	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note: «+» – the principles of the CSO activity coincide with the general requirements of the quality management system; «–» – does not coincide with them

Table 2

Comparison of the Quality Standard of CSOs and DSTU ISO 9001:2015 (modified according to [6, 17–19])

CSO Quality Standard		DSTU ISO 9001:2015	
Principles	People-oriented	–	none
	Organization-oriented	–	none
	Society-oriented	–	none
System requirements	Needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders	5.1.2 4.2.0	Customer-oriented Understanding the needs and expectations of the stakeholders
	Legal requirements	8.2.0	Input design and development data
	Documentation requirements	7.5.1 7.5.2	Terms Creation and actualization
	Control of documentation	7.5.3	Control of documented information
	Record control	7.5.1 7.5.2	Terms Creation and actualization
Management responsibility	Obligations and leadership	5.1.0	Leadership and obligations
	Policy and goals	5.2.1 6.2.0	Formulation of quality policy Quality goals and action planning to achieve them
	Resources for quality assurance	7.1.0	Resources
	Quality control of the system	9.3.0	Analysis of management system
	Acceptance of obligations and approval of projects	8.2.0	Requirements for products and services
	Management representative	5.3.0	Functions, obligations and powers within the organization
Process-based planning and management	Continuous improvement cycle	10.3.0	Continuous improvement
	Change planning	6.3.0	Change planning
	Process definition and planning	4.4.0 8.3.0	Quality management system and its processes Design and development of products and services
	Setting quality goals	6.2.0	Quality goals and action planning to achieve them
	Definition of roles and responsibilities	5.3.0	Functions, obligations and powers within the organization
	Involvement of volunteers, personnel, beneficiaries	5.1.1	Terms
	Relations with stakeholders	8.2.1 9.1.2	Information contact with customers Customer satisfaction
Key processes	Quality features of projects, services and products	8.0.0	Production
	Implementation of projects, services and products	8.0.0	Production
	Rights and obligations of beneficiaries	8.2.1 8.5.3	Information contact with customers Property of customers or external suppliers
Other processes	Personnel management	7.1.2 7.2.0	Human resources Competence
	Procurement management	8.4.0	Control of processes, products and services issued from outside
	Economic management	4.1.0	Understanding the organization and its environment
	Internal and external communication	5.2.2 7.4.0	Information about quality policy Information
Measurement, analysis and evaluation	Productivity of the process	9.1.0	Monitoring, measurement, analysis and evaluation
	Satisfaction of beneficiaries	9.1.2	Customer satisfaction
	Internal audits	9.2.0	Internal audit
	Data analysis	9.3.0	Analysis of management system
	Inconsistency	10.2.0 8.7.0	Inconsistency and corrective actions Control of inappropriate way outs
	The system of complaints, proposals and dunning	8.2.1 10.2.0	Information contact with customers Inconsistency and corrective actions
Improve-ment	Corrective and preventive actions	10.1.0 10.2.0	Terms Inconsistency and corrective actions
	Improvement groups	10.1.0	Improvement




Fig. 2. Structure of DSTU standard ISO 9001:2015 is presented in the form of Deming cycle (modified according to [20])

Summarizing, the quality management system in the standard ISO 9001:2015 first of all guarantees the organizations the use of structured approach to their activity in order to achieve the goals. Therefore, the «Quality Standard of the CSO» is characterized by such appointment and successfully complements the requirements of ISO 9001:2015 in the aspect of quality management in the CSO.

The Modified Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (MOCAT) contains a list of indicators intended for external evaluation of the CSO activity (Fig. 3). In general, most of the requirements specified in the Quality Standard of the CSO are similar or equivalent to those specified in the MOCAT, which makes it possible to use them for quality management in the CSO [21].

The institutional capacity of the organization is described by three interrelated categories – governance, management practices and use of human resources [21, 22].

According to the MOCAT, governance of the organization means ways of transferring and exercising authority in the organization. At the same time, if the organization is divided into decision-making functions so that the authorities and resources do not accumulate in the hands of one person or group of people, it is possible to speak about proper governance of the organization. This system allows restraining and limiting the power of one person or group of people, provides effective management of resources of the organization and orient the organization to

the fulfillment of the mission. According to the MOCAT, governance can be divided into several equally important sub-categories: authorities; values, vision and mission of the organization; governance style and leadership; and strategic planning [21]. All these aspects of governance are similar to the standard of quality of CSOs.

Management practices include organizational structure, program planning, and operational management in the organization [21], which correlates with the requirements of the CSO Quality Standard for planning and management. In addition, each CSO forms staff at its own discretion, depending on its goals and resources. It is not enough simply to have employees dedicated to their business; it is also necessary to properly manage their activity, maintain motivation and promote their development in order to achieve the goals and objectives of the organization. This component includes aspects of personnel policy formulation, personnel development and diversity of representation [21], which are also summarized in the CSO Quality Standard.

The program capacity of the organization is described by three categories – orientation to beneficiaries, quality of services and external resources, which are written in more detailed form in the Quality Standard of CSO. The financial capacity of the organization is described by three categories – financial management, stability of revenues and minimization of expenses [21, 22], which are very briefly described in the CSO Quality Standard.




Fig. 3. Hierarchical structure of MOCAT indicators (modified according to [11, 12, 21, 22])

The restriction of this study is the absence of similar regulations to the CSO Quality Standard for the possibility of comparing practical implementation of the quality management system in public organizations against the background of different socio-cultural and economic prerequisites.

Development of standards of quality of civil society organizations in Ukraine should be considered a promising direction of development of this research. This is due to the rapidly growing number of NGOs and their growing role in political, state, international and grants initiatives.

4. Conclusions

On the basis of the analyzed regulatory and technical documentation, the need to develop an SOI for civil society organizations based on the complementarity of different approaches to evaluating the quality of organizations according to the «Quality Standard of CSOs» and DSTU ISO 9001:2015 is substantiated.

The results of the analysis of registered public associations by organizational and legal forms in Ukraine confirm the tendency to increase their number, which is a prerequisite for the introduction of international experience in the use of the «Quality Standard of CSO».

Considering the results of a comparative assessment of the principles of the «Quality Standard of CSO» and DSTU ISO 9001:2015, it is possible to state that there are no differences in the main approaches to managing the quality system of organizations.

The governance aspects of the Modified Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool are similar to those of the «Quality Standard of CSO», which is based on the subcategories: authorities; values, vision and mission of the organization; management style and leadership; strategic planning.

Conflict of interests

Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest related to this research, including financial, personal,

authorship or other nature, which could have an impact on the research and its results presented in this article.

Financing

The research was conducted without financial support.

The coverage of the research in the form of publication was due to financial support in the form of a grant from SUES (Support to Ukrainian Editorial Staff).

Availability of data

The manuscript has no associated data.

References

1. Nikolovska, M. (2021). *Orhanizatsiia hromadianskoho suspilstva ta rozvytok liudskoho kapitalu*. European Training Foundation, 38.
2. Orhanizatsii hromadianskoho suspilstva Ukrainy (2017). *Rezi-ume doslidzhennia*.
3. Herasina, L. M., Pohribna, V. L., Polishchuk, I. O.; Trebin, M. P. (Ed.) (2015). *Politolohichniy entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk*. Kharkiv: Pravo, 814.
4. *Rekomendatsii shchodo standartiv yakosti ta nalezhnogo vriaduvannya dlia orhanizatsii hromadianskoho suspilstva yak mekhanizmu zmitsnennia doviry* (2019). Kyiv: Orhanizatsiia z bezpeky i spivrobitnytstva v Yevropi Koordynator proektiv v Ukraini, 1–13.
5. *Code of Ethics and Conduct for NGOs* (2004). World Association of Non-Governmental Organizations, 44. Available at: www.aomonline.org/aom.asp?ID=&page_ID=240
6. Adrover, K. L., Barrera, M. M. (2020). *Kerichnytstvo iz vprovadzhennia Standartiv yakosti NUO*. Kyiv: Orhanizatsiia z bezpeky i spivrobitnytstva v Yevropi Koordynator proektiv v Ukraini, 206.
7. Buyse, A. (2018). Squeezing civic space: restrictions on civil society organizations and the linkages with human rights. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 22 (8), 966–988. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2018.1492916>
8. Ibrahim, U., Wan-Puteh, S. E. (2018). An overview of civil society organizations' roles in health project sustainability in Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Pan African Medical Journal*, 30 (1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2018.30.150.15851>
9. Van Rooy, A., Robinson, M. (2020). Out of the ivory tower: civil society and the aid system. *Civil society and the aid industry*. Routledge, 31–70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315071244-3>

10. Rivera-Ferre, M. G. (2018). The resignification process of Agroecology: Competing narratives from governments, civil society and intergovernmental organizations. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, 42 (6), 666–685. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2018.1437498>
11. Lambin, E. F., Thorlakson, T. (2018). Sustainability Standards: Interactions Between Private Actors, Civil Society, and Governments. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 43 (1), 369–393. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025931>
12. Egholm, L., Heyse, L., Mourey, D. (2019). Civil Society Organizations: the Site of Legitimizing the Common Good – a Literature Review. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31 (1), 1–18. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00171-y>
13. Korniiievskiy, O., Sydorenko, D., Pelivanova, N. et al.; Tyshchenko, Yu., Kaplan, Yu. (Ed.) (2021). *Kliuchovi vyklyky dlia rozvytku rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva. Stan rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva v Ukraini u 2020 rotsi*. Kyiv, 116.
14. *Pro hromadski ob'ednannia* (2012). Zakon Ukrainy No. 4572-VI. 22.03.2022. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4572-17#Text>
15. *NGOs regulating themselves: The NGO quality standards* (2006). Uganda, 24.
16. *Quality Standard. Version 5* (2014). Madrid: ADI Servicios Editoriales, 55.
17. DSTU ISO 9001:2015 (ISO 9001:2015, IDT) (2015). *Systemy upravlinnia yakistiu*. Available at: <https://khoda.gov.ua/image/catalog/files/%209001.pdf>
18. *ISO 9001:2015 Quality management systems – Requirements*. Available at: <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:9001:ed-5:v1:en>
19. López, C., Martínez, M. (2011). *Manual de implantación de la Norma ONG Calidad*. ICONG, 202. Available at: https://icong.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Manual_Implantacion_Norma_ONGC1.pdf
20. Trachenko, L. A. (2018). Important aspects of the formation of quality management systems in the context of the requirement of international standard ISO 9001:2015. *Efektivna ekonomika*, 4, 1–7.
21. *Upravlinnia v neuriadovii orhanizatsii: praktychni porady ta zrazky dokumentiv (administratyvni polityky, protsedury, protsedury, instruksii)* (2011). Kyiv: USAID, 31.
22. *The 2005 MOCAT Assessment of NSDP NGOs* (2005). NGO Service Delivery Program. Watertown: NGO Service Delivery Program, 16.

Kateryna Pylypko, Department of Standardization and Certification of Agricultural Products, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv; Department of Ecology and Zoology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7248-7362>

✉ **Leonora Adamchuk**, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Standardization and Certification of Agricultural Products, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine; National Science Center «PI Prokopovich Institute of Beekeeping», Kyiv, Ukraine, e-mail: leonora.adamchuk@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2015-7956>

Artem Antoniv, Postgraduate Student, Department of Technologies of Meat, Fish and Marine Products, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6614-4248>

Sedat Sevin, PhD, Researcher, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Veterinary Medicine, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0475-9092>

✉ Corresponding author