



2024:7

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

FCG Sweden

End-term Evaluation focusing on results
achieved by the Keep Georgia Tidy Project by
the organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT)

Final Report

End-term Evaluation focusing on results achieved
by the Keep Georgia Tidy Project by the
organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT)

Final Report
November 2023

Lene Poulsen

Authors: Lene Poulsen

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2024:07

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: 2023-11-01

Art. no. Sida62686en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62686en

This publication can be downloaded from: www.sida.se/en/publications

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Visiting address: Rissneleden 110, 174 57 Sundbyberg

Postal address: Box 2025, SE-174 02 Sundbyberg, Sweden

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: sida@sida.se Web: sida.se/en

Table of contents

Table of contents	1
Abbreviations and Acronyms	i
Preface.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background, purpose, and objectives.....	1
1.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2 Methodology	5
2.1 Overall Approach.....	5
2.2 Methodology.....	5
2.3 Evaluation framework	5
2.4 Data collection.....	6
2.5 Data analysis.....	7
2.6 Ethical Issues	8
2.7 Evaluation Limitations, Lessons-learned, and Opportunities	8
3 Evaluation object: the KGTP.....	10
3.1 Previous projects and evaluations	10
3.2 National Waste Management Legislative and Regulatory Framework	11
3.3 KGTP Project Document: Grant Agreement (GA)	12
3.3.1 Overall	12
3.3.2 Theory of Change	13
3.3.3 Outcomes and Outputs	15
3.3.4 Updated GA.....	16
3.3.5 Geographic Scope and Decentralization	17
3.3.6 Stakeholders.....	18
3.3.7 Lessons-learned and context	18
4 Findings.....	20
4.1 Success Stories.....	20
4.1.1 Key Findings on Perceived Success Stories in the KGTP.....	20

4.2	Relevance	22
4.2.1	EQ1. Does the project align with Sida's strategy and address Georgia's challenges in environmental governance reform and national priorities?.....	22
4.3	Effectiveness	27
4.3.1	EQ2. What is the extent of the project's contribution to the intended outcomes?.....	27
4.3.2	EQ3. How adaptive have the implementing partners of KGTP been in their approach to achieving results?	28
4.3.3	EQ4. To what extent have the activities of the three partner organizations complemented each other and resulted in synergistic project management?.....	33
4.4	Efficiency	36
4.4.1	EQ5. Can the project's costs be justified based on its results?.....	36
4.5	Sustainability	37
4.5.1	EQ6. Does the project implementation model ensure the sustainability of the achieved results?.....	37
4.6	Cross-cutting Issues: Local Voice, Poverty, Gender.....	38
4.6.1	EQ7. Has the project contributed to enhancing power, voice, choice, and opportunities, as well as reducing deprivation and poverty?.....	38
4.6.2	EQ8. How has gender equality been integrated into the project and what impact has it had on gender equality?.....	40
5	Conclusions, Lesson-learned, and Recommendations.....	43
5.1	Conclusions.....	43
5.1.1	Overall	43
5.1.2	Relevance	44
5.1.3	Effectiveness	44
5.1.4	Efficiency	45
5.1.5	Sustainability	45
5.1.6	Cross-cutting Issues.....	46
5.2	Lessons-Learned and Recommendations	46
5.3	KGTP specific recommendations	48
	Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	49
	Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed for the KGTP	58
	Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix	67
	Annex 4 – Assessment of Outcome Achievement.....	69
	Annex 5 - Data collection tools.....	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Annex 5.1: Online Perception Survey - - Key Elements.....	81
Annex 5.2: Indicative Interview Guide.....	85
Annex 6 – Key Informants interviewed for the KGTP	89

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CENN	Caucasus Environmental NGO Network
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ERC	Education Resource Centres
EU	European Union
GA	Grant Agreement
Greens Movement	Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth – Georgia (CSO)
GSNE “Orchis”	Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “Orchis” (CSO)
KfW	German Development bank
KGT	Keep Georgia Tidy (CSO)
KGTP	Keep Georgia Tidy Project
KGTPPE	Keep Georgia Tidy Project Evaluation
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PEST	Political- Economic-Social-Technological
RBM	Results-Based Management
SEK	Swedish Kronor
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
TOR	Terms of Reference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Preface

This evaluation was contracted by the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia through the Sida Framework Agreement for Evaluation Services and conducted by FCG Sweden.

The Evaluation Team consisted of Lene Poulsen, Team Leader; Sofia Tvaradze, Team Member; Tamar Loladze, Team Member; Ingela Ternström, Quality Assurance Expert; and Annefried Müller, Evaluation Manager. The report is drafted by the Team Leader and quality assured by the Quality Assurance Expert.

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all those who have supported and informed this Evaluation. We are particularly thankful to Khatuna Zaldastanishvili, Programme Officer and Erik Illes, Head of Development Cooperation at the Embassy of Sweden, Tbilisi for their continuous support throughout the Evaluation. Likewise, we are grateful for the interest and support in the Evaluation of the three implementing organizations, particularly Elena Loladze from Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT), Nino Chkhobadze and Maka Tsereteli from the Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth (Greens Movement), and Mariam Kimeridze and Dariusz Prazek from the Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “Orchis” (GSNE “Orchis”). We have benefitted from all your suggestions, thoughts, and inputs. Finally, we want to thank the many others who have provided inputs to us during interviews and surveys, including key staff from ministries, schools, universities, kindergartens, media, and other partners involved in waste management and clean environment in Georgia.

Executive Summary

Background & Methodology

The 47-month Keep Georgia Tidy Project (KGTP) funded by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) was launched in July 2019 by three Georgian civil society organizations: Keep Georgia Tidy; Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “Orchis”, and Greens Movement of Georgia / Friends of the Earth-Georgia. The focus of the KGTP is environmental awareness and waste management in Georgia in line with clauses in the European Union (EU)-Georgia Association Agreement. Key components of the Project are updated municipal waste management plans; Eco-Schools in line with the international Eco-School programme; community clean-up activities, environmental awareness activities for higher education facilities, and circular economy. The overall budget of the Project is 32 million Swedish Kronor or around 2.8 million EUR.

The independent End-Term Evaluation of the Keep Georgia Tidy Project was commissioned to the consulting company FCG Sweden by the Swedish Embassy in Georgia. The Evaluation was launched in March 2023 with primary data collection in May – June. The Evaluation was assigned 46.5 working days for the full Evaluation team of four persons. The overall purpose is to draw lessons-learned and reflect on what has worked well and what has been more challenging in the Project. By assessing the major results of the KGTP, the Evaluation also serves accountability purposes.

The Evaluation is guided by the Terms of Reference outlining eight questions on relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability; and poverty, voice, and gender. The Evaluation is theory-based and applied an appreciative inquiry approach with focus on positive results that are analysed through a realist and contribution assessment to identify what works well and under what circumstances. The Evaluation was informed by a comprehensive document review, key informant interviews, and an online perception survey.

The Evaluation encountered no major unexpected challenges but experienced a time-consuming process of identifying informants and arranging interviews with stakeholders from both within and outside the KGTP. Many showed limited knowledge and interest in participating in the Evaluation. The timing of an end-term evaluation when activities are still on-going caused challenges in getting all relevant data in a timely manner and final Project reports will only be available after the Evaluation has delivered its draft report.

Keep Georgia Tidy Project History

The KGTP succeeded the 12-year Clean-Up Georgia project, funded by the Swedish Government with the goal of enhancing waste management and environmental

consciousness in Georgia. The Clean-Up Georgia project was implemented by two of the three KGTP partners. The third Civil Society Organization (CSO) partner in the KGTP was created at the start of this project by staff members from the third partner involved in Clean-Up Georgia. An independent evaluation of the Clean-Up Georgia project recognized its effectiveness in addressing waste management needs but also highlighted design shortcomings including the cooperation agreements among the consortium members that would need development to achieve greater efficiency. The Keep Georgia Tidy Project document does not refer to the experiences from the Clean-Up Georgia or other waste management projects in Georgia, including programme and project evaluations and it remains unclear to the Evaluation how lessons-learned have been incorporated into the KGTP project document.

The KGTP's results chain encompasses 27 outcomes, along with outputs and activities. The Theory of Change and results chain are weak and the formulation of outcomes, outputs, and activities lacks adherence to normal definitions as defined for instance by OECD and Sida, leading to some outcomes being labelled as outputs or activities and visa-versa. Moreover, the monitoring and results framework reveals that outcomes and activities are distributed among the three consortium partners, creating five distinct project components: municipal waste management plans; Eco-Schools; community clean-up activities, environmental awareness activities for higher education facilities, and circular economy.

Evaluation Findings

Among the internal and external stakeholders informing the evaluation, only informants working with KGTP implementation identified success stories, while external stakeholders either refrained from participating in the online perception survey or indicated that they had too little knowledge of the project to identify a success story. Likewise, different external stakeholders who were interviewed expressed limited knowledge of the project activities. Overall, internal stakeholders identified the Eco-schools, the mapping of the circular economy potential, and the cleaning-up events as success stories in the online perception survey. A similar picture was found in the key informant interviews. According to the informants, the success was linked to 1/the coherence with Georgia's EU aspiration and the recognition that the environmental sector needs more attention; 2/the commitments of both local and national Government; 3/the mobilization of different stakeholder groups, and 4/ the focus on young people in many project activities.

Generally, the Evaluation finds that the KGTP scope is highly relevant and well aligned with Sida's strategy for cooperation with Georgia as well as Georgia's ongoing reform of its environmental sector to bring it up to EU standards, including the waste management systems.

The Evaluation finds that the effectiveness is difficult to assess based on the KGTP's result framework where outcomes are mainly described as outputs and not as changes per se. The Evaluation finds that the Project has contributed to all the 27 expected outcomes described in the project document and the updated Logical Framework from

March 2022. Outcomes defined in terms of development of knowledge products have been fully achieved. Planned awareness raising activities have been carried out although the number of reached target groups could not be verified by the Evaluation.

The KGTP partners and the Embassy of Sweden demonstrated adaptability and flexibility in updating the results framework to accommodate challenges posed by COVID-19 restrictions and the requirement for additional funding for the circular economy component. Despite this, the only update to the overall project document was reduction in some targeted values for some outcomes and outputs such as number of persons reached in an update of the logical framework the monitoring and evaluation framework from March 2022. These reductions were explained as necessary because of the challenges faced by the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, additional outcomes and outputs for circular economy were added to the updated logical framework and monitoring and evaluation framework. Key strategy parts of the document, that is the why and how, including the theory of change was never updated. Likewise, the Evaluation did not find evidence of results-based management practices, including feedback loops. The Evaluation found that the KGTP eventually updated approaches in outreach activities based on social interaction restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The scope of the Evaluation did not include a proper cost-benefit analysis but the Evaluation found that the investment of 32 million SEK is justified considering the KGTP level of results, including the clean-up contests and events throughout the country improving general environmental consciousness; environmental awareness activities at higher education facilities; five updated municipal waste management plans that are being implemented; the eco-school model that has been introduced in the public school system and the 11 eco-schools that have graduated to green flag status; the mapping of the circular economy potential in key economic sectors in Georgia; in addition to a number of knowledge products. However, this does not mean that it was the optimal way of spending this investment for achieving the specific objectives.

The Evaluation questions the sustainability of the KGTP in general as no plans for institutionalization could be identified. The project implementation model ensures a certain level of sustainability for activities that are directly linked to national legal and regulatory framework such as the five updated municipal waste management plans and policy decisions on circular economy as part of the waste management policy and the roadmap for circular economy. These activities are closely linked to the EU Association Agreement, which should be a guarantee for continuation beyond the KGTP. Otherwise, the Evaluation found that sustainability was mainly addressed through developing new project proposals for funding of project activities post May 2023.

The cross-cutting issues on local voice, poverty and deprivation reduction, and gender equality have received little attention in project implementation, which the Evaluation finds might reflect a lack of capacity among the KGTP partners and general challenges in cramming too many concerns into one project.

Conclusions

The KGTP activities are in line with and contributes to the Government of Georgia's policy on environmental protection and sustainable development supporting the EU-Georgia Association Agreement. However, the design of the KGTP with 27 outcomes that are not directly linked and a lack of a clear theory of change limit the impact of the investment in the KGTP. This is furthered by lack of effective results-based management with limited feedback loops, reflection on project performance, and regular update of the project design.

The KGTP consists of five major components implemented by one or two of the partners leaving the project practically as three sub-projects, and KGTP partners have limited knowledge of the implementation of each other's activities. The relevance of the project activities is high, but there is limited justification for why different implementation modalities have been chosen. Moreover, there is a lack of differentiation in communication strategies based on specific contexts, stakeholder groups, and needs. The activities related to waste management plans and circular economy mapping are relevant but not system-based, and fundamental challenges with lack of investment in waste management infrastructure remain. The KGTP has contributed to its updated expected outcomes and contributed to specific objectives, although the Evaluation could not verify the concrete impact on reduction in CO2 emissions based on available data. COVID-19 posed challenges to project implementation, but the partners adopted approaches to adapt to the situation.

The synergy potential among project partners has not been fully exploited. This seems to be linked to the inadequate project design and a lack of a theory of change binding the different project components together. The efficiency of the project is difficult to assess without a proper cost-benefit analysis, but the Evaluation considers that the investment of 32 million SEK for a 47-month intervention is justified based on the different concrete outputs. However, the Evaluation also considers that a more focused and harmonized approach would likely offer greater efficiency and sustainability. Overall, the sustainability of the project depends on the institutionalization of the introduced products and methods. Cross-cutting issues such as gender and poverty are mentioned in project documents, but concrete results in implementation of gender transformation and poverty reduction are lacking and there are no specific indicators. Overall, the KGTP requires improvements in project design, results-based management, and integration internal coherence to achieve better results and sustainability.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

Given that this is an end-term evaluation for a project that has already come to an end, the significant insights gained from the Project, which can be applied to different situations, align with the general recommendations for upcoming projects and programmes. Lessons-learned and recommendations are therefore presented together except for the last recommendation that specifically address the KGTP.

Lessons-learned 1: Importance of clear definition of the architecture of the consortium and the complementarity of the partners.

General recommendation 1 for other development projects implemented through consortia:

Clearly define the architecture of the consortium and the complementarity of the partners at the design of the project and ensure regular reviews of the fitness of the chosen structure.

Lessons-learned 2: Importance of a theory of change for all projects that clearly presents a comprehensive description and illustration of why and how a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context, including change strategies for generating behaviour and institutional changes. The theory of change should clearly show how outputs, outcomes, and objectives are interlinked. Moreover, the theory of change should provide external and causal assumptions for the different levels of the theory of change.

General recommendation 2 for other development projects:

Develop a theory of change for all projects to be used actively in all phases of project management to facilitate necessary reflections and updates of project design based on results assessments. The Theory of change should clearly identify the underlying problems to be addressed and the solutions in form of change pathways. Moreover, it should identify underlying assumptions and risks that should be revisited and updated, if necessary, throughout the implementation process to ensure the approach will contribute to the desired change. A well-developed theory of change agreed on by all partners will help strengthen harmonization by providing a common framework for setting goals, strategies, and indicators, fostering collaboration and shared understanding among stakeholders, and facilitating efficient resource allocation and adaptive management. It enhances transparency, accountability, and communication. Ultimately it contributes to the success of complex programs and initiatives.

Lessons-learned 3: Importance of ensuring that capacity for poverty reduction and gender transformation is included in allocated project resources.

General recommendation 3 for other development projects:

Ensure that capacity for poverty reduction and gender transformation exist and is incorporated into the project design, including the monitoring and evaluation framework with specific indicators for poverty reduction and gender equality based on context specific assessments on poverty, deprivation, and gender.

Lessons-learned 4: Importance of differentiated communication based on the target group, including differentiating between advocacy and awareness raising.

General recommendation 4 for other development projects:

Tailor communication strategies based on the target group.

KGTP specific recommendation

The key partners of the project, including the Embassy of Sweden, the three KGTP partners, and the relevant ministries (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment; Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Economy, and Sustainable Development), along with the involved municipalities, should prioritize and invest in the development of institutionalization plans for the KGTP generated results. This will help ensure the long-term sustainability and effective implementation of the KGTP's initiatives.

1 Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND OBJECTIVES

The Keep Georgia Tidy Project (KGTP) funded by the Swedish Government was launched in July 2019 by three Georgian civil society organizations: Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT); Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “Orchis” (GSNE “Orchis”); and the Greens Movement of Georgia / Friends of the Earth-Georgia (Greens Movement). The focus of the KGTP is environmental awareness and waste management in Georgia. According to the Grant Agreement (GA)¹ signed between the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the KGT on behalf of the KGTP consortium the overall objective of the KGTP is “To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of environment by 2023 through environmental sustainable education and promotion circular economy in Georgia.”² The implementation has covered a broad number of activities on awareness raising and advocacy, knowledge management, and the support to the legal and regulatory framework around the following key components:

- Development, enforcement, and upgrading of municipal waste management plans in line the European Union (EU)-Georgia Association Agreement from 2014.^{3,4} Greens movement is the responsible KGTP partner for this component in cooperation with GSNE “Orchis.”
- Introduction of Eco-Schools to promote environmental awareness and sustainable practices among students, schools, and their communities in line with the international Eco-School programme.⁵ KGT is responsible for this component.
- Community clean-up activities through contests for cleanest region, municipality, etc, and celebration of international days such as World Water Day, Earth Day, and World Environment Day. Greens Movement is responsible for this component.

¹ The July 2019 Grant Agreement (GA) includes the project document and the budget. **This report uses the abbreviation GA for the full Grant agreement including the project document.**

² Sida (Jul 2019) "Grant Agreement between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT). Regarding Keep Georgia Tidy" Sida Contribution No. 13312.

³ EU (Aug 2014) "Official Journal L261" Volume 57, 30 August 2014.

⁴ The European Union-Georgia Association Agreement is a bilateral agreement between the EU and Georgia. It was signed on June 27, 2014, and entered into force provisionally on September 1, 2014, and officially in July 2016. The Agreement supports Georgia's closer integration with the EU. It aligns Georgia's legislative framework with EU norms and standards, fostering closer economic and political integration. The agreement also provides a framework for ongoing cooperation and dialogue, helping Georgia to deepen its relations with EU member states.

⁵ The Eco-Schools programme is an international programme of the Foundation for Environmental Education (FEE) that was developed to support environmental learning in the classroom. The programme was launched in 1992 and is active in 68 countries and 59 000 schools around the world. Its methodology consists of seven steps that the school needs to adapt before being assigned a Green Flag: Establishment of an Eco-Schools Committee; Environmental review; Action Plan; Monitoring and Evaluation; Curriculum Linking; Informing and involving the wider community; Eco Code.

- Environmental awareness at higher education facilities through training essay contests, lectures, and knowledge products. GSNE “Orchis” is responsible for this component in cooperation with Greens Movement.
- Promotion of circular economy in Georgia through awareness raising and mapping of economic sectors in Georgia with potential for circular economy.⁶ GSNE “Orchis” is responsible for this component.

After 47 months of implementation the KGTP came to a close in May 2023. The independent End-Term Evaluation of the Keep Georgia Tidy Project (KGTPE) was launched in March 2023 with primary data collection in May – June before the final monitoring reports from the project were available. The Evaluation was assigned 46.5 working days for the full Evaluation team of four persons. The overall purpose of the KGTPE is to draw lessons-learned and reflect on what has worked well and what has been more challenging in the Project. By assessing the major results of the Project, the KGTPE also serves critical accountability purposes.

The objectives and scope of the KGTPE are described in the Terms of Reference (TOR)⁷ for the End-Term Evaluation that were developed by the Swedish Embassy in consultation with the three implementing partners of the KGTP. More specifically, the objectives of the KGTPE are 1/ to frame and summarise lessons learned, 2/ evaluate the outcomes and outputs of the project, 3/ Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness, and 4/ formulate recommendations for meeting objectives and sustaining results.

The scope of the KGTPE is in line with the Project. As such the geographic scope is the entirety of Georgia; the time scope is July 2019 – May 2023; and the programmatic/thematic scope is all Project activities and focus areas, including awareness raising and advocacy, legal and regulatory framework strengthening, and knowledge management to support integrated waste management, eco-schools, community clean-up activities, and circular economy in Georgia.

The primary KGTPE intended users are Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi and the KGTP implementing partners: KGT, GSNE “Orchis” and Greens Movement. Furthermore, it is expected that the KGTPE can be helpful for other stakeholders working on environmental awareness and waste management in Georgia and other countries at both national and decentralized levels.

⁶ Today, Circular Economy refers generally to three principles: 1/Eliminate waste and pollution, 2/Circulate products and materials (at their highest value), 3/Regenerate nature. These principles aim to decouple economic activity from the consumption of finite resources and to create a resilient system that is good for business, people, and the environment. Normally, integrated waste management is seen as part of the overall framework and political commitment to circular economy.

⁷ Embassy of Sweden (Jan 2023) “Terms of Reference for the end-term evaluation focusing on results achieved by the Keep Georgia Tidy project by the organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) together with its local partner organizations, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers GSNE “Orchis” and “Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia”, and Swedish partners Keep Sweden Tidy and Gästrike Återvinnare.”

1.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The KGTPE is organized around standard evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, and Cross-cutting norms from Sida's cooperation policy frameworks: Gender, Poverty, and Voice.

More specifically, the KGTPE addresses the following questions slightly reformulated here for clarity:

1. Does the project align with Sida's strategy and address Georgia's challenges in environmental governance reform and national priorities?
2. What is the extent of the project's contribution to the intended outcomes?
3. How adaptive have the KGTP implementing partners been in their approach to achieving results?
4. To what extent have the activities of the three partner organizations complemented each other and resulted in synergistic project management?
5. Can the project's costs be justified based on its results?
6. Does the project implementation model ensure sustainability of the achieved results?
7. Has the project contributed to enhancing power, voice, choice, and opportunities, as well as reducing deprivation and poverty?
8. How has gender equality been integrated into the project and what impact has it had on gender equality?

The questions in the TOR are closely followed by the KGTPE. However, three additional questions in the TOR are of a more concluding and lessons-learned nature and have therefore been addressed as part of the KGTPE's analysis and final conclusions, lessons-learned, and recommendations and not in the findings. These three questions are:

- What, if any, improvements could be recommended related to the management of the programme?
- How and what could be done to enhance the poverty relevance of the project?
- Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?

The full Evaluation Matrix with criteria, questions, key indicators/measurements, main sources of information, and data collection and analysis tools is presented in Annex 3. The Evaluation Matrix was approved by the Swedish Embassy as part of the inception phase.

Table 1. Structure of the Report

1.	Introduction	Overview of Evaluation.
2.	Methodology	Evaluation process: scope, focus, methodology, data collection approach, analysis framework, ethical issues, and limitations and opportunities.
3.	Evaluation Object	Description and analysis of the KGTP: background, design, focus, change theories, and budget.
4.	Findings	What the KGTP has verifiably observed and triangulated to respond to the key evaluation questions.
4.1	Success stories	Identification of key success stories of the KGTP and their unpacking.
4.2	Relevance	Assessment of how well the KGTP align with Sida's strategy and the legal and regulatory framework in Georgia.
4.3	Effectiveness	Assessment of KGTP's contribution to intended outcomes, adaptiveness flexibility, and synergy among KGTP partners.
4.4	Efficiency	Assessment of the extent to which Sida achieves value for invested resources.
4.5	Sustainability	Assessment of the extent to which the results and processes of the KGTP will be sustained post-project.
4.6	Cross-cutting norms	Assessment of how the KGTP has addressed key Sida principles: Voice, poverty, and gender.
5.1	Conclusions	Summation and analysis of what the findings show.
5.2	Lessons learned-cum-Recommendations	Identification of key lessons and recommendations from the KGTP with wider relevance beyond the KGTP.
5.3	Recommendations	Specific recommendations for the KGTP post-project.
	Annexes	Terms of Reference, Documents reviewed, Evaluation Matrix, Assessment of achievement of outcomes, Data collection tools: online perception survey and interview guidelines, Primary data collection informers.

2 Methodology

2.1 OVERALL APPROACH

The KGTP is theory based analysing the KGTP's achievement of expected results as defined in the Grant Agreement (GA),⁸ including the updated results framework from March 2022.⁹ The analysis takes into account the KGTP's context and the adjustments made to the results chain during the KGTP's lifetime, as described in section 3 of this report. As a theory-based evaluation the KGTP will identify what has worked well and what has been more challenging in the implementation of the project.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

To ensure usefulness of the KGTP, the evaluation methodology puts emphasis on ownership of evaluation results through a consultative approach. This has included a close dialogue with key evaluation stakeholders, particularly the Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi and the three Georgian implementing partners in order to capture their perspectives and experiences and respond to their expectations for a utilization focused evaluation.

The consultative and participatory approach to data collection was applied through an appreciative inquiry methodology. Appreciative inquiry applied in evaluations is premised on the belief that by focusing on positive results, the evaluation becomes a more constructive and inclusive exercise, promoting ownership of its findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The appreciative inquiry was used for qualitative data collection through which the KGTP has focused on learning from perceived successful experiences and perceived key contributing factors. This has been used to explore KGTP results and impacts. Focusing on success stories does not mean that challenges and problems are ignored. Rather, they have been addressed from a positive and learning perspective based on triangulated information.

2.3 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

To assess the KGTP performance, the KGTP has used:

- Identification of success stories as perceived by internal and external stakeholders, as well as the underlying change strategies and factors that have generated the success stories. This allows verification of the delivery model applied in the project as called for in the evaluation questions.

⁸ Sida (July 2019) "Grant Agreement between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT). Regarding Keep Georgia Tidy" Sida Contribution No. 13312; including amendments November 2020; June 2022, and November 2022.

⁹ Results Framework include the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and the Logical Framework from the original project document (July 2019) and the updated (March 2022).

- An evaluation matrix, with questions organized around traditional evaluation criteria as requested in the TOR. The full evaluation matrix is presented in Annex 3.

2.4 DATA COLLECTION

The KGTPE is informed by the following three data collection tools for secondary and primary data:

Secondary data sources through:

1/ A desk study. Around 90 background documents were reviewed, including context documents, Project documents, internal and external evaluations, studies, assessments, policies, strategies, and operational guidelines. The documents were identified with support from the Embassy of Sweden and the three KGTP partners. The review paid special attention to the evaluation questions outlined in the Evaluation Matrix. The documents reviewed is presented in Annex 2.¹⁰

Primary data sources through:

2/ Individual in-person and online interviews with 40 key informants representing the Embassy of Sweden; the three KGTP partners; Ministries of Environment, Education, Finance, Statistics, and Sustainable Development; Municipalities; bi-lateral and multi-lateral donors working on integrated waste management and circular economy in Georgia; private sector; other CSOs working on integrated waste management, circular economy, and clean-up-campaigns; public schools; universities; mass media; Parliament; and experts having participating in the circular economy activities of the project.¹¹ The institutions being interviewed by the KGTPE are presented in Annex 6. The interviews followed individually adapted semi-structured questionnaires based on the outline presented in Annex 5.

3/ An online perception survey among key KGTP stakeholders assessing their appreciation of the KGTP. The survey was distributed to 300 external and internal stakeholders.¹² The perception survey received 27 full responses and 63 part-responses, giving a response rate of about 20 per cent. The vast majority of the participants in the survey were internal stakeholders, that is stakeholders working for three KGTP partners, including consultants. The participants provided the following information about their background experience: Waste Management, Environmental Management, Teaching, Administration; Organizations: NGOs, Private sector, Media, and a few

¹⁰ For a full list of the key points from the document analysis please refer to the Inception Report.

¹¹ Although the KGTPE made repeated attempts to arrange face-to-face interviews with other key stakeholders, it was unsuccessful due to a lack of interest among several stakeholders or their prior commitments. Similarly, many key stakeholders opted not to participate in the online perception survey, as later noted in this section. Nevertheless, the sampling was extensive, and the document review aimed to incorporate information from key stakeholders who were not interviewed to the best extent possible.

¹² By internal stakeholders we refer to stakeholders directly involved in project implementation: staff working for the three KGTP partners, including regional and local coordinators. External stakeholders include other stakeholders involved in the focus areas of the KGTP such as central and local government, private sector, other NGOs, etc.

working in the public sector. The online perception survey questionnaire is presented in Annex 5.

The key informants for the primary data collection were selected through a careful and purposive sampling of participants for the different data collection modalities based on lists developed with input from the KGTP partners complemented by stakeholders identified by KGTPe. The sampling was based on the participants' roles and positions related to KGTPe and waste management, circular economy, and environmental awareness raising in general.

Anonymity was ensured in all data collection as can be seen for instance in primary data collection tools in Annex 5, which includes statements on the KGTPe commitment to participants on anonymity.

The majority of the key informants showed gender sensitivity but limited understanding on what gender transformation means. As such, many referred only to greater participation of women in all activities, which seemed to be the perceived goal for many informants and in fact in line with the KGTP results framework.¹³ The informants were not selected based on their sex and gender but there was a fair distribution with 17 males and 23 females among the key informants.

2.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on a realist evaluation approach combined with contribution assessment, to explain what works, how, to what extent, and in what circumstances. Key to realist evaluations is the assumption that nothing works everywhere or for everyone, and that context is critical for programme results. This requires a good understanding of the context. This is why the highly consultative approach has been essential for the KGTPe, to complement the comprehensive document review. The robustness of the explanatory framework is based on the broad range of data sources that have been triangulated throughout the data analysis.

¹³ In line with OECD-DAC and Sida Gender Policy, the KGTPe gender analysis framework is based on different levels: 1/Gender neutral: /Gender sensitive: Considers gender norms, roles and relations, Does not address inequality generated by unequal norms, roles or relations, Indicates gender awareness, although often no remedial action is developed; 2/Gender responsive: Considers gender norms, roles and relations for women and men and how they affect access to and control over resources, Considers women's and men's specific needs, Intentionally targets and benefits a specific group of women or men to achieve certain policy or programme goals or meet certain needs, Makes it easier for women and men to fulfil duties that are ascribed to them based on their gender roles; 3/Gender transformative: Considers gender norms, roles and relations for women and men and that these affect access to and control over resources, Considers women and men's specific needs, Addresses the causes of gender-based health inequities, Includes ways to transform harmful gender norms, roles and relations, the objective is often to promote gender equality, and Includes strategies to foster progressive changes in power relationships between women and men.

2.6 ETHICAL ISSUES

The KGTPE was developed by a team of independent consultants. The international consultants had had no prior or direct involvement in the KGTP design or implementation.

The KGTPE is guided by the ethical guidelines for evaluations laid out in OECD – DAC’s Quality Standards for Development Evaluations.¹⁴ This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting the privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results will not harm participants or their communities.

Moreover, the KGTPE applies the principles of integrity, independence and impartiality and accuracy, completeness and reliability are respected. Hence, the KGTPE has ensured that the evaluation is conducted in a transparent and accountable manner. Evidence can be traced back to the sources but in an anonymous manner.

2.7 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS, LESSONS-LEARNED, AND OPPORTUNITIES

The KGTPE did not encounter any unexpected challenges but confirmed some lessons-learned from other evaluations:

Importance of time-consuming organization.

Identification of informants and organization of interviews is time-consuming and should in ideal circumstances be initiated almost at the launch of the evaluation and with a full-time staff member dedicated only to this.

Importance of technical expertise in the language.

Georgian fluency and knowledge of the technical terms in Georgian is required for a satisfactory dialogue with many stakeholders in the Project.

Importance of online data collection.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a fast development of online interview and workshop techniques. Most informants, if not all, to evaluations like this KGTPE now have the necessary technology to participate in online data collection. Moreover, they are familiar using the online techniques. This provides some opportunities for evaluations. First of all, the data collection can be much more flexible compared to a typical three-week in-country data collection. However, with the increased flexibility and greater opportunities to interview all key informants through online techniques, the evaluation will also have lengthier data collection periods, which

¹⁴ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Action Committee (2010) ["DAC guidelines and reference series: Quality standards for development evaluation."](#)

in ideal circumstances should be accounted for in the initial planning. It is important also to note that, online interviews often create important spaces for frank and open discussions due to the safe place offered by sitting in a closed environment compared to in-person interviews that typically take place in office environments.

Importance of face-to-face interviews.

While online data collection offers many opportunities there are still some intangible information that can only be captured during physical visits. For the KGTPE, for instance: what was the general appearance of the schools participating the eco-school programme? How did different stakeholders interact not just verbally? Etc.

Importance of evaluation exercises to communicate about the project.

The KGTPE met many different interlocutors with some knowledge about a specific component of the KGTPE but with very limited information about the overall KGTP and Swedish Development cooperation. As such, the KGTPE also served general outreach purposes of the KGTP and Swedish Development cooperation in Georgia.

Importance of understanding the background of online respondents.

The 300 stakeholders invited to participate in the online perception survey represented both external and internal stakeholder but all with a relation to waste management, environmental awareness, and circular economy in Georgia. However, only two out of the 60 respondents were external stakeholders. Moreover, these stakeholders indicated that they had no knowledge of the different activities of the KGTP and could therefore not identify success stories. Likewise, internal stakeholders only reported on the subproject they were working on: eco-schools, circular economy, or waste management plans. And they all reported what they were working on as success stories. The KGTPE's analysis of this response pattern was also informed by the face-to-face interviews where a similar pattern was evident: limited knowledge of the KGTP among external stakeholders and limited knowledge of the full KGTP among internal stakeholders who are only fully aware of the specific sub-project they are assigned too. For the KGTPE this is an important finding in itself as will be discussed in chapter 4.

Timing of the evaluation.

While the KGTPE in principle took place at the time when the project was closing down, updated monitoring data were not available for all project activities and annual performance reports for 2022-2023 was only to be presented end of July 2023, that is after the draft of the KGTPE was submitted. As a result, this End-term evaluation is not necessarily reporting on all outcomes reached.

3 Evaluation object: the KGTP¹⁵

3.1 PREVIOUS PROJECTS AND EVALUATIONS

The KGTP followed the 2010-2018 Clean-Up-Georgia project funded by the Swedish Government. The Clean-Up Georgia project was originally implemented by an NGO consortium consisting of two of KGTP partners: GSNE “Orchis” and Greens Movement in addition to Eco-Vision. From mid-2015 the Clean-Up Georgia project was implemented by GSNE “Orchis,” Greens Movement, and Ecological Awareness and Waste Management (EAWM). The KGT was in fact formed by former staff members of EAWM during the preparation of the KGTP. The Clean-Up Georgia project also sought to foster a healthier environment and mitigate the impact of climate change in Georgia, through improved waste management practices and empowering individuals to take greater responsibility. The conclusions of the independent end evaluation of the third phase can be summarized as:¹⁶

- The project addressed the country's waste management needs effectively, utilizing bottom-up, community-based approaches and policy development.
- The results framework of the project had some deficiencies.
- The hazardous waste component faced challenges in gaining sufficient support and ownership from central government authorities, but hazardous waste studies would be useful in the future.
- The project had successfully fostered ownership among local authorities in the solid waste components, resulting in visible improvements throughout the country.
- The long-term sustainability of the project was uncertain.
- While the project was implemented in a cost-effective manner with low administrative costs, there was room for enhancing cooperation among consortium members to maximize efficiency and results in both hazardous and non-hazardous waste components, as each NGO during the project had maintained separate project staff with limited synergy.

¹⁵ The project development and project design has been controversial throughout the project and found by the KGTP to be a major limitation for an effective and efficient project as will be discussed further in section 4. This section with the KGTP analysis of the KGTP is therefore relatively long for an evaluation report, but the KGTP finds that the understanding of the project development, design, and expectations based on lessons-learned and recommendations for the preceding project is important for the evaluation.

¹⁶ Sida (2018) “Evaluation of four NGO implemented programmes in Georgia.”

The recommendations were clear:

- NGOs to improve the cooperation and resource sharing arrangements in order to augment the results of the whole project.
- Extend the project until the National Plan on Hazardous Waste Management becomes more concrete, expected by the end of 2018. The project should be split into two components: municipal waste and hazardous waste.
- The municipal waste component should ensure the continuation of the project results by reviewing the draft municipal waste management plans and facilitating the public discussions in the municipalities.
- During the remaining months of phase III and the proposed extension period, the focus should be on identifying challenges and capacity/service gaps, conducting feasibility studies, and developing project concepts or proposals to address the identified problems.
- The Swedish Embassy would make a decision in autumn 2018 on whether and how to proceed with the two components of the project. The Embassy's decision should depend on the quality of proposals from project partners and the sector's development, such as priorities outlined in the National Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan.

3.2 NATIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The management of solid waste in Georgia is governed by the Waste Management Code of 2014¹⁷ with further implementation details in the National Waste Management Strategy for 2016-2030 and five-year national waste management plans. The institutional framework is based on a waste management strategy: prevention, preparation for re-use, recycling, other recovery, and disposal. The framework and builds further updates and details and includes the regulations for the Extended Producers Responsibility and Waste Separation.¹⁸ Overall, the institutional framework follows the internationally recognized waste management models calling for legislation and regulations; voluntary agreements; economic instruments; education, including awareness raising and educational programmes; information and monitoring; and technology choice.¹⁹ This complex process requires active participation and buy-in throughout the entire process from not only the Government but also the general population.

¹⁷ Government of Georgia (2014) "[Law of Georgia – Waste Management Code.](#)"

¹⁸ Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) is a policy approach that places the responsibility for managing the environmental impact of a product throughout its lifecycle on the producers.

¹⁹ See for instance UNEP & UNITAR (2013) "[Guidelines for National Waste Management Strategies – Moving from Challenges to Opportunities](#)"

3.3 KGTP PROJECT DOCUMENT: GRANT AGREEMENT (GA)

3.3.1 Overall

The project document - which is included in the GA – should in principle clearly outline the roadmap for Project implementation as agreed upon by the key stakeholders in the Project, here the Government of Sweden, the Government of Georgia, and the three implementing CSOs, that is the KGT, the Greens Movement, and the GSNE “Orchis”. As such, the GA is supposed to be a key project management tool to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in project implementation but also to allow feedback loops and adaptive management as part of the results-based management approach called for by Sida. But this requires a well-developed evidence-based theory of change that helps stakeholders understand and analyse the underlying assumptions, logic, and expected outcomes of the overall project and thereby facilitating strategic decision-making. As a management tool the project document is supposed to be reviewed regularly, for instance to assess if the assumptions are still valid or should be updated.

According to the GA, the KGTP is to be implemented in close cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Culture of Georgia, Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia and its structural unit – Environmental Information and Education Centre as well as Swedish partners: Keep Sweden Tidy²⁰ and Gästrike Återvinnare.²¹ The GA presents detailed background analysis for the subject of the Project although some of the analysis are very general and not referenced with sources, such as the gender analysis and poverty analysis that seem to be based on general perceptions – some of them even global notions and not based on the specific context in the different locations in Georgia. Likewise, there are no direct references to the “Clean-Up-Georgia” project or the conclusions and recommendations from that project in the GA. Nor are experiences and lessons-learned from the Swedish partners on issues such as awareness raising, and behavioural changes referred to.

While not referring to the Clean-Up-Georgia project or its end-evaluation, the GA reflects the recommendations of the Clean-Up-Georgia end evaluation to a varying degree as shown in the following analysis of the KGTP. As such, the KGTP does not include hazardous waste management and the KGTP has reviewed municipal waste management plans. On the other hand, the organisational structure of the KGTP CSO consortium is very similar to the Clean-Up-Georgia except that there is no longer any rotational leadership, and it is not clear how the recommendation on improved cooperation arrangements has been heeded. Likewise, the KGTP has not seen any feasibility study as recommended and the KGTP results framework is questioned by

²⁰ “[Keep Sweden Tidy](#)” (Håll Sverige Rent) is a non-profit organization in Sweden established in 1983 and with nationwide presence and focus on promoting cleanliness, sustainability, and environmental responsibility. The organization conducts campaigns, events, and educational programs to increase awareness about the significance of keeping public spaces clean and reducing waste.

²¹ Gästrike Återvinnare is an association of five municipalities in Gävleborg County, Sweden aiming at sustainable waste management. The association has an international department with cooperation on waste management in 16 countries on a range of services including strategic planning and advisory support in waste management, recycling, landfill issues and biogas production.

the KGTP as discussed in the next chapters similar to the Clean-Up Georgia evaluation.²² It should also be noticed that the evaluation of the former project does not refer to circular economy, eco-schools, and clean-up activities, which are three of the five key components of the KGTP.

The GA presents a Political-Economic-Social-Technological (PEST) Analysis that identifies the overall problem linked to the Georgian Waste management as “Pollution from municipal solid waste in Georgia.” It, furthermore, outlines various challenges that can be summarized as Insufficient Public Waste Management;²³ Low Citizen Awareness, Knowledge, and Participation in Waste Management;²⁴ and Insufficient Legal and Regulatory Framework for Waste Management.²⁵ Many of the specific challenges are interdependent and the PEST analysis provides some linkages – but only some and not always in a logical manner. For instance, according to the PEST low public participation has an influence on public waste management effectiveness. However, based on KGTP’s interviews with stakeholders and general experience with the subject it is normally also a result of weak public waste management, which includes awareness raising and public participation as described earlier in this section. It should also be noted that the project documents made available for the KGTP, including the GA do not provide background analysis and evidence for these challenges.²⁶

3.3.2 Theory of Change

The July 2019 GA also presents a Theory of Change for the KGTP based on the PEST analysis but only in a summarized diagram and without any narrative. Overall, the Theory of Change presents expected changes at objective and outcome level, which are supposed to be generated through specific outputs for each outcome. While the outcomes are separated into two groups according to the KGTP’s two overall objectives the theory of change does not present any interlinkages or synergies between the different objectives, outcomes, or outputs or links to the challenges outlined in the PEST analysis. There are no specific change strategies presented either except that “The project aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of environment by

²² In fact, the Clean-Up-Georgia project had a simpler and more logical results chain than the KGTP with its 27 outcomes.

²³ Lack of organization and financial resources hinder the effectiveness of waste management in Georgian municipalities; Uncontrolled disposal of solid domestic waste strains local self-government budgets due to increased workforce and financial requirements; Some Municipal waste management plans lack accuracy, consistency, and commitment to implementation; and No Regional waste management plans or structure.

²⁴ Low public participation in integrated waste management; Inadequate public information and education systems to address waste management challenges; Lack of interest and qualification among teachers to teach environmental and sustainable development courses in schools; Lack of business support to sustainable waste management, including technological solutions; Limited inclusion of environmental specifications in higher education institutions' faculties; Lack of demand, non-prioritization, and partial ignorance of environmental challenges by the state and universities; and Emphasis on fundamental science rather than environmental protection in educational curricula.

²⁵ Public waste management not linked to economic development models in Georgia and Green Economy not institutionalized Insufficient sustainable mechanisms and systems for waste reduction and environmental improvement.

²⁶ Please refer to the list of documents reviewed for the KGTP in Annex 2.

2023 through environmentally sustainable education and promotion circular economy in Georgia.” Still, the various project documents reviewed by the KGTP suggest that the KGTP follows some generally accepted models for Waste Management as implemented for instance by the Swedish Partners. In this line, the KGTP concept recognizes that Waste Management is a multifaceted concept that involves various practices such as waste collection, recycling, and waste reduction at national, regional, municipal, and local level.

Based on KGTP’s analysis of the project documents, the overall change strategy of the project can be seen as an integrated approach with social, economic, legal-normative, management and technical systems but with a focus on awareness raising, legislative framework, and capacity issues at different levels. According to the Theory of Change in the GA, the KGTP seeks to address “Lack of adequate knowledge, incentives, and waste management in Georgia” which is identified as a major obstacle for achieving Georgia’s international commitment for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of the environment.²⁷ More specifically, the GA identifies the overall objective as “reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of environment by 2023 through environmental sustainable education and promotion circular economy in Georgia.” This formulation can be interpreted in different ways. Based on the review of the project documents and interviews with the Swedish Embassy and the KGTP partners, the KGTP understands the objective as “To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of the environment by 2023 through education in sustainable environmental issues and public awareness and promotion of circular economy.” The GA, moreover, identifies the KGTP’s specific objectives as:

1. To attain environmentally conscious generation in Georgia by 2023, and
2. To reduce pollution from municipal waste (40%) and greenhouse gas emissions (10%) in Georgia by 2023.

It should be noted, that the KGTP did not identify plans for how to measure the pollution from municipal waste, let alone the exact reduction, including the greenhouse gas emissions and which specific gasses.²⁸ According to several experts interviewed during the KGTP, such exact measures do not exist in Georgia.

In other words, the main focus of the KGTP is to create environmental awareness among the general population, private sector, and local and central Government and to promote engagement in sustainable environmental management in the overall education system of the country. By doing so, the KGTP aims to protect people's rights to live in a clean environment. Furthermore, the Project seeks to support the development of a circular economy, which should also reduce poverty. The KGTP project documents suggest, moreover, that the project will have a positive impact on

²⁷ Grant Agreement “Keep Georgia Tidy”, Sida Contribution No. 13312. 1 July 2019.

²⁸ According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), landfill gas is composed of roughly 50 percent methane, 50 percent carbon dioxide and a small amount of non-methane organic compounds ([Basic Information about Landfill Gas](#)). Methane has more than 80 times the warming power of carbon dioxide over the first 20 years after it reaches the atmosphere.

gender equality and support people living in poverty but without providing any evidence-based analysis for how this is likely to happen.

3.3.3 Outcomes and Outputs

The specific objectives in the original project document should be achieved through 25 outcomes with a number of outputs²⁹ for each outcome and specified in the Logical Framework of the GA. There is no systematic logical distinction between outcomes and outputs. For instance, some of the outcomes are defined as outputs³⁰ while some of the outputs are defined as outcomes.³¹ Moreover, many of the outputs are described as activities.³² The KGTP activities focus on awareness raising and advocacy through a broad number of activities that are more or less linked. These activities include surveys, mass campaigns, knowledge management, work with special stakeholder groups, etc. The Logical Framework is complemented by a Monitoring and Evaluation framework with outcome performance indicators and corresponding baselines. There are no output indicators. Furthermore, the links between the different outcomes are not indicated in the GA nor the links between the many different outputs, which could have an impact on effectiveness and efficiency.

Another key element of a traditional Theory of Change that is missing in the GA are causal assumptions. However, the KGTP Logical Framework presents assumptions – both causal and external assumptions³³ but also assumptions that are formulated as indicators; for instance, an assumption on increased knowledge on circular economy from an activity on seminars and workshop to raise awareness on circular economy. Overall, it can be concluded that the GA is based on three general external assumptions:

1. Availability of human, financial, and technological resources.³⁴
 2. Rising national and incomes and availability of fiscal resources for waste management.
 3. Political will and no frequent changes in the Government.
- These assumptions have not been questioned in project implementation for their continuous validity.

²⁹ The exact number of outputs is difficult to determine from the Logical Framework as many are presented as mix of activities and outputs, for instance “Development of training materials, Lectures, publications & presentations in 20 State universities on Environmental issues, Promotion of Clean up campaigns in Georgia according to Eco-calendar, climate change, SDGs, circular economy, etc.(sic!) Knowledge transfer, Essay competitions, Media campaigns.”

³⁰ For instance, the outcome “Keep Georgia Tidy received the license from Foundation for Environmental Education (FEE) on Eco-Schools program” is the product of an activity, which would normally be described as an output.

³¹ For instance, the output “New methods and approaches used in awareness on Stop littering in Georgia” is a behaviour change which should normally be described as an outcome.

³² For instance, the output “Training of young generation and key stakeholders on positive input of bio-restoration” is what should normally be described as an activity.

³³ External assumptions are given and critical for the KGTP performance, but the project has no direct influence on them. Causal assumptions also referred to as implementation assumptions are assumptions about how change will happen according to the project’s explicit or implicit theory of change.

³⁴ The assumption on resource availability can also be considered as a semi-external assumption as the project management would be able to control the resource availability to a certain extent.

3.3.4 Updated GA

The original funding for the 47-month Project was 28.5 million SEK (Swedish kronor). This was later increased to 34 million SEK through an amendment to the budget in November 2020, to allow for an increased focus on circular economy with a new circular economy component from 1 November 2020 to 31 October 2022³⁵ The basis was a realization that the circular economy component in the original project document focused on very general awareness raising with no concrete results. With the addition of the new component studies and knowledge products could also be generated. Moreover, the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and Logical Framework for the project was updated in March 2022 adjusting objectives, outcomes, and outputs to take into account the unforeseeable COVID-19 pandemic that had negative impact on planned project activities.^{36, 37}

The updated specific objectives are:

1. To attain an environmentally conscious generation in Georgia by 2023, and
2. To reduce pollution from municipal waste (15%) and greenhouse gas emissions in Georgia by 2023.

As such, the targeted reduction in pollution from municipal waste was decreased from 40 to 15 per cent and the exact reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is no longer identified in the objectives. It is still not mentioned how the pollution reduction will be measured. With the addition of the special focus on Circular Economy, the number of outcomes were increased from 25 to 27 in the updated Logical Framework from November 2020. Apart from the add-ons of the two circular outcomes there were no modifications of the rest of the logical framework or monitoring and evaluation framework.

The updated Logical Framework from March 2022 does not include any update on the assumptions. Likewise, the KGTP did not see any suggestions for updated assumptions as part of the project management for instance in the annual performance reports, which in principle should be results- based according to general Sida principles. And generally, the KGTP found that the Theory of change presented in the original GA was never updated. As such, the KGTP considers that the general change strategies identified above remain valid for the updated Grant Agreement from 2022.

³⁵ Amendment to the Agreement on Keep Georgia Tidy between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT). 20 November 2023. Sida Contribution No. 13312.

³⁶ Updated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, March 2022. Sida. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework focuses on outcomes.

³⁷ Updated Logical Framework, March 2022. Sida. The Logical Framework includes both outcomes and linked outputs.

3.3.5 Geographic Scope and Decentralization

The geographic scope of the KGTP is the whole territory of Georgia consisting of 12 regions,³⁸ 59 municipalities, and 5 self-governing cities³⁹ including the capital of Georgia, Tbilisi. The geographic scope should be seen in the context of the decentralization in Georgia and the role, responsibility, and capacity of the regions, municipalities, and self-governing cities. This is not discussed, though, in the GA or any other project documents reviewed by the KGTPPE.

The decentralization process in Georgia started in 1997. The current legal foundation for self-government is the Law on Local Self-Government Code from 2014 giving local government authorities responsibility for local taxation and budgeting; local natural resources; socio-economic development and spatial planning; local roads and transportation; water supply, sewage and sanitation; solid waste management; public spaces, parks, cemeteries and green areas; shelter and child care, protection of victims of family violence; preschool and additional education. In line with the decentralization process, all 59 municipalities have adopted five-year Municipal Waste Management Plans, and their implementation has commenced.⁴⁰ Furthermore, numerous waste-generating companies have submitted waste management plans to the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture for approval and have started annual reporting on their waste generation.

The decentralization process is still ongoing governed by the Decentralisation Strategy 2020-2025.⁴¹ The decentralization process in Georgia has faced several challenges. According to the Strategy by the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, some of the main challenges include the lack of political will and support for decentralization, insufficient financial resources for local governments, and inadequate human resources. Those are all important challenges for the highly decentralized structure of the solid waste management policy in Georgia as highlighted in the 2021

³⁸ Georgia is divided in nine administrative regions and three autonomous territories. The latter include Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which are officially recognized by Georgia's laws as territories occupied by the Russian Federation. Meanwhile, the Autonomous Region of Adjara is governed by an autonomous government appointed by the supreme council, with autonomous competences in areas like finance, economy, healthcare, agriculture, and education. The administrative regions, on the other hand, are managed by State Trustees appointed by the Prime Minister of Georgia. They function as a decentralized level of central government and are responsible for coordinating the activities of central government agencies and creating strategies for the socio-economic development of the region. (Melua, David (2021) "[Decentralization and Local Public Administration Reform in Georgia – Status Report.](#)" [Platforma – Local and Regional International Action](#) & National Association of Local Authorities in Georgia, NALAG).

³⁹ Self-government cities are big urban settlements while municipalities are agglomerations of small rural and urban settlements. All local self-government units have equal powers and are responsible for: local taxation and budgeting; local natural resources; socio-economic development and spatial planning; local roads and transportation; water supply, sewage and sanitation; solid waste management; public spaces, parks, cemeteries and green areas; shelter and childcare, protection of victims of family violence; preschool and additional education.

⁴⁰ World Bank (May 2021) "[Georgia Solid Waste Sector Assessment Report.](#)"

⁴¹ [Government of Georgia \(2019\) "Decentralization Strategy 2020-2025."](#) According to the strategy: "The decentralization strategy puts a strong emphasis on cooperation between municipalities (financial and/or technical and/or etc) in the areas such as portable water supply, smooth functioning of the sewage system, **municipal waste management**, local economic development and implementation of programs fostering employment etc."

World Bank Assessment of the Solid Waste Sector in Georgia.⁴² The assessment highlights among others the need for supporting municipalities to address capacity shortcoming and financing, responsibility, and accountability. This is not outlined, though, in any of the project documents reviewed by the KGTP. Nor has it been referred to by key informants to the evaluation.

3.3.6 Stakeholders

Based on the KGTP's analysis of the project documents and the interviews with the KGTP partners, the key stakeholders of the KGTP are:

- The Parliament,
- Local Government Authorities: Regions and municipalities,
- Government: Line ministries of Environmental Protection and Agriculture; Regional Development and Infrastructure; Education and Science; Economy and Sustainable Development; Regional line ministries: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports of Adjara.
- State Universities,⁴³
- Education resource centres,⁴⁴
- Public and private schools,
- Kindergartens,⁴⁵ and
- Business sector.

3.3.7 Lessons-learned and context

Finally, it should be noted that the GA does not present any context analysis in terms of other development cooperation interventions aiming at the waste management sector in Georgia. Rather the GA presents the project strategy almost in a vacuum. As already mentioned, the preceding Clean-Up-Georgia project is not mentioned – for instance what were the lessons learned and what were the recommendations from the evaluation?

Still, there are other important waste management projects. For instance, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in cooperation with the Georgian Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN)⁴⁶ supported the waste management sector in Georgia to bring it up the EU Association Agreement. During the second

⁴² World Bank (May 2021) "[Georgia Solid Waste Sector Assessment Report](#)."

⁴³ There are 17 State Universities and 37 Private Universities in Georgia.

⁴⁴ Each municipality has an Education Resource Centre (ERC), staffed by a team of four-five individuals, which is responsible for administering schools and coordinating between them and the ministry of Education. ERCs offer a range of services, including teacher training and professional development, curriculum development, and support for teaching and learning materials. They also provide access to modern technology and information resources.

⁴⁵ Kindergartens are mostly operated by the Government, although there are also private kindergartens available. The age of admission is usually 3-4 years old, although some kindergartens may accept children as young as 2 years old. Children attend kindergarten for 3 years before starting primary school at the age of 6. The curriculum is based on a play-based approach. Kindergartens are regulated by the Ministry of Education and Science and the Education Resource Centres.

⁴⁶ [CENN](#) is Georgian NGO and member of IUCN working to protect the environment by fostering sustainable development throughout the South Caucasus. CENN's mission is to work with communities, governments, and businesses to create sustainable solutions for a healthy environment.

phase of the programme that ran from 2019-2020, 19 waste management plans for municipalities were developed and approved through the programme support and 3 waste management plans were specifically designed for protected areas. In addition, the programme has played a critical role in the development of the Extended Producers Responsibility (EPR) regulations, and it facilitated the closing of 10 dumpsites.⁴⁷ The programme also worked on a nationwide campaign called "Keep Georgia Beautiful", aiming to safeguard the country's biodiversity and ensure a clean environment, inter alia through public-private partnerships on waste separation and recycling, which introduced the country's first public waste separation schemes. As such, the programme supported establishment of 47 waste separation corners located in public places and 28 in public schools. Moreover, the programme carried out capacity development activities for stakeholders, including the business sector and public awareness campaigns through clean-up contests, clean-up campaigns, community events, as well as via TV programs, Facebook campaigns, special activities for kindergartens and schools, etc. As we will see later those are very similar to many of the activities of the KGTP.⁴⁸

The KGTPE also noted that the different KGTP project documents do not make references to use of experience from pilot projects on solid waste management either. For instance, the EU and the German development bank KfW funded pilot studies in cooperation with the Solid Waste Management Company of Georgia of the Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan of the Kutaisi municipality in 2019.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Dumpsites are sometimes referred to as illegal landfills.

⁴⁸ Information provided in interviews with USAID and CENN representatives as well as the Final Report: USAID and CENN (2020) "Waste Management Technology in Regions Phase II - WMTR II" USAID, Tbilisi.

⁴⁹ See for instance, [The project "Integrated Solid Waste Management – Kutaisi" 2015-2022 and Government of Georgia \(2019\) "Acquiring and Using Waste Data for Monitoring and Optimization of Local Waste Management -Conduct, findings and conclusions of the pilot studies in the project area."](#)

4 Findings

4.1 SUCCESS STORIES

4.1.1 Key Findings on Perceived Success Stories in the KGTP

F-SS1 – While the response rate to the online perception survey was acceptable at 20+ per cent, the participants were by and large project staff. The lack of responses from external stakeholders might reflect the limited knowledge about the project among other actors in Georgia working on municipal waste management plans, eco-schools, and circular economy.

F-SS2 – The perceived success stories are limited to introduction of eco-schools, introduction of circular economy and preparation of the mapping of circular economy potential, and cleaning-up contests at local level. These identified success stories are clear reflections on what the individual respondent is working on.

Identification of success stories

As described in the methodology in section 2, most of the participants in the online survey are internal stakeholders working with and being responsible for certain parts of the KGTP implementation. That most invited external stakeholders decided not to participate might reflect the responses from the few external stakeholders that actually participated in the survey. In fact, they provided limited information and mainly stating that they did not have enough information to provide meaningful responses.⁵⁰ This interpretation also reflects the information collected during KGTP interviews where external stakeholders involved in waste management, had very limited - if any - knowledge about the KGTP, including NGOs working on development of municipal waste management plans and circular economy or the environmental sections of national broadcast companies. So, the lack of external stakeholder participation in the online perception survey might reflect the limited reach of the project. This should also be seen in the context of the overall investment in the project of 34 million SEK or approximately 2.9 million EUR, which interviewed stakeholders generally considered as relatively modest as discussed in the findings under efficiency (EQ5). These introductory comments are critical for the interpretation of the identified success stories.

The identified success stories are mainly:

⁵⁰ One participant in the online perception survey states that the survey is the first time the respondent hears about the KGTP.

- The introduction of eco-schools in different parts of the country, where the importance of the eco-committees is highlighted as a way to involve different stakeholders. Overall, the respondents identifying the eco-schools as success stories point to the success of raising the environmental awareness of students and the surrounding communities.
- The introduction of circular economy and the preparation of the mapping of circular economy potential in key economic sectors in Georgia, which are identified by respondents who have participated in various project activities on the circular economy.
- The cleaning up events mobilizing different stakeholder groups were identified as a success story by three respondents.

The first important information from the survey results is that no respondent refers to the full project with different activities and different partners when identifying success stories. Likewise, there are no references to the importance of the project's contribution to CO₂ reduction in spite of this being the overall project objective. The perceived project success is explained in terms of greater environmental awareness particularly among young people and greater understanding of the circular economy as part of sustainable development. This was in fact also a characteristic of the key informant interviews, where there were no references to CO₂ reduction or direct impact on pollution except when informants responded to a direct question on measurement of CO₂ reduction.

What makes a success story

The primary data collection - that is the online perception survey and the key stakeholder interviews – identified a number of major external factors contributing to the perceived successes:

- EU aspiration: the environmental sector needs more attention.
- Commitments of both local and national Government, including the existence of a strong and updated legal and regulatory framework on issues such as circular economy, waste management, and environmental standards.
- The mobilization of different stakeholder groups.

The identified internal factors leading to the perceived successes are:

- The links to an international environment and use of experience from other countries, including experts from Sweden.
- The distribution of a full package of material for the eco-schools training, education, and public awareness. Here it should be noted, though, that among the survey responses and interviews there were also comments about the lack of proper adaptation to local conditions and involvement of local stakeholders in the design of activities such as eco-schools that are following a general model with limited attention to the local needs and capacities. The survey results, furthermore, revealed that while material such as videos distributed by the Project are of high quality, there is limited attention to their actual use and usefulness. Likewise, it was noted

during interviews by direct partners in project implementation such as government agencies and municipalities that they were only consulted on the project design, that is according to them they were presented the final draft, but they were not involved in the design as such. Finally, as mentioned in section 3, the project document does not make references to other actors in the project areas such as NGOs and agencies supporting various aspects of waste management and circular economy. Some of these external actors working on relevant aspects of waste management and circular economy in Georgia confirmed during interviews that there had been limited – if any – contacts with the KGTP.

- The fact that the Project focuses on young people is perceived as a major factor to the success by several informants.

Lessons learned from the success stories

The primary data collection highlighted the interest of everybody in strengthening exchange of experience through more formalized networks both within Georgia and with other similar countries where eco-schools and circular economy are being introduced. These formalized networks can consist of different forms of platforms but need structure and continuous facilitation.

Informants to the survey and interviews also highlighted the need for a long-term focus to ensure sustainability of the activities and continuous commitments to the principles of eco-schools and circular economy. Some respondents noted the need for financial commitments of local authorities to ensure ownership and continuation. But it was also noted by some respondents that the school budgets, for instance, for the time being are very constrained and that external funding such as the one from KGTP is critical for maintaining an environmental focus. This would include for instance the continuous training of teachers.

Finally, it should be noted that many of the internal stakeholders responding to the online perception survey highlighted the need for another project phase.

4.2 RELEVANCE

4.2.1 EQ1. Does the project align with Sida's strategy and address Georgia's challenges in environmental governance reform and national priorities?

The KGTP is well aligned with Sida's strategy for cooperation with Georgia as well as Georgia's ongoing reform of its environmental sector to bring it up to EU standards, including for the waste management systems.

Key Findings on EQ1

F-EQ1.1 – Overall the KGTP supports the major bottlenecks and barriers identified by Georgian authorities for bringing waste management up to EU standards through an update of the institutional framework, including municipal waste management plans, awareness raising, and circular economy.

F-EQ1.2 – The KGTP design is fully aligned with Sweden’s reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans, and Turkey 2014-2020⁵¹ and the Strategy for Sweden’s Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe 2021-2027⁵² and Georgia’s environmental governance reform, which essentially consists of updating the legal and regulatory framework in accordance with the provisions in the EU-Georgia Association Agreement.⁵³ In implementation, the KGTP is particularly supporting environmental awareness raising and municipal waste management plans in general.

Discussion of EQ1 findings

The KGTP alignment with Sida’s strategy for Georgia should be seen in the context of the overall history of Sweden’s cooperation with Georgia, which has been defined by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)⁵⁴ of the EU from 2003.⁵⁵ The following bullet points highlight how the KGTP is relevant for key components of the ENP:

- *Bilateral cooperation*: the KGTP builds on cooperation with Sweden and key Swedish partners, particularly Keep Sweden Tidy and Gästrike Återvinnare.
- *Shared values and objectives*: the KGTP seek to adopt Swedish values and principles on recycling and environmental consciousness.
- *Differentiation*: the KGTP reflects the needs in Georgia but differentiate in different degrees for the different components. As such, the updating of five municipal waste management plans is by design adapted to the local context while the eco-school programmes generally follow the international standard seven points model.
- *Sectoral cooperation*: the KGTP strengthen cooperation in the environmental sector between Swedish and Georgian partners who are working on waste management and/or international partners who are working on environmental education.
- *Financial assistance*: the KGTP is based on Sida’s investment in project activities.
- *Regional cooperation*: the KGTP does not specifically promote regional cooperation although some contacts have been made with other countries under the ENP, for instance on circular economy.

⁵¹ MFA (2014) “[Results Strategy for Sweden’s reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey 2014 – 2020.](#)”

⁵² MFA (2021) “[Strategi för Sveriges reformsamarbete med Östeuropa 2021–2027.](#)”

⁵³ EU (2014) “[Association Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the one part, and Georgia, of the other part](#)”

⁵⁴ [The ENP](#) is a foreign relation instrument of the EU designed to establish closer ties between the Union and countries situated to the east and south of its European territory to foster stability, security, and prosperity in the EU’s neighbouring regions.

⁵⁵ Sweden’s cooperation policy with Georgia and the strong support to the ENP directly reflects Sweden’s priorities of EU enlargement and integration the EU Eastern Partnership from 2009 and therefore also Sweden’s support to good governance and EU common legal framework on issues such as environmental management in cooperation countries.

- *Mobility and People-to-People* contacts: the KGTP has facilitated exchange visits between Sweden and Georgia allowing for exchanges.
- *Regular Dialogue and Monitoring*: the KGTP support to the legal and regulatory framework for waste management in Georgia has included for instance assessment of implementation of the municipal waste management plans and initiated activities to establish a registry on dumpsites.⁵⁶

More directly, the KGTP is also in line with the Strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans, and Turkey 2014-2020⁵⁷ and the Strategy for Sweden's Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe 2021-2027⁵⁸. These strategies specifically support the ENP, including 1/enhanced economic cooperation with the EU; 2/strengthened democracy, greater respect for human rights, and a more fully developed state under the rule of law; and 3/a better environment, reduced climate impact, and enhanced resilience to environmental impact and climate change. The KGTP particularly support the last component through strengthening Georgia's waste management regulation to be compliant with EU regulations, supporting the international climate change goals and promoting public sector understanding of and involvement in environmental management. Issues on democracy are not directly promoted by the project although rule of law, in this case environmental and climate change legislation are addressed.

The latest Swedish reform cooperation strategy from 2021 highlights the following goals: 1/ Human rights, democracy, principles of the rule of law, and equality and 2/ Environmentally and climatically sustainable development and sustainable use of natural resources. As shown in the findings on cross-cutting issues in the KGTP - EQ7 and EQ8, later in this report - the KGTP reflects issues on equality although the project lacks proper evidence-based strategies for poverty reduction and gender equality. On the other hand, the design of the KGTP is a direct contribution to the goal of environmentally and climatically sustainable development.

The KGTP is also in full alignment with Georgia's National Waste Management Strategy (2016-2030) and Action Plan (2016-2020).⁵⁹ The Strategy has the overall vision of "Georgia to become a preventing and recycling society." The following bullet points highlight how the KGTP is relevant for key components of the Waste Management Strategy:

- *aligning legislation with EU requirements and international conventions*: the KGTP is designed in line with the EU-Georgia Association Agreement.

⁵⁶ According to the latest Status Reports from the three KGTP partners with data from May 2023, the project has distributed questionnaires to partners in 63 municipalities for collection of information on dumpsites for the planned registry.

⁵⁷ MFA (2014) "[Results Strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey 2014 – 2020.](#)"

⁵⁸ MFA (2021) "[Strategi för Sveriges reformsamarbete med Östeuropa 2021–2027.](#)"

⁵⁹ Government of Georgia (2016) "[National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and 2016-2020](#)" Resolution no. 160.

- *establishing a comprehensive waste management planning system at the national and local levels:* the KGTP works with municipalities on municipal waste management plans as well as the national legal and regulatory framework. Moreover, the KGTP has taken initiative to prepare for a regional waste management plan in the region of Kakheti. Support to regional waste management plans was not foreseen in the GA and the KGTP noticed different perceptions among different key informants whether there should be regional management plans in the national waste management structure. Still, the National Waste Management Strategy (2016-2030) and the five-year action plans foresee establishment of regional landfills in accordance with EU standards, which will require some form of cooperation among the participating municipalities.⁶⁰
- *establishing an efficient waste collection and transportation system:* the KGTP addresses these issues through the municipal waste management plans. However, as in chapter 3 under decentralization, the municipalities face a number of infrastructure and equipment shortcomings that will require substantial investment and they are not directly addressed by the KGTP.⁶¹
- *promoting waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and reproduction; ensuring full cost recovery for waste management based on the polluter pays principle:* the KGTP focus on circular economy is a direct contribution to this objective through awareness raising in schools and universities and the mapping of the circular economy potential at key economic sectors at national level.
- *enforcing extended producer responsibility:* the KGTP circular economy component includes attention to the extended producer responsibility.
- *implementing a robust data and information management system for waste:* the KGTP is designed with outputs to improve knowledge management.
- *strengthening the public sector at national and local levels;* empowering the private sector; and raising public awareness.

The Strategy was updated in 2022 and a new Action Plan 2022-2026 adopted.⁶² Four new objectives were added concerning management of hazardous waste, plastic waste, biodegradable waste, and construction waste. In fact, the new Strategy highlights that the main challenges related to waste management planning is related to waste collection and transportation, municipal waste, hazardous waste, medical waste, and construction waste.⁶³ Construction waste is included in the Circular Mapping Report developed by the KGTP. Otherwise, the KGTP does not directly work on specific challenges mentioned in the Strategy. Rather, the KGTP has adopted a more overall approach to

⁶⁰ Government of Georgia (2016) "[National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and 2016-2020](#)" Resolution no. 160.

⁶¹ According to the KGTP Greens Movement has facilitated this process in two regions of Georgia through the support of the Japan Embassy in Georgia.

⁶² The update of the National Waste Management Strategy and the new Action Plan 2022-2026 was prepared with technical support from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the local implementing partner REC Caucasus (Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus) under the EU-funded EU4Environment Programme.

⁶³ EU4Environment (2022) "[National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and National Waste Management Action Plan 2022-2026](#)"

awareness and management strategies, what can include all four categories of waste highlighted as challenges.

Overall, the main challenges for implementing the waste management strategy in Georgia, was summarized by the Deputy Head of the Waste and Chemicals Management Department in the Georgian Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture at a presentation at a conference on circular economy at the Second Regional Conference: Measuring and monitoring the circular economy and the use of data for policymaking organized by the UN Economic Commission for Europe.⁶⁴ The following bullet points highlight how the KGTP addresses some of the major challenges to the waste management strategy:

- *Implementation of the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)*: the KGTP GA addresses the EPR implicitly through support to the circular economy in Georgia. In the implementation, the project has addressed the EPR through various activities: Greens Movement organized a series of online awareness raising seminars on EPR for local government and non-governmental actors in 2020 and has included the subject in other related presentations of the organization. Overall, the KGTP partners informed the KGTP that they have been advocating for the EPR at various occasions. Based on information from KGTP interviews, the EPR is still in its introductory phase, and it is expected that, for instance, the increased attention and updated policies on circular economy will facilitate a greater implementation. Moreover, the EU will finance an action plan related to EPR according to the KGTP interviews.
- *Waste Management Data*: the KGTP is designed with an output on creating a database on 63 municipal dumpsites.⁶⁵ According to KGTP interviews with KGTP partners and the latest Status Reports from the three KGTP partners with data from May 2023, the project has distributed questionnaires to partners in 63 municipalities for collection of information on dumpsites for the planned registry.⁶⁶ The inventory is not finalized.
- *Environmentally sound Management Technology for Recycling*: the KGTP introduced tree planting campaigns as part of bio-restoration of dumpsites in addition to general awareness raising on bio-restoration and recycling as part of awareness raising activities, for instance at higher education institutions and eco-schools. According to KGTP interviews, KGTP partners had planned to introduce technology fairs for municipalities but consider that training in how to separate, etc. is still lacking.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Irma Gurguliani (2021) "Waste Management Policy in Georgia" -at United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (2021) "[Second Regional Conference: Measuring and monitoring the circular economy and the use of data for policy-making organized-](#)"

⁶⁵ Updated Logical Framework from 2022.

⁶⁶ The Status reports only provide status on implementation of planned activities.

⁶⁷ The fairs are not part of the logical framework or the monitoring and evaluation framework of the KGTP.

- *Municipal waste separation at source (recyclable and biodegradable):* the KGTP has primarily addressed this challenge through the five updated municipal waste management plans.
- *Tariff policy for municipal waste management (based on the polluter pays principle):* the KGTP has addressed this challenge indirectly through its introductory work on circular economy both at the general awareness raising level and through specific advocacy tools such as the mapping of circular economy mapping in key economic sectors.
- *Awareness raising:* the KGTP is designed with a focus on targeted awareness raising, for instance, for schools through the eco-school programme, for university students through essay contests and other awareness raising activities, and for the public through Clean up days and contests.
- *Landfills:* landfills are addressed as a key component of the five updated municipal waste management plans that the KGTP has supported covering development of strategies for both promotion of effective legal landfills and removal of dumpsites.

Finally, it should be mentioned that according to KGTP interviews with both KGTP partners and other waste management stakeholders in Georgia, the two main problems for proper waste management is lack of infra-structure to collect waste in remote areas as well as a general lack of applying a system-wide approach with low knowledge of waste management at many levels. This would need systematic integrated training and capacity development according to several informants – activities that need to be done on a continuous basis according to both internal and external stakeholders.

The lack of direct involvement of decision makers at national and local level in project design, management, and implementation as described in section 4.1 on Success stories Challenges poses special relevance of project activities. The KGTP learned during interviews that many implementation partners have only been consulted about the final project proposal. The lack of direct involvement might also explain some contradictions in terms of the project's approach and the Government position to some aspects of waste management for instance the development of regional waste management plans, of which one has been introduced by the Project. The KGTP could not find a general agreement on this approach, which might be due to lack of proper involvement of all key decision-makers in all design, implementation, and monitoring processes of the KGTP.

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS

4.3.1 EQ2. What is the extent of the project's contribution to the intended outcomes?

The KGTP has contributed to all 27 expected outcomes described in the GA and the updated Results framework from March 2022. Outcomes defined in terms of production of knowledge products have been fully achieved. Planned awareness raising activities have been carried out although the number of reached target groups could not be verified by the KGTP with available data. Measurements for verifying some of the defined indicators for outcomes such as behaviour change is questioned.

Key Findings on EQ2 – Please refer to Annex 4 for more detailed assessment of each outcome.

F-EQ2.1 – Many of the outcomes are defined in unrealistic terms of number of reached people.

F-EQ2.2 – The reported outcome results do not take into account that other actors are working towards the same goals, and it is difficult to assess the specific contributions of the KGTP to the outcomes.

F-EQ2.3 – The COVID-19 pandemic delayed most activities of the project and have contributed to some outcomes not being fully achieved while others have exceeded expectations.

Discussion of EQ2 findings

The key challenges of the project formulation outlined in section 3, in terms of too many outcomes (27), lack of clear distinction between outcomes and outputs where many of the outcomes are described in terms of outputs such as production of knowledge products while others refer to behaviour change but with limited clarity of outputs leading to these outcomes, and the lack of an overall theory of change complicates the assessment of the outcomes. On the one hand, the KGTP can confirm that the KGTP has contributed to most of identified outcomes but the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved could only be assessed for outcomes defined in terms of outputs due to lack of indicators in the results framework. Moreover, as described in section 3, there are other actors supporting the improvement of Georgia's waste management with activities similar to what the KGTP has been doing. Perceived changes thus are most likely the result of different sources and not just the KGTP, which can be seen as positive. However, the insufficient description of how the KGTP complements and cooperates with other actors hinders a comprehensive evaluation of its actual impact on outcome-level changes.

It should also be noted that the measurement of many of the outcomes can be questioned. The KGTP recognizes that the KGTP has visited project implementation sites regularly for visual assessments in addition to discussions with key stakeholders. Moreover, the Project has used questionnaires to assess the appreciation of the content of activities such as awareness raising and training and likeliness of future use of the new knowledge. However, visits of the KGTP to some project sites that had participated in environmental awareness left the impression that a lot of work was still necessary. Some school yards visited by the KGTP, for instance, in schools and universities participating in the activities on Eco-schools and environmental awareness raising for higher education institutions were not cleaned up for litter.

4.3.2 EQ3. How adaptive have the implementing partners of KGTP been in their approach to achieving results?

The project management structure includes the possibility for adaptation through annual performance reports and could provide opportunities for reflections on the need for an

adaptation of the project document, including the change pathways. Similarly, the original plan for a mid-term review could have been an opportunity for reflecting on the project design and implementation and adapting the project as needed. However, these instruments have only been used for adjustment of existing outcomes and addition of two new specific outcomes rather than an overall reflection on the project design and implementation. Moreover, there are no performance indicators for adaptation of the project design in the results framework.

Key Findings on EQ3

F-EQ3.1 – The KGTP identified COVID-19 challenges as an immediate risk to project implementation in 2019 as key stakeholders and target groups were not available for project activities as planned, for instance, school children and university students. The immediate result was delays in project results followed by adaptation and use of online communication measures similar to other development projects.

F-EQ3.2 – While the COVID-19 pandemic had profound immediate impacts on project implementation and led to a general reflection on the KGTP objectives, outcomes, and outputs the logical framework was not reformulated until March 2022. The update did not include changes to the project logic, theory of change, or assumptions but only to the scale of some of the planned results.

F-EQ3.3 – The other major adaptation undertaken by the project management is the scaling up of the project's attention to circular economy activities through two additional outcomes to the results chain in November 2020 and an additional budget allocation from Sida.

F-EQ3.4 – Key principles of results-based management have not been exploited including regular monitoring and adaptation of all the components of the key planning frameworks: results chain, logical framework, theory of change, and continuous risk management.⁶⁸

Discussion of EQ3 findings

Some of the basic principles for flexibility and adaptive management were written into the GA, for instance through references to results-based management. Furthermore, the Embassy of Sweden provided training in results-based management for the KGT staff

⁶⁸ Results-based management has been part of Sida's strategy for development cooperation for many years risk management to the dynamic context and flexible approaches are cornerstones of the approach and therefore also monitoring and risk analysis. (see for instance "OECD (2017) [Case Studies of results-based management by providers: Sweden](#) and Sida (2007) [Strengthening Sida Management for Development Results](#)." Likewise, over the last 10 years there have been growing efforts to apply results-based management in the public sector in Georgia with special incentives from the international development cooperation.

during the preparation of the project document.⁶⁹ The KGTP could not verify the exact content of the training but noticed that risk management - which is closely interconnected with results-based management - has not been properly implemented as a forward-looking strategy but only as reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic. As mentioned in section 3, the GA includes a PEST analysis with factors leading to the overall problems that the KGTP seeks to address through its change strategies such as awareness raising and advocacy. The KGTP finds that many of these challenges are repeated in the list of 15 major risks for project implementation in the GA and this confusion between project implementation risks and the general challenges that the project seeks to address might explain the rather weak risk management in the project. For instance, if a key project activity is awareness raising, advocacy and capacity development the project risk should not be lack of interest among key stakeholders, which would be more to say that the project change strategy on awareness raising, advocacy, and capacity development is not effective.

The following table presents the KGTP analysis of the risk management of the risks identified in the GA.

Table 2. KGTP Risk management

Risks identified in the GA	KGTP control and influence KGTP assessment	Mitigation measures described in annual KGTP partner reports with KGTP assessment in parenthesis
• Governmental changes in institutional changes	• KGTP limited influence	• In general: Communication (KGTP assessment: no specific strategy) • Specifically for Government commitment to circular economy: mobilization of stakeholders and communication strategy, advocacy for inter-ministerial coordination board
• Insufficient coordination among key sectorial stakeholders	• Role of KGTP management	• Different communication measures (KGTP: this is the project strategy in the GA)
• Insufficient involvement and coordination of stakeholders	• Not clear what kind of stakeholders – but in principle this should not be a risk but the role of KGTP management	• Stakeholder identification and regular communication (KGTP: this is the project strategy in the GA)
• Insufficient interest among target groups and key stakeholders including business sector	• In principle this should not be a risk but the role of KGTP management	
• Lack of stakeholders' interest	• If this is a risk, it means that KGTP's awareness raising and advocacy campaigns are not effective. Lack information on what kind of stakeholders	

⁶⁹ GA and personal communication.

Risks identified in the GA	KGTP control and influence KGTPE assessment	Mitigation measures described in annual KGTP partner reports with KGTPE assessment in parenthesis
• Insufficient interest and activity of local municipalities	• If this is a risk, it means that KGTP's awareness raising and advocacy campaigns are not effective	• Active involvement of stakeholders, e.g. in tree planting
• Lack of implementation mechanisms for waste related legislation	• KGTP some influence, particularly through advocacy and cooperation with other waste management projects	
• Insufficient support for green industry (recycling minimization, separation) from National Legislation	• KGTP should have some influence, particularly through advocacy and cooperation with other waste management projects	• Circular economy roadmap development engaged some private sector (KGTPE: that was the project strategy)
• Getting commitment of all involved target groups and stakeholders (especially governments for project implementation)	• KGTP should have some influence, particularly through advocacy and cooperation with other similar (circular economy, waste management, and environmental awareness) projects	
• Insufficient finances in local Government's budget	• Limited KGTP influence but role of advocacy is to ensure ownership, which also means ensure budget allocations for waste management	
• Climate change and weather can be a risk for some KGTP activities⁷⁰	• Can be mitigated by the KGTP approach but needs a strategy	
• Insufficient technical equipment in local communal services	• Can be mitigated by the KGTP approach but needs a strategy – taken into account remoteness of community, rural-urban, etc.	
• Existence of white spots with regard to required baseline information⁷¹	• Depending on what kind of what kind of baseline information is missing, the KGTP might have influence on it.	• Use of different data sources (KGTPE: this was the project strategy) • Use of Inter-ministerial Coordination Board to facilitate data (KGTPE: this is a clear mitigation strategy beyond the project general strategy)
• Lack of environmental education in media	• If this is a risk, it means that KGTP's awareness raising and advocacy campaigns, including the communication strategy are not effective.	
• Expected elections, which may cause certain tense in the municipalities	• KGTP limited influence but impacts can be mitigated	

⁷⁰ Reformulated by KGTPE for clarity (original: Climatic Conditions-to implement the activity weather conditions should be met).

⁷¹ The KGTPE understands that the "white spots" refer to missing or incomplete pieces of baseline information. It is not clear what kind of information is missing, if it is in certain localities, etc.

The following table presents the KGTP analysis of the risk management of the risks identified during project implementation.

Table 3. KGTP Risk management

Risks identified during project implementation	KGTP control and influence	Mitigation measures described in individual partner annual reports ⁷² with KGTP assessment
• COVID 19 pandemic	• KGTP no influence – requires analysis of potential impacts on project implementation and a mitigation strategy	• Activities delayed • Virtual workshops • Online communication with stakeholders such as schools • Foundation for Environmental Education (FEE) provided training in adopting Eco-schools to COVID-19 restrictions
• Insufficiency of working groups in Kakheti Region	• Not quite clear what the risk is – or if this is specifically for the Kakheti Region	• Awareness raising
		• A list of general “mitigation measures” is offered by one organization – but all measures are already the change strategies in the GA such as awareness raising campaigns, and clean region contests.

The weak risk management is also reflected in the annual reports prepared by the KGTP partners. The KGTP did not identify updated risk analysis and risk management in the different performance reports such as annual reports. For instance, the consolidated KGTP annual reports 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 report on what a risk analysis is, why it is important, and that the KGTP partners monitor risks at monthly coordinating meetings. This frequency could not be verified by the KGTP. Moreover, it is stated in the consolidated annual reports that “The risk analysis implemented for the KGT Project and preventive/ management measures used by the project implementing CSOs are comprehensively described in the full annual reports.” But the annual reports of the individual partners offer very little risk management and mostly offer project change strategies instead of risk mitigation measures.

The lack of clear differentiation between on the one hand the problems that the project seeks to address through its theory of change – or in other words the project’s *raison-d’être* - and on the other hand the risks with potential impacts on project implementation and performance leaves the project with very limited risk management. As can be seen in Table 2, what is referred to as “risk management” is what would normally be seen as the project’s change strategies to obtain results. The lack of proper

⁷² These risk mitigation measures are repeated in three consecutive annual reports.

risk management including continuous risk identification and development and application of appropriate risk mitigation measures limits the project's flexibility and adaptability.

Other aspects that are normally used to assess development projects' adaptability and flexibility beyond risk management and specific adaptability performance indicators⁷³ include 'stakeholder engagement and feedback mechanisms.' While the project management includes meetings and dialogue with stakeholders, these external stakeholders are not involved formally in project management. The partners report on some feedback from the dialogue⁷⁴ they have had with target groups during implementation, but this resembles more of a consultation approach rather than actively engaging in project management and contributing with a strong voice. It should also be noted that key stakeholders such as government institutions reported during interviews that they did not participate in the design and management, including monitoring and evaluation of the KGTP.

4.3.3 EQ4. To what extent have the activities of the three partner organizations complemented each other and resulted in synergistic project management?

Overall, the KGTP consortium functions primarily as a funding consortium, that is collaboration of NGOs that are funded under the same budget with the same overall goal as defined in the GA and with joint reporting and communication with the donor. Joint technical activities are very limited, and the project design and implementation are mainly based on three subprojects or focus areas that are technically implemented in isolation. The reporting, for instance in annual progress reports, reflects this picture of lack synergy in project management and implementation.

Key Findings on EQ4

⁷³ An adaptability indicator could be 'flexibility in resource allocation and response time to changes-'

⁷⁴ See for instance annual reports. Some partner agencies also reported on dialogue with target groups.

F-EQ4.1 – The vast majority of the 27 planned outcomes has one partner being responsible for related project implementation with limited to no inputs from the other partners. The updated results framework lists one outcome with all three partners as responsible, and two outcomes with two responsible partners. Reporting on these three outcomes is still provided by each partner individually with no attempt for joint reporting on what has been achieved as a result of joint activities on the two outcomes with two partners assigned, namely 1/increased environmental awareness among students and 2/support to regional waste management in Kakheti. Some coordination meetings had been held for the two outcomes with the two partners according to KGTE interviews.

F-EQ4.2 – The three KGTP partners refer to the consortium in various ways, but typically as a funding mechanism with the KGT referred to as the fund administrator. The level and extent of coordination is not defined and the GA does not provide a clear definition of the interaction of the three partners except stating that there will be coordination meetings among the three organizations. The KGTE could not find any evidence that the coordination meetings had led to increased technical harmonization and synergy in implementation. Rather, it was noticed that the three partners did not have full information about the implementation of the other two partners except for some activities implemented by Greens Movement and GSNE “Orchis” in cooperation.

F-EQ4.3 – Primary data collection through the online perception survey and the interviews confirmed the architecture of the KGTP consortium as a funding consortium.

Discussion of EQ4 findings

According to the GA, the project is implemented through a consortium of the KGT, Greens Movement, and GSNE “Orchis.” Cooperation through consortia refers to many different forms of collaboration among formally constituted organizations from loose coalitions or networks to strong formal and legal entities that may be formed on a project or cause basis. Based on interviews and the document review, the KGTE finds that for the KGTP, the consortium model is similar to how consortia are most commonly used within the humanitarian and development community, namely as a formal collaboration on a project basis. The justification for such a model varies among the funding agency and the three KGTP consortia members. For the Embassy of Sweden, a consortium model was chosen to encourage technical complementarity and cooperation. This is in line with the final evaluation of the third phase of the former Clean-Up project described. As described in section 3, the evaluation concluded that the cooperation arrangements within the consortium did not allow for synergy. Moreover, the evaluation recommended to improve the cooperation arrangements.

During discussions with the three KGTP partners, the KGTE learned that the architecture and functions of the consortium model applied for KGTP was not discussed as an alternative among other models. And in fact, the GA including the results framework assign individual partners to the different outcomes as described in

section 1 of this report. This picture is further reflected in the annual reports where each agency is reporting on their own activities, and joint activities only consist of coordination meetings. It remains unclear for the KGTP why the model applied in the former project with a rotating fund manager was abandoned for the KGTP and several internal stakeholders interviewed for the KGTP questioned why a brand-new organization was appointed as fund manager considering that the other two other partners had long project managing experience.

The KGTP experience from other NGO development projects indicates that it takes at least 12 months to form a functional consortium, even when it is only for administrative purposes. Moreover, consortia that are explicitly structured for maximizing synergy requires results-based management with theories of change and results frameworks that clearly reflect synergy benefits and with regular revision of the theory of change and results framework. The KGTP observed that this was never applied in the KGTP despite the Embassy of Sweden's support to capacity development of the fund manager for results-based management.

The design of the project has been determining for the implementation into five subprojects with limited to no interaction with other key actors in the focus areas of the KGTP: Municipal waste management plans, Eco-Schools, Community clean-up activities, Environmental awareness at higher education facilities, and Circular economy, through 27 distinct outcomes with lined outputs and activities that are not linked to promote synergy and harmonization. Rather, the focus areas are mainly implemented as individual sub-projects with the three KGTP partners assigned different focus areas as shown in section 1. Based on interviews and the document review, the KGTP finds that this lack of harmonization and synergy has a negative impact on the project's overall performance. Likewise, the KGTP finds that the lack of recognition and cooperation with other actors supporting the development of municipal waste management plans, circular economy, clean-up events, and general environmental protection awareness have a negative impact on the project's potential performance.

The KGTP partners have used the project document and particularly the results framework diligently and can report on progress on all outcomes and outputs. As there are no change strategies for instance for working on a harmonized and integrated approach among the three partners, harmonization has been limited to some university activities undertaken by two of the three partners reflecting one outcome to be implemented by both organizations. The absence of technical interactions was observed during interviews with KGTP partners and their consultants, but no solutions or changes to the implementation arrangements were suggested. Likewise, it was observed during the KGTP that external stakeholders involved in waste management plans and circular economy had limited, if any, information about the KGTP.

4.4 EFFICIENCY

4.4.1 EQ5. Can the project's costs be justified based on its results?

The KGTP has contributed to increased environmental awareness and improved waste management in Georgia through a number of direct products, particularly clean-up contests and events throughout the country, environmental awareness activities at higher education facilities, five updated municipal waste management plans that are being implemented, the eco-school model has been introduced in the public school system and 11 eco-schools have graduated to green flag status, mapping of the circular economy potential in key economic sectors in Georgia, in addition to a number of knowledge products. The KGTPE finds that these results justify the investment of 32 million SEK. However, this does not mean that it was the optimal way of spending this investment for environmental awareness and improved waste management. Moreover, it does not reflect the highly unrealistic specific objectives and the extent of the KGTP's contribution to the objectives cannot be determined based on the existing information and project monitoring data.

Key Findings on EQ5

F-EQ5.1 – The KGTP's two **specific** objectives: 1/To attain environmentally conscious generation in Georgia by 2023 & 2/To reduce pollution from municipal waste (15%) and greenhouse gas emissions in Georgia by 2023 are both largely unrealistic to be achieved within a four-year programme with a total investment of 32 million SEK. The KGTPE finds that the KGTP has contributed to both objectives although the extent of contribution cannot be determined based on the available information, indicators, and measurements. The financial and human resources allocated to the different outcomes match outputs and activities as defined in the project document.

F-EQ5.2 – In terms of project management, financial and human resources have been available as planned and without delays allowing for smooth project implementation.

F-EQ5.3 – The Swedish Embassy has been flexible in terms of revision of the project document resulting in 1/additional funding to allow greater attention to circular economy mapping and 2/revision of the results justified by delays caused by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The revision was very limited though and came at a late stage of the project as a result of the inefficient results-based management described in EQ3.

Discussion of EQ5 findings

Overall, the KGTPE finds that the KGTP has been generating a lot of products for a relatively modest price. However, this does not mean that the KGTP is efficient.

The estimation of potential efficiency through a more harmonized and integrated approach, both internally and externally, falls outside the scope of the KGTPE. However, there appears to be a consensus among all stakeholders that the project is missing out on potential benefits due to the lack of harmonization, both internally and

externally. According to the stakeholders interviewed for the KGTPE, this also has the potential to impact sustainability in the sense that when multiple partners align around a single focus, they have a greater potential to influence institutionalization, including securing national/local funding. Moreover, a more harmonized approach would have the potential of creating stronger and productive networks for future activities.

The Swedish Embassy's willingness to accommodate changes in the specific outcomes and objectives of the logical framework demonstrates a flexibility to incorporate well-justified modifications to the project document and implementation agreements. However, the project has not effectively utilized opportunities to enhance efficiency through results-based management and cooperation.

4.5 SUSTAINABILITY

4.5.1 EQ6. Does the project implementation model ensure the sustainability of the achieved results?

The project implementation model ensures a certain level of sustainability for activities that are directly linked to the national legal and regulatory frameworks such as the municipal waste management plans and policy decisions on circular economy as part of the waste management policy. Both activities are closely linked to the EU Association Agreement, which should be a guarantee for continuation of activities beyond the KGTP. The eco-school activities are still in the initial phases and their continuation and institutionalization will depend on a facilitated platform to support existing programmes. Some efforts have been made to sign cooperation agreements with some universities for continuation of environmental awareness raising activities.

Key Findings on EQ6

F-EQ6.1 – The KGTPE could only identify one transit strategy which consisted of development of new project proposals to allow the three organizations to individually pursue their initiated activities, particularly KGT continuation with introduction of Eco-schools throughout the country; Greens Movement with continuation of waste management at municipal, regional, and national level and environmental awareness raising; and GSNE “Orchis” with continuation of circular economy activities in Georgia.

F-EQ6.2 – The waste management plans, and circular economy related to the national waste management policy can be considered as institutionalized in the sense that the national legal and regulatory framework for continuation of these activities exist and action plans have been developed. In the current state, the institutionalization and expansion of the eco-school programme and environmental awareness raising activities for higher education facilities depends on external assistance although agreements have been signed with some universities for continuation of the awareness raising activities. The KGTPE interviews with internal and external stakeholders showed that there are no systematic plans at the

government, schools, and universities to ensure continuation, for instance, budget allocations.

Discussion of EQ6 findings

The KGTP found through interviews and the comprehensive document review that the KGTP has produced a number of knowledge products such as material for environmental awareness raising among school children through the Eco-school component, articles and special magazines on waste management and circular economy challenges and opportunities in Georgia, updated municipal waste management plans, and a road map on circular economy potential. Those are all valid and technically well-respected products that can serve the overall purpose of the project in Georgia for many years, namely increased public environmental consciousness, and improved waste management. However, the KGTP did not identify plans for the future use of these knowledge products, except resource mobilization efforts for the three KGTP partners to continue with their individual parts of the project. Nor did the KGTP identify any funded plans for continuation of the eco-school activities.

During KGTP interviews it was noticed that the schools having adopted the Eco-school programme had not allocated any resources on their own budget for continuation of the Eco-school programme or even some sub-components. While it was stated that many schools are challenged by low budgets, the KGTP also noted that no concrete plans had been undertaken to ensure future local funding either through the schools' own budget and/or through sponsorships with local businesses for instance.

Finally, it should be noted that some of the key challenges highlighted by the national authorities for sustainable waste management is linked to the need for substantial infrastructure investment, for instance for waste collection, new sustainable landfills, and waste separation systems. A sustainable solution to these challenges has not been developed by the project for instance through development of financing plans and the challenges will likely continue with the new and updated waste management plans according to a number of external and internal stakeholders.

4.6 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES: LOCAL VOICE, POVERTY, GENDER

4.6.1 EQ7. Has the project contributed to enhancing power, voice, choice, and opportunities, as well as reducing deprivation and poverty?

Poverty and deprivation reduction has not been an explicit priority of the KGTP although some personal and non-evidence-based conclusions were offered during KGTP data collection to explain why waste management is important for poverty reduction. The KGTP finds that such conclusions are linked to respond to the perceived donor requirement of poverty focus but without having evidence or indicators to show poverty reduction impact of the project. The

KGTP also finds that local voice⁷⁵ and opportunities as a direct result of the KGTP is limited and has not been purposefully sought in project design and implementation.

Key Findings on EQ7

F-EQ7.1 – The KGTP could confirm some scientific articles on the role of circular economy in Georgia written by experts working for the KGTP among others.⁷⁶ The articles recognize the funding from the Government of Sweden for the circular project. Otherwise, local voices in news about waste management and circular economy with references to the KGTP could not be identified by the KGTP.

F-EQ7.2 – The KGTP did not identify any new CSO projects on waste management and the circular economy that arose as a direct result of the KGTP, except for project proposals from the three KGTP partners aimed at further developing KGTP's main focus areas, such as the circular economy once the KGTP came to a close.

F-EQ7.3 – The information collected by the KGTP from the awareness raising activities including the eco-schools show adaptation of some new waste management behaviour with waste separation when the infrastructure exists. The KGTP could not identify any information about changed habits for different income categories. However, the general information provided during interviews indicates that poor families often live in remote areas where infrastructure for waste separation and waste collection is minimal to non-existing and the updated municipal waste management plans address some of challenges of remote areas. However, the required infrastructure will be investment dependent.

F-EQ7.4 – Poverty focus in the project implementation is minimal and limited to some general conclusions that are not directly linked to the project but based on an assumption that plastic littering in the rural areas will result in dead cows. The conclusion is that the impact of such a potential event would be worse for a poor family with few cows than for a better-off family with many cows. The KGTP could not identify project data supporting a poverty reduction impact of the project.

F-EQ7.5 – The absence of a participatory approach in project development, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, which would have included the

⁷⁵ Sida defines “local voice” as “the ability of people to express their views and concerns, and to influence decisions that affect their lives. It is a key aspect of democratic governance and a fundamental right of citizens” In other words, it refers to the participation of local communities in decision-making processes that affect them. Sida’s definition highlights the importance of ensuring that local communities have a say in the development projects that are implemented in their areas. As such, it goes beyond national government officials, researchers, etc. expression views on the project components. Sida (2017) “[Defining Key Concepts, Tools and Operational Responses.](#)”

⁷⁶ See for instance Pavliashvili, S., and D. E. Prasek (2020) “Accelerating Transition to the Circular Economy in Georgia” Bulletin of Georgian National Academy of Sciences (2020): 7-13; Buachidze, N., et al. (2021) “Circular Economy of Georgia” In: Ghosh, S.K., Ghosh, S.K. (eds) “Circular Economy: Recent Trends in Global Perspective”. Springer, Singapore; and the article “A Circular Economy for Georgia” in the newspaper “GT – Georgia Today” 3 November 2022 in the Business and Economy Section.

active involvement of representatives from all target groups, has additionally constrained the potential for fostering local voice as a result of the KGTP.

Discussion of EQ8 findings

The KGTPPE finds that the references to poverty, deprivation, voice, and opportunities in the project communication is a response to a perceived donor request that funding depends on a poverty focus. However, these cross-cutting issues were never integrated into the project design, including the logical and monitoring and evaluation frameworks. Consequently, the actual implementation has not taken these issues into account, for instance in targeted communication for different income categories and social groups as part of the awareness raising and capacity development activities.

4.6.2 EQ8. How has gender equality been integrated into the project and what impact has it had on gender equality?

Gender equality is mentioned in the design and reports of the KGTP, although these references are not founded on specific and up-to-date local analysis that considers the ever-evolving context. Furthermore, there are no specific measures in place to address gender disparities in waste management or attitudes toward gender management. The sole consideration given in project implementation is the percentage of women participating in certain project activities, such as awareness-raising campaigns, and the KGTPPE cannot identify any discernible impact on gender equality in waste management.

Key Findings on EQ8

F-EQ8.1 – The GA makes reference to a "comprehensive gender analysis" but does not offer additional specifics. KGTP partners have informed the KGTPPE that the project has never conducted a gender analysis, nor allocated a budget for it and gender equality was not an initial priority in the project's design. For instance, the messages used in awareness-raising activities did not take into account the varying perspectives of men and women regarding waste management.

F-EQ8.2 – 'Gender' is only referred to in one output and in no outcomes in the project's Logical Framework (the original and the updated from March 2022). The output is related to the essay contest that suggest gender as a possible theme for the essays on biodiversity. In the end, no essays on gender were submitted.

F-EQ8.3 - Out of 37 performance indicators only three refers to 'gender' but with references to sex distribution (percentage males and females participating in certain activities) rather than gender per se.

F-EQ8.4 – One of the consultants who have worked on the project found that girls were more sensitive to the project's environmental messages than boys. There was no explanation for this or suggestion for how that information could be used. But it corresponds to the findings of a 2010 study of the European Bank for Reconstruction

and Development (EBRD) that women's attitude towards waste management is different than that of men in Georgia.⁷⁷

Discussion of EQ8 findings

Specialized organizations such as United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) regularly produce studies and guidelines on gender issues in waste management, for instance a 2019 study on the “Gender and Waste Nexus” based on case country studies that highlights that both global trends and local conditions contribute to the gendering of the waste sector. Hence there is a need for specific, local, and dynamic gender analysis of the waste management sector and proper context-specific gender mainstreaming the municipal, regional, and national waste management strategies and action plans in Georgia.⁷⁸

According to several external stakeholders interviewed for the KGTP, gender mainstreaming and the meaning of gender equality, gender sensitivity, transformation, etc. are not well understood in most development projects in Georgia. This might also be the reason why several stakeholders from the implementing partners noted that ‘gender’ is only referred to because of a donor requirement.

The interviews with KGTP partners and the KGTP's review of the project documents, including progress reports clearly leave the impression that ‘gender’ is understood as participation of men and women and if there are 50:50 then there is gender equality. This is far from Sida's definition of ‘gender equality’ as “Gender equality is achieved when women and men, girls and boys, in all their diversity, have equal rights, life prospects and opportunities and the same power to shape their lives.”⁷⁹

The following quote from one of the annual KGTP reports is a representative example of this: “Woman and especially young ladies always participate in all our activities. More than half of the winners of our Essay contest are female who demonstrate high awareness of environmental issues and perfect writing skills.”⁸⁰

It should also be noted that the recent study on Gender equality in Georgia, prepared by the Gender Equality Council of the Parliament of Georgia - inter alia with funding from the Government of Sweden - does not offer any reflections on gendered aspects of environmental pollution, waste management, or environmental management in general.⁸¹

The latest report generated through the KGTP “Municipal Waste Management in Georgia Report 2021-2022”, which was presented at a public meeting early June 2023

⁷⁷ EBRD (2011) "[Mainstreaming Gender in Waste Management Projects](#)."

⁷⁸ UNEP (2019) "[Gender and Waste Nexus](#)."

⁷⁹ Sida (2021) "[Gender Equality – Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Women's and Girls' Empowerment](#)."

⁸⁰ Keep Georgia Tidy Project Georgian Society of Nature Explorers GSNE “Orchis”- Third Annual Report 2021-2022.

⁸¹ Gender Equality Council of the Parliament of Georgia (2022) "[Gender Equality in Georgia: Barriers and Recommendations](#)." Updated Edition Part I and II.

has no references or gender considerations either. The report followed the format and standard indicators of the National Waste Management Strategy. Unfortunately, there are no gender indicators in the Strategy. On the other hand, the KGTPE noticed that the project Waste Management Technology in Regions Project II (2017-2020), which was funded by USAID and implemented by the NGO CENN outlines a gender strategy and action plan focusing on fostering women leadership in waste management activities. The KGTPE was informed that a context specific gender analysis guided the strategy and action plan. The KGTPE is unaware of any independent evaluation of gender strategy and action plan of the USAID-funded project.

5 Conclusions, Lesson-learned, and Recommendations

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 Overall

The KGTP has undertaken a wide range of activities aligned with the Government of Georgia's commitment to environmental protection and sustainable development, which is in accordance with the EU-Georgia Association Agreement established in July 2016. The Agreement emphasizes the need for improved environmental governance and waste management, aligning Georgia's practices with the EU's institutional framework.⁸²

The KGTP activities have significantly increased public awareness of environmental protection and have led to the establishment of a more robust legal and regulatory framework for waste management. However, while the project has achieved the defined outputs and outcomes, it has struggled to demonstrate a clear overall impact. This can be attributed to the KGTP's weak theory of change and results chain, which deviates from how conventional project design applies concepts of components such as outputs, outcomes, and objectives. Moreover, the results framework reveals that outcomes and activities are distributed among the three consortium partners, creating five distinct project components: municipal waste management plans; Eco-Schools; community clean-up activities, environmental awareness activities for higher education facilities, and circular economy without clear harmonization and integration of activities with negative impacts on overall efficiency and effectiveness. Unfortunately, the KGTP theory of change does not provide more clarity and has not been defined in a way that it can be used for results-based management.

In essence, the specific objectives of the project could be seen as overarching goals that the project aimed to contribute to. The project implementation lacked an integrated approach, and the various poorly defined outcomes were not adequately linked, further contributing to the absence of a clear overall result for the KGTP with negative impacts on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

The challenges stemming from the weak project design are exacerbated by the project management's failure to effectively implement results-based management. This failure includes the absence of well-documented feedback loops and appropriate decision-making and reporting processes. There is a lack of continuous reflection on the project's

⁸² For instance, Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on Waste management.

overall performance, the dynamic context, and the involvement of various stakeholders.

Although some consideration of the dynamic contexts occurred during the project design and annual performance reporting, mainly through the PEST analysis, there is a noticeable disconnect between the results of the PEST analysis and the actual project activities and approaches. Consequently, the only updates made to the project document were revisions to the expected outcomes, outputs, and specific objectives. However, no efforts were made to re-evaluate the project's fundamental design, theory of change, or redefine the outcomes, outputs, and objectives based on the project's actual performance, causal assumptions, external factors, and risk management.

Ultimately, the KGTP suffers from the absence of a cohesive results-based management approach throughout its design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation stages. As a consequence, the project primarily comprises five distinct subprojects, interconnected solely through a shared funding agreement, with each partner having limited insight into the specific activities undertaken by the others. Moreover, stakeholders usually possess knowledge of only one component of the project, further contributing to the lack of integration and overall coherence.

5.1.2 Relevance

The activities of KGTP are highly pertinent to both the national context and Sida development policy which is aligned with the EU-Georgia Association Agreement. However, there are certain areas that need improvement. For example, the project lacks sufficient justification for its diverse awareness raising activities, and there is no clear communication strategy tailored to the specific needs of different socio-economic groups. Disparities between rural and urban areas, which is typically a question of level of remoteness of the areas, as well as economically advantaged and resource-challenged schools, were not taken into account in their awareness campaigns. Moreover, the distinction between awareness raising and advocacy was not adequately addressed in their analysis or implementation.

The updating of municipal waste management plans and mapping of circular economy potential are crucial in fulfilling Georgia's commitments under the EU-Georgia Association Agreement. Nevertheless, these activities are not adequately integrated or system-based, and significant challenges, such as the lack of investment in waste management infrastructure and insufficient waste collection, persist even after updating the municipal waste management plans.

5.1.3 Effectiveness

The KGTP has made great progress in achieving the updated expected outcomes, as evidenced by the status reports from the three partner organizations and annual reports. Notably, outcomes defined in terms of the production of knowledge products have been successfully accomplished. Additionally, planned awareness-raising activities were executed, although verifying the exact number of target groups reached and their change in behaviour was challenging for the KGTP.

The KGTP identified the COVID-19 pandemic as a significant hurdle during project implementation, leading to delays in various activities. Over time, the partners adapted to the new situation, developing and adopting innovative implementation methods to address the challenges posed by a society largely operating online. The positive impact from these new approaches have never been assessed in the project, but personal accounts collected by the KGTP suggest that some effectiveness was achieved by applying new methods. After the reopening of the society, the project was able to adapt and work towards achievement of the 27 outcomes as defined in the updated results framework.

5.1.4 Efficiency

The efficiency of the KGTP can be assessed using various methods. Although a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis was not within the scope of KGTP, the KGTP finds that it is justifiable to invest 32 million SEK in a wide range of awareness-raising activities, eco-schools, updated municipal waste management plans, and other knowledge products such as circular economy mapping. However, it is important to note that this does not necessarily mean that investing this amount in the current project is the most optimal approach. Instead, a more focused and coordinated project appears to offer greater efficiency.

To achieve this, KGTP would need to implement the program management capacity development provided by the Embassy of Sweden to the KGT during the design phase of the project. This would have involved adopting results-based management practices and increasing investment in the development of the consortium structure.

In summary, while investing in various awareness-raising activities and knowledge products appears justified, optimizing the efficiency of KGTP may require a more targeted and streamlined approach, alongside capacity development and improved consortium management.

5.1.5 Sustainability

The sustainability of the KGTP depends on the institutionalization of the products and methods introduced by the KGTP, including Eco-schools, waste management plans, and circular economy. The lack of plans except development of new funding proposals is a major concern for the sustainability of the KGTP investment and to a certain degree of the investment of the former project, the Clean-Up-Georgia.

The long-term viability of the KGTP activities and results relies on how effectively its products and methods, such as Eco-schools, waste management plans, and circular economy initiatives, become institutionalized. However, a significant concern arises from the absence of concrete plans beyond generating new funding proposals. This lack of strategic planning poses a substantial risk to the sustainability of the KGTP investment and, to some extent, also affects the previous project's - Clean-Up-Georgia - investment.

5.1.6 Cross-cutting Issues

The KGTP documents mention gender and poverty aspects, and a PEST analysis was conducted as part of the design phase. However, during the implementation phase, there are no tangible outcomes concerning these critical cross-cutting issues. It appears that the reporting on gender equality and poverty reduction is superficial and based on general assumptions, rather than meeting the donor's requirement for more substantive results. For example, gender equality is merely assessed based on the number of females and males participating in activities, without addressing the broader concept of gender transformation.

It is essential to acknowledge that the project's emphasis on poverty eradication and gender equality is well-justified. Nevertheless, achieving meaningful progress in these areas would have required significant capacity development and support for KGTP partners. This additional assistance could have enhanced the project's effectiveness in making a substantial and sustainable impact on poverty and gender issues.

5.2 LESSONS-LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given that this is an end-term evaluation for a project that has already come to an end, the significant insights gained from the Project, which can be applied to different situations, align with the general recommendations for upcoming projects and programmes. Lessons-learned and recommendations are therefore presented together except for the last recommendation that specifically address the KGTP.

Lessons-learned 1: Importance of clear definition of the architecture of the consortium.

General recommendation 1 for other development projects implemented through consortia:

Clearly define the architecture of the consortium and the complementarity of the partners.

To enhance the effectiveness and coordination of the consortium, it is crucial to establish a clear and well-defined architecture for the specific context, partner organizations, and project. This should include delineating the roles, responsibilities, and decision-making processes for each partner organization involved and be developed with synergy and harmonization in mind for both project management and technical implementation. By doing so, the consortium can streamline its efforts, avoid duplication, and capitalize on the unique strengths of each member to achieve the project's objectives more efficiently.

Lessons-learned 2: Importance of a theory of change for all projects that clearly presents a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context, including change strategies for generating behaviour changes. The theory of change should clearly show how outputs, outcomes,

and objectives are interlinked. Moreover, the theory of change should provide external and causal assumptions for the different levels of the theory of change.

General recommendation 2 for other development projects:

Develop a theory of change for all projects.

It is essential to create a comprehensive theory of change for each project. The theory should provide a clear and detailed description of the desired changes the project aims to achieve and the strategies it will employ to bring about these changes. By articulating how and why specific transformations are expected to occur in the project's context, the project can better align its activities and measure its impact accurately. The theory of change should be used as a key results-based management tool and be reviewed and updated regularly as needed.

Lessons-learned 3: Importance of ensuring that capacity for poverty reduction and gender transformation is included in the project resources.

General recommendation 3 for other development projects:

Ensure capacity building for poverty reduction and gender transformation is incorporated in the project design, including the monitoring and evaluation framework with specific indicators for poverty reduction and gender equality based on context specific assessments on poverty, deprivation, and gender.

To effectively address poverty and promote gender equality, it is vital to invest in capacity development for all project partners. By equipping them with the necessary skills, knowledge, and resources, development projects can enhance their ability to implement sustainable poverty reduction and gender transformation initiatives. This investment in capacity building will strengthen the overall impact and long-term sustainability of the project's efforts in tackling these critical issues. Moreover, it is critical that poverty reduction and gender equality activities are based on the local context, and that the context analysis is regularly updated as part of the project management.

Lessons-learned 4: Importance of differentiated communication based on the target group, including differentiating between advocacy and awareness raising.

General recommendation 4 for other development projects:

Tailor communication strategies based on the target group.

To maximize the project's outreach and impact, communication efforts should be tailored according to the characteristics, capacities, and needs of the target groups. This involves differentiating between advocacy and awareness-raising approaches, ensuring that the message is delivered in a manner that resonates with the intended audience. By adopting this approach, the development projects can foster better engagement,

understanding, and support from different stakeholders, leading to more meaningful outcomes.

5.3 KGTP SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to promote sustainability of the KGTP, the KGTPE recommends that:

The key partners of the project, including the Embassy of Sweden, the three KGTP partners, and the relevant ministries (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Ministry of Regional Development and Integration, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Economy, and Sustainable Development), along with the involved municipalities, should prioritize and invest in the development of institutionalization plans for the KGTP generated plans. This will help ensure the long-term sustainability and effective implementation of the project's initiatives.

The KGTPE team considers that this should be a priority and could take place through a one day facilitated workshop. If possible, this workshop could be organized in continuation of the presentation of the KGTPE results

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for the end-term evaluation focusing on results achieved by the Keep Georgia Tidy project by the organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) together with its local partner organizations, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers "GSNE "Orchis"" and "Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia", and Swedish partners Keep Sweden Tidy and Gästrike Återvinnare

Date: January 23, 2023

1. General information

1.1 Introduction

The project to be evaluated is Keep Georgia Tidy (contribution 13312) which is funded by Sweden through the Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi and implemented by The organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) together with its local partner organizations, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers "GSNE "Orchis"" and "Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia", and Swedish partners Keep Sweden Tidy and Gästrike Återvinnare in cooperation with the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia and its structural unit – Environmental information and Education Centre proposing implementation of a project “Keep Georgia Tidy” during 2019-2023. The project aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of environment by 2023 through environmentally sustainable education and promotion circular economy in Georgia. The volume of the Swedish support is 34 046 000 SEK SEK.

Sweden’s cooperation with Georgia is governed by the Results Strategy for Sweden’s Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe 2021-2027. The contribution Keep Georgia Tidy contributes to the support area 3 Environmentally and climate-sustainable development and sustainable use of natural resources.

Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) is the implementing partner of the contribution and fund forwarder to the third Parties (GSNE GSNE “Orchis” and Greens Movement of Georgia/ Friends of the Earth of Georgia) of the contribution. The KGT is an NGO and its main vision and mission is clean Georgia. It strives for protection of the nature of Georgia, maintenance and improvement of ecology and ecosystems.

Organization “Keep Georgia Tidy” together with its partner organizations, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers "GSNE "Orchis"" and "Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia", in cooperation with the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia and its structural unit – Environmental information and Education Centre, implements a 47-month project,

aiming at prioritizing environmental sustainable education, raising awareness and high engagement of the population, business sector and GOG in waste sector improvement in order to ensure people's rights protection to live in a clean environment and develop the country's economy.

1.2 Evaluation rationale

The end-term evaluation rationale is the following: The Embassy of Sweden provides support to environmentally sustainable education first time to attain environmentally conscious generation in Georgia, to reduce pollution from municipal waste (15%) and greenhouse gas emissions. It also promotes circular economy and mapping. The end-term evaluation has to be focused on results achieved by the project Keep Georgia Tidy.

1.3 Evaluation object: Project/programme to be evaluated

The evaluation object is the contribution called Keep Georgia Tidy.

The overall objective(s) (impact) towards which the programme aims to contribute is:

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution of environment by 2023 through environmentally sustainable education and promotion circular economy in Georgia.

The specific objectives that the programme aims to achieve are as follows:

To attain environmentally conscious generation in Georgia by 2023

To reduce pollution from municipal waste (15%) and greenhouse gas emissions in Georgia by 2023

For further information, the project/programme proposal including revised Monitoring and Evaluation Framework; Logical Framework is attached as Annex D.

The intervention logic or theory of change of the project/programme shall be further assessed by the evaluator in the inception report.

2. The assignment

2.1 Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

The purpose of the evaluation is to help Sida and the Keep Georgia Tidy project implemented partners, KGT, GSNE "GSNE "Orchis"" and GMG/FoE-G, to assess the results achieved of the project.

The primary intended users of the evaluation are:

- Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi
- KGT, GSNE "GSNE "Orchis"" and GMG/FOE

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate in the tender how this will be ensured during the evaluation process.

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation scope

The evaluation scope is limited to time frame that covers the project activities until the end of May 2023.

If needed, the scope of the evaluation may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

2.3 Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

The objectives of this evaluation are to assess the results achieved by the project focusing on the following: 1) to frame and summarise lessons learned, 2) evaluate the outcomes and outputs of the project, 3) Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the project and formulate recommendations as an input to discussions concerning the meeting set objectives and sustaining results.

The evaluation questions are:

Relevance

- Is the project relevant to Sida's Strategy and Georgia's environmental governance reform challenges and national priorities?

Efficiency

- Can the costs for the project be justified by its results?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project contribute to intended outcomes? (Compare project's indicators against set targets) If so, why? If not, why not?
- To what extent have the Keep Georgia Tidy project implemented partners, KGT, GSNE "GSNE "Orchis"" and GMG/FoE-G been adaptive in their approach towards reaching results.
- To what extent has the activities of the three partner organizations been complementary and joint management structured and operating towards the achievement of programme synergies? What, if any, improvements could be recommended related to the management of the programme?

Sustainability

- Is the current project implementation model for delivering of results ensuring sustainability?

Cross-cutting issues

- Has the project contributed to power and voice, choice and opportunities within the environmental context that has contributed to reduced deprivation/poverty reduction ? How and what could be done to enhance the poverty relevance of the project?
- How has gender equality been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention? To what extent has the intervention contributed to the improvement of gender equality? Has the project had any positive or negative effects on gender equality? Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?

Questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further developed during the inception phase of the evaluation.

2.4 Evaluation approach and methods

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception report.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods.

A *gender responsive* approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used.

Sida's approach to evaluation is *utilization-focused*, which means the evaluator should facilitate the *entire evaluation process* with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluators should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

2.5 Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi. The intended users are Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi and KGT, GSNE GSNE “Orchis”, GMG/FOE. As the evaluation will serve as an input to the decision on whether the project reached its objectives. KGT, GSNE GSNE “Orchis” and GMG/FOE have contributed to the ToR and will be provided with an opportunity to comment on the inception report as well as the final report but will not be involved in the management of the evaluation. Hence, the commissioner will evaluate tenders, approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation. The start-up meeting and the debriefing/validation workshop will be held with the commissioner only.

2.6 Evaluation quality

All Sida's evaluations shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation⁸³. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation⁸⁴. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

2.7 Time schedule and deliverables

The suggested timeline for the evaluation is highly tentative.

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out in March-May 2023. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews needs to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meeting (virtual)	Embassy of Sweden	March 2023
2. Draft inception report		March 2023
3. Inception meeting (virtual)	Embassy of Sweden	April 2023
4. Comments from intended users to evaluators (alternatively these may be sent to evaluators ahead of the inception meeting)		April 2023

⁸³ DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD, 2010.

⁸⁴ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014.

5. Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance	Evaluators	April 2023
6. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting) - virtual	Embassy of Sweden	April 2023
7. Draft evaluation report		May 1, 2023,
8. Comments from intended users to evaluators		May 10, 2023
9. Final evaluation report		May 27, 2023

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology (including how a utilization-focused and gender responsive approach will be ensured), methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proofread. The final report should have clear structure and follow the report format in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Report Template for decentralised evaluations (see Annex C). The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages. The evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect a gender analysis/an analysis of identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, directed to relevant stakeholders and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term. The report should be no more than 35 pages excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report). The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation⁸⁵.

⁸⁵ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014

The evaluator shall, upon approval of the final report, insert the report into the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Report for decentralised evaluations and submit it to Nordic Morning (in pdf-format) for publication and release in the Sida publication data base. The order is placed by sending the approved report to sida@nordicmorning.com, always with a copy to the responsible Sida Programme Officer as well as Sida's Evaluation Unit (evaluation@sida.se). Write "Sida decentralised evaluations" in the email subject field. The following information must always be included in the order to Nordic Morning:

1. The name of the consulting company.
2. The full evaluation title.
3. The invoice reference "ZZ980601".
4. Type of allocation "sakanslag".
5. Type of order "digital publicering/publikationsdatabas".

2.8 Evaluation team qualification

In addition to the qualifications already stated in the framework agreement for evaluation services, the evaluation team shall include the following competencies:

- Professional experience in fields relevant to Environment management and ecological education
- Professional experience in the field of waste management, circular economy

It is desirable that the evaluation team includes the following competencies

- Experience in evaluating project
- Experience in post-Soviet country reforms
- Knowledge of Georgian language
- Working experience in Georgia and/or knowledge of the region's context;
- Familiarity with the region (particularly Georgia), its overall governance features, development needs, and directions

A CV for each team member shall be included in the call-off response. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team if appropriate.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

2.9 Financial and human resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is 500 000 SEK.

The contact person at Swedish Embassy is Khatuna Zaldastanishvili, Program Officer. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant Sida documentation will be provided by the Embassy, namely by the responsible Program Officer.

Contact details to intended users such as KGT, will be provided by the responsible Program Officer at the Embassy.

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics, including interviews with KGT, GSNE GSNE “Orchis”, GMG/FOE, GÄ, Keep Sweden Tidy and other relevant parties.

3. Annexes

Annex A: List of key documentation

Results strategy for Sweden’s reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, 2021-2027

Project Document Keep Georgia Tidy

Progress report/annual report

Annex B: Data sheet on the evaluation object

Information on the evaluation object (i.e. project or programme)	
Title of the evaluation object	Keep Georgia Tidy Project
ID no. in PLANIt	13312
Dox no./Archive case no.	UM2019/26581/TBIL
Activity period (if applicable)	01-07-2019- 31-05- 2023
Agreed budget (if applicable)	34 046 000 SEK
Main sector	Good governance/democracy
Name and type of implementing organizations	Keep Georgia Tidy (NGO), NNLE Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “GSNE “Orchis””, NNLE Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia,
Aid type	Project Type intervention
Swedish strategy	Results strategy for Sweden’s reform cooperation with Eastern Europe 2021-2027

Information on the evaluation assignment	
Commissioning unit/Swedish Embassy	Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi
Contact person at unit/Swedish Embassy	Khatuna Zaldastanishvili
Timing of evaluation (mid-term, end-of-programme, ex-post or other)	End-term
ID no. in PLANIt (if other than above).	13312A0109

Annex C: Decentralised evaluation report template

Annex D : Project/Programme document

Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed for the KGTP

For key points and comments from the KGTP document review, please refer to the Inception Report.

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
Project Documents					
Project Title: KEEP GEORGIA TIDY	Jul 2019	GA	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ4 EQ7
Budget 2019-2023	Jul 2019	Budget	KGT Sida	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ7
Request on changes of project targets and approval of revised Keep Georgia Tidy contribution project Log frame and Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Mar 2022	Letter	KGT Sida	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ7 EQ3
Updated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	Mar 2022	PD	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ3 EQ4 EQ7
Logical Framework Updated	Mar 2022	PD	Sida	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ3 EQ7
Grant Agreements					
Grant Agreement between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) regarding Keep Georgia Tidy Sida Contribution No. 13312	Oct 2018 But based on a PD submitted 5 Jun 2019	Agreement	KGT Sida	Project Mgt	EQ1 EQ4
Amendment to the Agreement on Keep Georgia Tidy	Nov 2020	Agreement	KGT	Project mgt	EQ1 EQ3

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
Between Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) And Georgian Society of Nature Explorers 'GSNE "Orchis"' (GSNE 'GSNE "Orchis"') Sida Contribution No. 13312					
Amendment to the Agreement. on Keep Georgia Tidy Between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) Sida Contribution No. 13312	Nov 2020	Agreement	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ! EQ3
Amendment of Grant Agreement between Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy regarding the project "Keep Georgia Tidy", Sida contribution number 13312	Jun 2022	Agreement	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3
Amendment of Grant Agreement between Sida and Keep Georgia Tidy regarding the project "Keep Georgia Tidy", Sida contribution number 13312 + follow-up agreements within consortium	Nov 2022	Agreement	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3
Amendment to the Agreement on Keep Georgia Tidy Between Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) and Georgian Society of Nature Explorers 'GSNE "Orchis"' (GSNE 'GSNE "Orchis"') Sida Contribution No. 13312	Jun 2022	Agreement	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
Amendment to the Agreement on Keep Georgia Tidy Between Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) And Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia (GMG/FoE-G) Sida Contribution No. 13312	Jun 2022	Agreement	KGT	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3
Annual Reports					
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT FIRST ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020 Consolidated report	Sep 2020	Report	KGT	- Results - Activities - Challenges	EQ1-7
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT Second ANNUAL REPORT 2020-2021 Consolidated report	Sep 2021	Report	KGT	- Results - Activities - Challenges	EQ1-7
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT Second ANNUAL REPORT 2021-2022 Consolidated report	Sep 2022	Report	KGT	- Results - Activities - Challenges	EQ1-7
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT FIRST ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020 Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) 2020 Tbilisi,	Sep 2020	Progress Report	KGT	- Results - Activities	EQ1-7
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT Second ANNUAL REPORT 2020-2021 Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) 2021 Tbilisi,	Sep 2021	Progress Report	KGT	- Results - Activities	EQ1-7
KEEP GEORGIA TIDY PROJECT Second ANNUAL REPORT 2021-2022 Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT) 2022 Tbilisi, With activity plan and monthly budgets	Sep 2022	Progress Report	KGT	- Results - Activities	EQ1-7

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
First Annual Report 2019-2020 KEEP GEORGIA TIDY With annexes: Media, workplan, budget expenses, cash ledger, budget 2020-2021	2020	Report	Greens Movement	• Background • Results • Activities • Challenges	EQ1-7
First Annual Report 2019-2020 KEEP GEORGIA TIDY	2020	PowerPoint	Greens Movement	• Results • Activities • Challenges	EQ1-7
Second Annual Report 2020-2021 KEEP GEORGIA TIDY With annexes: Waste mgt meeting, Budget, Financial report, Budget expenses, workplan, cash ledgers, Budget	2021	Report	Greens Movement	• Background • Results • Activities • Challenges	EQ1-7
Second Annual Report 2020 – 2021	2021	PowerPoint	Greens Movement	• Results • Activities • Challenges	EQ1-7
Third Annual Report 2021-2022 KEEP GEORGIA TIDY With annexes: waste management system budget, work plan, financial report, budget expenses, Audit, Cash ledgers, Media & social media information report	2022	Report	Greens Movement	• Background • Results • Activities • Challenges	EQ1-7
Third Annual Report 2021 – 2022	2022	PowerPoint	Greens Movement	• Results • Activities	EQ1-7
Keep Georgia Tidy Project Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “GSNE “Orchis”” FIRST ANNUAL REPORT 2019 – 2020	Jul 2020	Report	GSNE “Orchis”	• Results • Activities	EQ1-7
Municipal Waste Management in Georgia Report 2020	Jan 2022	Report	Greens Movement	Waste management Activities	EQ3-7
Annual Audits Greens Movement 2020. 2021 – for Green Movement	2021-2022	Audit reports	Baler Tilly Georgia Lmt (2019-2020)	Effectiveness and efficiency	EQ2-7

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
			AGIC Prime Global (2020-2021) Greens Movement		
Review of internal management and control systems of Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT)	Oct 2020	Audit	Swedish Embassy KPMG	Efficiency	EQ2-7
Report on Implementation of the KGT Management Action Plan	Mar 2021	Progress report	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-7
Annual Audits – KGT consortium 2021 - 2022		Audit reports	AGIC Prime Global KGT	Effectiveness and efficiency	EQ6
Monthly Status Report					
Monthly Status Report Jul 2019 – May 2023 Greens Movement +Financial reports +Workplans from Oct 2019	Jul 2019-May 2023	Progress reports	KGTP	Effectiveness and efficiency	EQ2-7
Monthly Status Report Jul 2019 – May 2023 GSNE “Orchis” +Workplans from Oct 2019	Jul 2019-May 2023	Progress reports	KGTP	Effectiveness and efficiency	EQ2-7
Monthly Status Report May 2023	July 2023	Progress report	KGTP	Effectiveness and efficiency	EQ2-7
Project implementation					
Memorandums Of Understanding – Ministry of Education Adjara	2022	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5
Memorandums Of Understanding – National Center for Teacher Professional Development	2022	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5
Memorandums Of Understanding – Oriflame Georgia	2022	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5
Memorandums Of Understanding – Educational management Information System	2019	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5
Memorandums Of Understanding –	2020	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
National Parliamentary Library of Georgia					
Memorandums Of Understanding – Ministry of Education and Science Georgia	2022	MOU	KGT	Implementation	EQ1-5
Other Publications prepared by / with consortium partners					
Letter of appreciation	Oct 2022	Letter	FEE, Copenhagen	Eco-Education	EQ2-5
Social Media Report 01/07/2021–31/07/2022	Sep 2022	PowerPoint	KGT	Awareness raising	EQ2-5
List of public schools in Eco-School programme	?	Excel sheet	KGT	Eco-education	EQ2-5
List of public schools in Circular Economy Small Grant Competition	?	Excel sheet	KGT	Circular Economy	EQ2-5
Other Publications prepared by / with consortium partners					
Waste Management National Strategy 2016-2030					EQ2-5
Municipal Waste Management Action Plan				Waste Management	EQ2-5
Environment and Society – 1(59)	Feb 2021	Journal	Greens Movement	Waste Mgt Normative framework	EQ2-5
Environment and Society – 1(56)	Feb 2019	Journal	Greens Movement	Waste Mgt	EQ2-5
Environment and Society – 2(60)	Feb 2021	Journal	Greens Movement	Waste Mgt	EQ2-5
Other Background Documents					
Results Strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey 2014 – 2020	2014	Strategy	MFA, Sweden	Development cooperation	EQ1
Strategi för Sveriges reformsamarbete med Östeuropa 2021–2027	2021	Strategy	MFA, Sweden	Development cooperation	EQ1
Association Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the	2014	Agreement	EU	Development cooperation	EQ1

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
one part, and Georgia, of the other part					
Official Journal L261 Volume 57, 30 August 2014.	Aug 2014	Legal annals	EU	Waste mgt	Context
Law of Georgia – Waste Management Code	2014	National law	Government of Georgia	Waste mgt	Context
Georgia's Updated Nationally Determined Contributions	2021	Report	Government of Georgia	Waste and climate change	EQ2-3
National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and 2016-2020 Resolution no. 160.	2016	National strategy	Government of Georgia	Waste mgt	EQ1
National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and National Waste Management Action Plan 2022-2026	2022		EU4Environment	Waste Mgt	EQ1
Waste Management Policy in Georgia	2021	Presentation	UNECE Irma Gurguliani	Waste Mgt	EQ1
Evaluation of four NGO implemented programmes in Georgia	Oct 2018	Report	Sida P. Walther et al.	KGTP	EQ1
Evaluation of Swedish Support to Clean-Up Georgia, Phase III Final Report	Sep 2017	Evaluation Report	Sida Nino Partskhaladze	Clean-Up-Georgia	EQ1 EQ4 EQ8
Overview of Waste Sector in Georgia	Apr 2017	Report	USAID Winrock International Sustainable Energy Center “Remissia”	Waste Mgt	EQ1
Situation Analysis of Civil Society in Georgia	2016	Report	Sida & EuropeFoundation Gemma Piñol Puig	CSO Governance	EQ3-4
Case Studies of results-based management by providers: Sweden	2017	Report	OECD	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3
Strengthening Sida Management for Development Results.	2007	Guidelines	Sida	Project Mgt	EQ2 EQ3

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
Defining Key Concepts, Tools and Operational Responses.”	2017	Guidelines	Sida	Project Mgt	EQ7
Accelerating Transition to the Circular Economy in Georgia’	2020	Research article	Bulletin of Georgian National Academy of Sciences (2020): 7-13; Pavliashvili, S., and D. E. Prasek	Circular Economy	EQ7
Circular Economy of Georgia	2021	Research article	Ghosh, S.K., Ghosh, S.K. (eds) “Circular Economy: Recent Trends in Global Perspective”. Springer, Singapore Buachidze, N., et al	Circular Economy	EQ7
A Circular Economy for Georgia	3 November 2022	Newspaper article	GT – Georgia Today	Circular Economy	EQ7
Mainstreaming Gender in Waste Management Projects	2011	Guidelines	EBRD	Gender Waste Mgt	EQ8
Gender and Waste Nexus	2019	Report	UNEP	Gender Waste Mgt	EQ8
CSO Meter A compass to conducive environment and CSO empowerment – Georgia 2019 Country Report (2017-2018 + 2019)	2019	Report	Civil Society Institute	CSOs	Context
CSO Meter A compass to conducive environment and CSO empowerment – Georgia 2022 Country Report	2023	Report	European Center for Not for Profit Law	CSOs	EQ3-4
Basic information about Landfill Gas	Na	Web information	EPA	Waste Mgt	Context and conclusions
Guidelines for National Waste Management Strategies – Moving from Challenges to Opportunities	2013	Report	UNEP & UNITAR	Waste mgt	Context
Decentralization and Local Public Administration Reform	2021	Report	NALAG Melua, David	Decentralization	Context

ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THE KGTP

Document Name	Year	Document Type	Source	Focus Areas	Have informed the following questions of the KGTP
in Georgia – Status Report					
Decentralization Strategy 2020-2025	2019	National Strategy	Government of Georgia	Decentralization	Context
Georgia Solid Waste Sector Assessment Report	May 2021		World Bank	Waste Mgt	EQ1-EQ4
Waste Management Technology in Regions Phase II - WMTR II	2020	Project document	USAID and CENN	Waste Mgt	EQ1-EQ5
Integrated Solid Waste Management – Kutaisi 2015-2022 and	2014	Project document	Government of Georgia	Waste mgt	Context
Acquiring and Using Waste Data for Monitoring and Optimization of Local Waste Management - Conduct, findings and conclusions of the pilot studies in the project area	2019	Guidelines	Government of Georgia	Waste mgt	Context
WEB Sites					
Keep Georgia Tidy Clean Up Georgia	2010->	Website with documents	KGTP	Environment	EQ1-7

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation questions	Preliminary Measures /Indicators	Sources	Data collection methods
Relevance			
EQ1 Is the project relevant to Sida's Strategy and Georgia's environmental governance reform challenges and national priorities?	- Extent to which the project aligns with identified bottlenecks and barriers for sustainable waste management and circular economy - Extent to which the project design, implementation, and stakeholders align with Sida's Strategy and Georgia's environmental governance reform.	- Project documentation, incl. project proposal, and annual reports - reports from planning workshops, - national policies, - Sida Strategy - Project staff and other staff from project organizations - Sida Tbilisi & Stockholm - Project stakeholders	- Desk review - Key informant interviews - Survey
Effectiveness			
EQ2 To what extent has the project contributed to intended outcomes? (Compare project's indicators against set targets) If so, why? If not, why not? EQ3 To what extent have the KGTP implementing partners, KGT, GSNE "Orchis" and Greens Movement been adaptive in their approach towards reaching results? EQ4 To what extent has the activities of the three partner organizations been complementary and joint management structured and operating towards the achievement of project synergies?	- Project indicators - Project log-frames - Project Theories of Change - Evidence of flexibility of project design, including regular revisions, lessons-learned, and risk analysis - Evidence of complementarity of results frameworks of three organizations - Evidence of synergies of implementation and results of three organizations	- Project documentation, incl. annual reports, reports from annual meetings with Sida - Project management documentation - National Environmental Reports - Project staff and other staff from project organizations - Sida Tbilisi & Stockholm - Project stakeholders	- Desk review - Key informant interviews - Survey
Efficiency			

EQ5 Can the costs for the project be justified by its results?	• Extent to which the financial and human resources allocated match programmatic ambitions. • Extent to which financial and human resources are available in a timely manner vis-à-vis workplans. • Evidence of flexibility in resource allocation. • availability to respond to emerging needs and changed context.	• Project documentation, incl. annual reports, audit reports, reports from annual meetings with Sida • Project Management documentation • Project staff and other staff from project organizations • Sida Tbilisi & Stockholm • Project stakeholders	• Desk review • Key informant interviews
Sustainability			
EQ6 Is the current project implementation model for delivering of results ensuring sustainability?	• Evidence of transit strategies • Evidence of institutionalization • Evidence of local funding for continuation of KGT activities	• Project documentation, incl. annual reports, reports from annual meetings with Sida • Project management documentation • National Environmental Reports • Project staff and other staff from project organizations • Sida Tbilisi & Stockholm • Project stakeholders	• Desk review • Key informant interviews • Survey
Cross-cutting issues			
EQ7 Has the project contributed to power and voice, choice and opportunities within the environmental context that has contributed to reduced deprivation/poverty reduction? EQ8 How has gender equality been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention? To what extent has the intervention contributed to the improvement of gender equality? Has the project had any positive or negative effects on gender equality?	• Extent of local voices in news about waste management and circular economy • Extent of new CSO projects for waste management and circular economy • Evidence of poor families adopting sustainable waste management and circular economy principles • Evidence of poverty targeting of project communication • Evidence of economic benefits of project for poor people • Evidence of project design and implementation addressing gender equality based on dynamic gender analysis • Evidence of project design and implementation going beyond a 50:50 criteria for when addressing gender	• Project documentation, incl. annual reports, reports from annual meetings with Sida • Project management documentation • News media • Social media • Project staff and other staff from project organizations • Sida Tbilisi • Project stakeholders	• Desk review • Key informant interviews • Survey

Annex 4 – Assessment of Outcome Achievement

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
1.1. Increased ecological awareness among 70 000 teachers and children in Public schools and kindergartens in Georgia by 2023	Number of teachers and children by gender (female/male) are practicing new knowledge	30% male and 70% female students and teachers (of 70 000) by the end of the project	It remains unclear what “practicing new knowledge mean – and how and when its verified. It was beyond the scope of the KGTPE to verify the number but random visits at schools participating in the Eco-school programme left an impression of some very passionate participants but also litters around the school yards.	According to KGT, the outcome has been achieved and more schools than planned originally has been originally planned enrolled in the Eco-school programme with 161,823 teachers and children.
1.2. Eco-school program is accepted and run in at least 10% of public schools of Georgia by 2023	Number of schools that run <i>Eco-school</i> program	30 schools (of 200 public schools) by 2021	According to the National Statistics Office of Georgia (Geostat) there are 2,302 public schools in Georgia. The KGTPE is not aware where the 10% of 200 schools comes from. According to government officials, the Education Resource Centers received information about the Eco-school program that was then forwarded to all schools in the districts. The schools then took the decision to apply or not. The reasoning behind the choice to join or not could not be verified by the KGTPE. The concept of pilot schools was not introduced in the programme document but introduced during implementation.	According to KGT, Eco-schools programme has been introduced to 456 public schools out of which 20 are “pilot” schools, which is less than 1 per cent of all public schools in Georgia. 11 schools have applied for the green flag – meaning that they have gone through all seven steps of the Eco-school programme defined by FEE. According to KGT all 11

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
				schools were awarded the green flag in June 2023 (this is reported in the Status report for May 2023).
1.3. Increased application of skills and knowledge in public schools and kindergartens (i.e., proper disposal of waste, reduce littering, prevent pollution) by 25 000 pupils and teachers in public schools and 5 000 kindergarten kids and Methodists by 2023	The extent to which school territory is cleaned: High polluted - red, Medium- yellow, Low-green	10% of school territory by the end of the project	It was beyond the scope of the KGTPE to verify the number of schools practicing proper waste management but random visits at schools participating in the Eco-school programme left an impression of some very passionate participants but also litters around the school yards. Waste separation bins were distributed – but many were already distributed under the former Clean-Up programme as well as under programmes funded by USAID and other donors.	According to KGT, the outcome has been achieved.
1.4. Increased capacity of Keep Georgia Tidy and its partners	FEE membership	Apply for one additional program of FEE by 2022	KGT has become a member of FEE and has participated in international gatherings. It is not clear for KGTPE what partner capacity there is reference to in the outcome.	FEE membership achieved.
1.5. Keep Georgia Tidy received the license from Foundation for Environmental Education (FEE) on Eco-Schools program	Keep Georgia Tidy registered in FEE	Receive license by September 2020		FEE license has been achieved in March 2020.

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTP comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
1.6. Increased knowledge of 50,000 State university students by 2023 on Environment protection, Eco Calendar and Clean Up Campaigns importance, Waste Management, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Green Economy, circular economy and sustainable development goals (SDGs) throughout Georgia	Number of students with increased knowledge on Environmental and Health Protection	Total 50,000 students (25, 000 male and 25,000 female) by the end of the project	It is beyond the scope of the KGTP to verify directly if the activities with the universities have been realized. However, the KGTP reports on awareness raising activities, establishment of a youth forum with participation of 11 universities, clean-up activities, etc. The measurement of increased knowledge from the awareness raising activities is not clear and the timing of that measurement is not clear for the KGTP. The handbook on circular economies seems to be a further development of handbooks for policy makers and project promoters;	According to Greens Movement key activities were still ongoing in May 2023 while GSNE “Orchis” report several activities as finished as of May 2023. Awareness raising activities have taken place in some universities. Through social media, the KGTP has also distributed a number of articles targeted students and universities in general. 3 essay competitions targeting university students generated 60 essays on environmental issues. The total number of reached students could not be identified. Finally, the KGTP has developed a Handbook on Circular Economy directed at universities.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ Prasek, D. (2022) "The Circular Economy Handbook for Universities"

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
1.7. Committees in 20 universities established to discuss thematic areas on environmental issues	Number of committees established; Number of women in committees	20 Committees are established at the State Universities by the end of the Project.	The KGTPE could only find limited information about these committees	Under preparation
1.8. At least 35,000 students who dispose waste properly	Number of students, by gender, who dispose waste properly	35,000 university students are disposing waste properly by the end the project.	The KGTPE could not identify status of this outcome.	Under preparation
1.9. At least 40, 000 students engaged in environmental campaigns	Number of students, by gender, engaged in Campaigns	40,000 university students are engaged in environmental campaigns by the end of the project.	KGTPE identified several examples of environmental campaigns at universities – some directly with KGTP input	Under preparation
1.10. Integration of new environmental information and data into the curricula of relevant departments of about 20 State Universities of Georgia	The extent of integration of materials into the curricula	New environmental information and data are integrated into the curricula of relevant departments of 20 state universities by the end of the project.	KGTPE identified several examples of universities proposing courses on various aspects on environmental management – including some universities offering courses on circular economy and waste management	Under preparation
2.1. Enforcement and implementation of Municipal waste	Extent of implementation status	Enforcement and implementation of municipal waste	The KGTPE did not identify an overall database on the status of the municipal waste management plans – general impression from visits and talks with municipalities is that	Preparation for monitoring of implementation implementation; e.g. KGTP is collecting

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTP comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
management plans (5 years) in all municipalities of Georgia	of MWM plans (%) in all municipalities; Extent of reduction of red spots (uncontrolled dump sites) in all municipalities	management will continue in all municipalities till 2023	the plans are implemented although some resources might be lacking for instance for proper waste separation and collection	information on implementation level in all municipalities through questionnaires including assessments of budgets for implementation.
2.2. Increased awareness in 5 municipalities on commitments undertaken in Georgia EU Association Agreement on waste management sector	Number of municipalities and their key stakeholders that are aware of the requirements laid out in the Georgia EU Association Agreement in the context of waste management	15% of municipalities representatives is aware of commitments undertaken in Georgia EU Association Agreement on waste management sector by the end of the project	Interviews with key informants provided impression of good awareness of requirements of EU-Georgia Association Agreement among professionals. The use of the knowledge products could not be assessed by the KGTP – in general external stakeholders were not aware of the products.	Outcome realized A great number of knowledge products developed and distributed to selected municipalities
2.3. Revised 5-years Waste Management Plans that adhere to current legal requirements of waste management sector are disclosed for public review by 5	Number of municipalities that adopt redrafted 5-years Waste Management Plans.	5-years Waste Management Plans which meets national and international requirements are prepared for 5	Five municipalities have updated waste management plans. According to KGTP partners, the municipality waste management plans have been prepared by the KGTP – the level of ownership could not be verified by the KGTP. One municipal waste management plan (update of an old one) was presented to the public in June at an event for key stakeholders. It was noted by some key informants who have	Outcome realized

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTP comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
municipalities and self-governing cities		municipalities by the end of the project	been involved in municipal waste management plans that they had not been invited to the event.	
2.4. Support the establishment of modern system of waste management on Regional level in Kakheti	Whether or not regional waste management system is established; Regional waste management plan for Kakheti region	Will start from October, 2019 Regional waste management plan for Kakheti region is prepared by the end of 2022	The KGTP noticed some disagreement at the level of the Government regarding the Regional Waste Management Plan highlighting that they are not part of the national planning framework outlined in the 2022 updated National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and National Waste Management Action Plan 2022-2026. ⁸⁷ It is noted that the suggestions for the new strategy outlines development of joint landfills for several municipalities at regional level. The transportation and collection challenges will still remain.	Suggestions for the regional waste management plan in Kakheti discussed with officials in the region.
2.5. Increased awareness among 50,000 representatives of young persons on positive input of bio-restoration, afforestation activities in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and energy	Number of young persons who are aware of positive input of bio-restoration, afforestation activities in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and energy saving	50,000 young persons are aware of positive input of bio-restoration, afforestation activities in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and energy saving by the end of the project	Several of the KGTP activities address environmental awareness raising among young people. However, how the project measures increased awareness remain unclear to the KGTP.	Outcome realized according to KGTP through essay competition, two conferences on circular economy and environmental awareness raising lectures.

⁸⁷ EU4Environment (2022) " [National Waste Management Strategy 2016-2030 and National Waste Management Action Plan 2022-2026](#)"

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTP comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
2.6. Reduced desertification process in semi-arid regions of Georgia; 4 ha of the cleaned-up territories is restored with native plant species; support to forest sector in reduction of the GHG emissions.	The extent of bio-restoration in the cleaned-up areas with native seeds and seedlings	4 ha of the cleaned-up territories are restored with native plant species by the end of the project	During primary data collection, the KGTP noticed that the activity was basically unknown among others that the KGTP partner implementing it.	Outcome realized
2.7. Reduction in heavy metals on polluted soils in targeted areas in Georgia by 10% by 2023	The extent of polluted soil	3% Reduction in heavy metals on polluted soils in targeted areas in Georgia by 2021	The KGTP identified very limited information on this outcome except that the tree planting activities (bio-remediation) should have an impact.	Outcome considered to be achieved
2.8. Raised awareness of self-government and municipalities at least 1 000 000 people on waste management in 4 years.	Number of people whose awareness is increased in waste management; % of Georgian population taking part in clean-up actions, Contest “Clean Region”, Social Network, meetings in	Start from 2019 Raised awareness of self-government and municipalities at least 1 000 000 people on waste management by the end of the project	The Clean up activities have engaged a large number of people throughout the country. Still, the KGTP questions that 1 million people can and will have increased awareness from these activities. The KGTP could not find any exact number of how many people have been involved in the KGTP’s clean-up activities. Many external stakeholders among the key informants were not aware of the Clean-up activities – even the national media.	Outcome partly achieved.

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTP comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
	55 Community centers			
2.9. Increased awareness among 700, 000 representatives of stakeholders on the benefits of circular economy; acceleration of Green Economy development, via using waste management improvement as per EU standards and reduction of pollution and accelerate systemic change through wider policy and advocacy work.	Number of policymakers, civil society organizations, businesses and other stakeholders aware of circular economy; Regulatory changes addressing Circular economy aspects; Relevant incentives are in place for Business Sector in waste management; Extent of change of awareness on practical aspects of Circular Economy practices among students and Government officials and business sector;	10% of representatives of key stakeholders have knowledge on the benefits of Circular Economy by the end of the project	The key informant interviews showed limited understanding about circular economy among many stakeholders. The KGTP found that the ambitions are unrealistic for a new subject. Some key informants questioned that circular economy is placed under the ministry of environment as a waste management component – should be raised above waste management.	Outcome partly achieved

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
	Incentives for new businesses are created			
2.10. 63 municipalities dispose waste on the legal Landfills by 2023	Number of reduced uncontrolled dumpsites in 63 municipalities	Will start from October ,2019 and finalized by the end of the project	According to the latest status report from May 2023, the only activity that has been carried out for this outcome is distribution of questionnaires to 65 municipalities.	Outcome not achieved
2.11. Established community network for monitoring of waste situation in 10 regions (watch-dog system) on the municipalities level is functional	The extent to which the network implements its functions	Will start from October 2019 and finalized by the end of the project	The KGTPE noticed various perceptions among internal and external stakeholders of what such a Watch-dog system should consist of and who should ensure its function. For instance, how formalized should the network be?	Awareness raising and social media platforms established with discussions on waste situation.
2.12. Two Social enterprises on waste separation (one per region) are functional by 2023	Number of Social enterprises participating in separating waste in the municipalities	Starts from 2022 and will be finalized by the end of the project	The KGTPE could not verify updates on this outcome	No information
2.13. Awareness raised of Rural Population 500 000 on waste water negative impact on	% of population in municipalities switched to septic sanitation systems	Starts from 2022 and will be finalized	The KGTPE could not verify updates on this outcome but noticed comments from key informants about an unrealistic outcome	No information

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
human health 3% of rural population uses septic sanitation systems		by the end of the project		
2.14. Raised awareness of 63 municipal level policy makers in 10 regions of Georgia and Tbilisi in 4 years substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse.	Number of policy makers taking parts in discussions, round tables and meetings on waste management. Number of policy makers in 10 regions are putting into practice monitoring reports	Starts from 2019 December and will be finalized by the end of the project	The KGTPE found challenges identifying who provided information and training of municipal decision makers. The ones who could confirm KGTP input were generally appreciative of the support.	Most of the planned activities for reaching this outcome were realized. However, according to the May 2023 status report no information is available on one critical activity for assessing the outcome, namely: Collection of information and preparation of detailed and clear recommendations for the municipalities on implementation of waste management plans in their regions
2.15. Increased awareness among key stakeholders regarding reduced littering in the country, the gradual improvement of the educational system, modern waste management system	Extent of change of awareness	10% of representatives of key stakeholders have knowledge on the benefits of Circular Economy by the end of the project	The key informant interviews showed limited understanding of the circular economy among many stakeholders. The KGTPE found that the ambitions are unrealistic for a new subject. Some key informants questioned that circular economy is placed under the ministry of environment as a waste management component – should be raised above waste management. Participants in the so-called expert group on circular economy did not consider their	Outcome partly achieved

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
establishment and acceleration of circular economy principles in society			participation as “experts” but more generalist who participated in presentations on circular economy	
2.16. Circular economy is mapped in Georgia together with GoG to accelerate transition to the circularity via setting appropriate national quantitative circular economy policy targets and circular ambitions, identifying sector circular economy opportunities, mapping priority sectors for circular economy initiatives and sector-specific policy options.	Circular economy map, which clearly defines national quantitative circular economy policy targets and circular ambitions, and identifies sector circular economy opportunities for the county, defines priority sectors for circular economy initiatives and their role in the national economy, identifies barriers to CE and maps sector-specific policy options is prepared and published.	CE mapping starts in November 2020 and will be finalized by the end of 2022	The mapping was finalized and publicized providing an important input to the national policy making on circular economy	Outcome realized

ANNEX 4 – ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT

Information from updated KGTP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework from October 2022			KGTPE comments	Status according to annual reports (2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 and status reports May 2023 complemented by information from KGTP interviews May and June 2023
Outcomes	Performance Indicator	Project target on the Outcome		
2.17. Recommendations for the Circular Economy Roadmap and Strategy of Georgia are developed	Recommendations for development of the Circular Economy Roadmap and Strategy for Georgia is prepared and available	To be prepared by the end of 2022	The mapping document includes recommendations for policy makers. The target groups perception and planned use of the recommendations could not be assessed by the KGTP.	Outcome realized

Annex 5 - Data collection tools

ANNEX 5.1: ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY - - KEY ELEMENTS

The following presents the outline of what was shared with the selected stakeholders invited to participate in the online perception survey.

Dear Madam/Sir

In 2019, three Georgian civil society organizations: “Keep Georgia Tidy”, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers "Orchis" and "Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia" launched the **Keep Georgia Tidy Project** with funding from the Swedish Government. The focus of the project is **environmental awareness and waste management** in Georgia through a broad number of activities.

The Keep Georgia Tidy Project will come to an end in May 2023 and an **independent evaluation** has therefore been launched to draw **lessons learned from the last four years of project implementation**. For this it is important to **understand different stakeholders’ perception about the successful achievements of the Project and what factors have played a critical role for successes**. To help identify the success stories, the independent Evaluation team from FCG Sweden has developed this short survey that we kindly invite you to fill-in. The evaluation is commissioned to the company FCG Sweden. We are interested in hearing **from people who have been directly involved in the Project as well as others who are working with different aspects of waste management and environmental consciousness**.

The survey takes about **fifteen minutes to complete** to complete.

The survey complements other data collection tools for the evaluation, namely a document review, focus groups, and interviews.

Your participation in the online perception survey is **voluntary** and your decision to participate or not will not be recorded anywhere. Likewise, while we hope you will answer all questions you might choose only to answer some of the questions. That decision will not be recorded anywhere either. **The survey is anonymous** and will be administered solely by the team leader for the independent evaluation, Ms. Lene Poulsen. All information will be kept confidential, so please feel free to express your views!

I hope you will be able to fill in the survey by **16 May 2023**. If you have any questions don’t hesitate to contact me on: lene.poulsen@gmail.com.

Many thanks,

Lene Poulsen

Team Leader

Question 1: Please describe in a few lines what you consider to be the most important success story of the project Keep Georgia Tidy - that is, an initiative or activity from the Project that has contributed or is likely to contribute to environmental awareness and improved waste management in Georgia.

Question 2: Please identify some key factors that you believe allowed this to become a success story.

- a) External factors, for instance related to other initiatives happening at the same time, policy changes etc.
- b) Internal factors related to Keep Georgia Tidy's approach, thematic focus, geographic focus, role and/or organisational characteristics, for instance its engagement in partnerships, consultations, technical assistance, staff profiles, etc.

Question 3: If you were to recommend others, either in Georgia or abroad, to learn from the success story, what would you want them to pay particular attention to when adopting or replicating the success story?

Question 4: Do you have any specific recommendations for similar projects in the future?

Question 5: Are there any other things related to Keep Georgia Tidy's activities and performance in the Georgia that you would like to share with us for the evaluation?

Finally, for the analysis of the results of the survey we would like to know type of organisation you work for:

And what is the main focus of your work:

- Finally, for the analysis of the results of the survey we would like to know type of organisation you work for:
 - International CSO
 - Donor
 - Government Ministry, Department or Agency
 - Regional Local Government Authority
 - Municipal Local Government Authority
 - Other International Organization
 - Media
 - University

- School
 - Kindergarten
 - Private Sector
 - Other – Write in
- What is the main focus of your work?
 - Waste Management
 - Environmental Management
 - Circular Economy
 - Administration - Management
 - Teaching
 - Communication
 - Development cooperation
 - Other - Write in

THANK YOU!

მოგესალმებით,

2019 წელს, შვედეთის მთავრობის მხარდაჭერითა და სამი ქართული სამოქალაქო საზოგადოებრივი ორგანიზაციების: „დაიცავი საქართველოს სისუფთავე“, „საქართველოს ბუნების მკვლევართა კავშირი „ორქისი“ და „საქართველოს მწვანეთა მოძრაობა / დედამიწის მეგობრები“ ხელშეწყობით საფუძველი ჩაეყარა პროექტს „დავიცვათ საქართველოს სისუფთავე“. პროექტის ძირითად მიზანს წარმოადგენს საქართველოში გარემოსდაცვითი ცნობიერების ამაღლება და ნარჩენების მართვის რიგი ღონისძიებების გატარება.

პროექტი „დავიცვათ საქართველოს სისუფთავე“ სრულდება მიმდინარე წლის მაისის ბოლოს და შესაბამისად დაწყებულია მისი დამოუკიდებელი შეფასება იმისათვის, რომ გამოვლენილი იყოს ბოლო ოთხი წლის განმავლობაში პროექტის მიმდინარეობისას მიღებული გაკვეთილები. ამისათვის, უმნიშვნელოვანესია გავიგოთ სხვადასხვა დაინტერესებული მხარეების აღქმა პროექტის მიღწევებზე და რა ფაქტორებმა განაპირობა პროექტის წარმატება.

შეფასება დაევალა კომპანია **FCG შვედეთს**, რომლის დამოუკიდებელი შემფასებელი გუნდის მიერ შემუშავებულია აღნიშნული კითხვარი და გთხოვთ მის შევსებას. ჩვენ დაინტერესებულები ვართ მოვუსმინოთ იმ ადამიანებს და არამხოლოდ იმათ, ვისაც უშუალოდ ჰქონდათ შეხება პროექტთან და ასევე მუშაობენ ნარჩენების მართვისა და გარემოსდაცვითი ცნობიერების ამაღლებისათვის სხვადასხვა საკითხებზე.

ანონიმური კითხვარის შევსებისთვის მხოლოდ 15 წუთი დაგჭირდებათ. შედეგად, ის სრულყოფს შეფასებისათვის აუცილებელი მონაცემების

შეგროვების ინსტრუმენტებს, კერძოდ კი დოკუმენტების განხილვას, ფოკუს ჯგუფებს და ინტერვიუებს. გამოკითხვაში მონაწილეობა ნებაყოფლობითია და არსად ჩაიწერება. ამასთან ერთად იმედს ვიტოვებთ, რომ შეძლებთ ყველა კითხვაზე პასუხის გაცემას ან შეგეძლებათ აირჩიოთ მხოლოდ ზოგიერთი კითხვა და მას გასცეთ პასუხი. კითხვებზე პასუხიც შესაბამისად არსად ჩაიწერება. გამოკითხვას განახორციელებს ჯგუფის ლიდერი, დამოუკიდებელი შემფასებელი, ქალბატონი ლენე პოლსენი. ყველა თქვენს მიერ მოწოდებული ინფორმაცია იქნება კონფიდენციალური, შესაბამისად თამამად და თავისუფლად შეძლებთ შეხედულებების გამოხატვას.

გამოკითხვის შევსებას შეძლებთ 2023 წლის 16 მაისი თარიღის ჩათვლით.

დამატებითი კითხვებისთვის დამიკავშირდით.

lene.poulsen@gmail.com

დიდი მადლობა

ლენე პოლსენი.

ჯგუფის ლიდერი.

კითხვა 1: გთხოვთ, რამდენიმე წინადადებით აღწეროთ პროექტის „დავიცვათ საქართველოს სისუფთავე“ ყველაზე მნიშვნელოვანი წარმატების ისტორია, ინიციატივა ან აქტივობა, რომელმაც ხელი შეუწყო ან სამომავლოდ განაპირობებს გარემოსდაცვითი ცნობიერების და ნარჩენების მართვის გაუმჯობესებას.

კითხვა 2: გთხოვთ, იდენტიფიცირება გაუკეთოთ იმ საკვანძო ფაქტორებს, რამაც განაპირობა პროექტის წარმატება.

ა) გარეგანი ფაქტორები, მაგ: დროის იმავე პერიოდში არსებული სხვა ინიციატივები, პოლიტიკის ცვლილება და ა.შ.

ბ) შიდა ფაქტორები, დაკავშირებული პროექტის მიდგომებთან, თემატური და გეოგრაფიული ფოკუსი, როლი ან/და ორგანიზაციული მახასიათებლები, მაგალითად ჩართულობა სხვადასხვა პარტნიორობაში, კონსულტაციები, ტექნიკური მხარდაჭერა, პერსონალის პროფილი და ა.შ.

კითხვა 3: თუ თქვენ ურჩევთ სხვას, საქართველოში ან მის ფარგლებს გარეთ, რომ ისწავლონ ამ წარმატების ისტორიიდან, თქვენი მოსაზრებით რას ისურვებდით რომ მიაქციონ ყურადღება აღნიშნულის გაზიარების ან გამეორების შემთხვევებში.

კითხვა 4: სამომავლოდ გაქვთ თუ არა მსგავსი ტიპის პროექტებისთვის სპეციფიური რეკომენდაციები?

კითხვა 5: გაქვთ თუ არა პროექტის „დავიცვათ საქართველოს სისუფთავე“ აქტივობებთან და მიმდინარეობასთან დაკავშირებით დამატებითი ინფორმაცია, რომლის გაზიარებასაც ისურვებდით შეფასებისთვის?

დასკვნით ეტაპზე ჩვენი შეფასებისთვის მნიშვნელოვანია ვიცოდეთ რა ტიპის ორგანიზაციას წარმოადგენთ და რა არის თქვენი ძირითადი საქმიანობა.

- საერთაშორისო სამოქალაქო საზოგადოებრივი ორგანიზაცია
- დონორი
- მთავრობა, სამინისტრო, დეპარტამენტი ანდა სააგენტო
- რეგიონული სამთავრობო ადმინისტრაცია
- მუნიციპალური სამთავრობო ადმინისტრაცია
- სხვა საერთაშორისო ორგანიზაცია
- მედია
- უნივერსიტეტი
- სკოლა
- საბავშვო ბაღი
- კერძო სექტორი
- სხვა - აქ ჩაწერეთ

რა არის თქვენი საქმიანობის ძირითადი სფერო?

- ნარჩენების მართვა
- გარემოსდაცვითი მენეჯმენტი
- ცირკულარული ეკონომიკა
- ადმინისტრაცია - მართვა
- სწავლება
- კომუნიკაცია
- განვითარების თანამშრომლობა
- სხვა - აქ ჩაწერეთ

დიდი მადლობა

ANNEX 5.2: INDICATIVE INTERVIEW GUIDE

The following present the semi-structured interview guidelines used for face-to-face primary data collection.

Key points for general introduction / opening statements

- Introduction of the KGTP team member(s) carrying out the interview: independent consultants, not Sida or KGTP staff. We are recruited by FCG Sweden, an independent consulting company based in Sweden, contracted by the Swedish Embassy in Tbilisi to undertake this evaluation independently.

- In 2019, three Georgian civil society organizations: “Keep Georgia Tidy”, Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “GSNE “Orchis”” and “Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth-Georgia” launched the **Keep Georgia Tidy Project** with funding from the Swedish Government. The focus of the project is **environmental awareness and waste management** in Georgia through a broad number of activities.
- The Keep Georgia Tidy Project will come to an end in May 2023 and an **independent evaluation** has therefore been launched to draw **lessons learned from the last four years of project implementation**. For this it is important to **understand different stakeholders’ perception about the achievements of the Project and what factors have played a critical role for successes**.
- The interviews complement other data collection tools for the evaluation, namely a document review, focus groups, and an online perception survey focusing on success stories.
- Your participation in the interview is **voluntary** and your decision to participate or not will not be recorded anywhere. Likewise, while we hope you will answer all questions you might choose only to answer some of the questions. That decision will not be recorded anywhere either. **The interview is anonymous**, and the result will be administered solely by the team leader for the independent evaluation, Ms. Lene Poulsen. Quality Control of the products generated by the evaluation will ensure that no information can be traced back to any individuals. So as all information will be kept confidential, please feel free to express your views!
- The interview will last around 45 minutes to an hour.
- Do you agree continuing with the interview and as such provide information for the KGTPE?

Opening questions

General information about the person(s) being interviewed: – background, how long they have been working at their current job, what they do, and what experience do they have working / collaborating with the KGTPE – and/or waste management and environmental awareness in general.

First area of inquiry: Relevance of the KGTP

- Do you consider the KGTP focus relevant for Georgia?
- Why is KGTP relevant? Which areas?
- How can circular economy improve waste management in Georgia?

Second area of inquiry: Effectiveness of the KGTP

- Can you mention some specific results or changes in Georgia to which the KGTP has contributed – e.g.
 - behaviour change of different groups – what changes and which groups?
 - New infrastructure – where and what?

- Do you have any information on how the three implementing organizations are working?
 - Are they working together?
 - Could they work more together?
 - Are they working with other organizations? – how and which ones?
 - Should they work with other organizations? – how and which ones?
- How do you see KGTP’s approach at national, regional, and municipal levels?
- Are you aware of any adaptation of the project approach? – what and when – successful?
- Does KGTP pay attention to different stakeholders’ capacities, capabilities, and needs? e.g.
 - women vs. men? – and how?
 - Different regions? – which ones and how?
 - Young vs. old? – and how?
 - Rich vs. poor? – which ones and how?
 - People in occupied territories?

Third area of inquiry: Efficiency of the KGTP

- How do you consider KGTP’s ambitions with the resources?
- Do you see any resource challenge in the way KGTP is being implemented?
- Are you aware of any KGTP prioritization of activities? – which ones?

Fourth area of inquiry: Sustainability of the KGTP

- Do you consider that the activities launched by KGTP – and changed behaviour generated by the project - will continue after the project has come to an end in May?
 - Which ones? And why?
 - Which ones will not be continued? And why?

Fifth area of inquiry: Cross-cutting areas

- Has the KGTP contributed to more people speaking up for improved waste management, circular economy and/or environmental awareness in general?
 - Which stakeholders particularly?
 - What has changed? And what has brought on the changes?

Final questions

- Would you have any other comments on the KGTP?

If you have any documents or information, you think would be useful for informing the evaluation, Thank you.

Annex 6 – Key Informants interviewed for the KGTPE

Representatives from the following organizations participated in the KGTPE interviews.

- Embassy of Sweden, Georgia
- Keep Georgia Tidy
- Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of the Earth
- Georgian Society of Nature Explorers “Orchis”
- Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture
- Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development
- Parliamentarian committees
- Education Resource Centres
- National Statistics
- Public Schools
- Universities
- Private Sector working on recycling
- National Broadcast company
- Municipalities
- Bilateral Donors
- European Union
- United Nations
- NGOs beyond the KGTP partners



End-term Evaluation focusing on results achieved by the Keep Georgia Tidy Project by the organization Keep Georgia Tidy (KGT)

This evaluation report presents end-term assessment of the Keep Georgia Tidy Project (KGTP) funded by Sida in Georgia, the evaluation focuses on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues such as poverty, voice, and gender. Key components of the KGTP include waste management plans, community clean-up activities, and circular economy initiatives. Findings indicate stakeholder recognition of the project's relevance and alignment with Sida's strategy and Georgia's environmental reforms. While the KGTP has achieved expected outcomes the sustainability plans lack institutionalization strategies beyond project completion. Given that this is a project that has already come to an end, the significant insights gained from the Project can be applied to different situations. General recommendations emphasize the importance of clear consortium definitions, robust theories of change, and differentiated communication strategies.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Visiting address: Rissneleden 110, 174 57 Sundbyberg
Postal address: Box 2025, SE-174 02 Sundbyberg, Sweden
Telephone: +46 [0]8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 [0]8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se Web: sida.se/en

