



2013:16

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Vera Devine
Jessica Rothman
Ian Christoplos

Review of the Results of Sweden's Development Cooperation Strategy in Georgia

Final Report

Review of the Results of Sweden's Development Cooperation Strategy in Georgia

**Final Report
April 2013**

**Vera Devine
Jessica Rothman
with Ian Christoplos**

Authors: Vera Devine and Jessica Rothman with Ian Christoplos

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 2013:16

Commissioned by The Embassy of Sweden in Georgia

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: April 2013

Published by Citat 2013

Art. no. Sida61602en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61602en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

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

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
Preface.....	5
Executive Summary	6
1 Introduction and Background.....	10
1.1 Purpose of the Review	10
1.2 Context.....	10
2 Methods.....	13
2.1 Process	13
2.2 Selection of Methods and their Description	13
2.3 Limitations and their Implications.....	15
3 Findings: Democracy, Human Rights and Gender Equality	17
3.1 Relevance of Current Strategic Objectives	17
3.2 Results	21
3.3 Efficiency and Choice of Modalities	28
3.4 Finding Complementarities and Synergies	29
3.5 Sustainability and Ownership	29
3.6 Feedback on Sida.....	30
4 Findings: Environment.....	32
4.1 Relevance of Current Strategic Objectives	32
4.2 Results	32
4.3 Sustainability and Ownership	33
4.4 Feedback on Sida.....	33
5 Findings: Development of a Market Economy	34
5.1 Relevance of Current Strategic Objectives	34
5.2 Results	34
5.3 Sustainability and ownership	35
5.4 Modalities	35
5.5 Feedback on Sida.....	35
6 Conclusions	36
7 Recommendations.....	38

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	39
Annex 2 – Key Informants.....	42
Annex 3 – Documents Consulted	44
Annex 4 – Projects in the Portfolio and Consulted Documentation	47

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACF	Accion contra el Hambre
CRA	Civil Registry Agency
DCFTA	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EPF	Eurasia Partnership Foundation
EUD	Delegation of the European Union
GoG	Government of Georgia
GSFIS	Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
ISET	International School of Economics at Tbilisi University
KtK	Kvinna till Kvinna
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender
NAPR	National Agency for Public Registry
NBE	National Bureau of Enforcement
NDI	National Democratic Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
RBM	Results-Based Management
SEPA	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TI	Transparency International
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNM	United National Movement
WV	World Vision

Preface

This *Review of the Strategy on Sweden's Support to Georgia, 2010- 2013* was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi, Georgia, through Sida's framework agreement for reviews and evaluations with Indevelop AB. The purpose of the review is to provide Sida with input for its preparation of a new cooperation strategy between Sweden and Georgia, which is expected to be part of a regional strategy covering several countries in Eastern Europe.

Indevelop AB carried out the review between December 2012 and April 2013.

The independent review team included the following key members:

- Vera Devine, Team Leader, member of Indevelop's Core Team of professional evaluators
- Jessica Rothman, Evaluator, Project Manager at Indevelop for Sida's framework agreement for reviews and evaluations

Quality assurance of the methodology and reports was provided by Ian Christoplos, Project Director at Indevelop for Sida's framework agreement for reviews and evaluations.

This final report has incorporated feedback from the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia and Sida on the draft report.

Executive Summary

This report is the result of a review of Sweden's current, 2010 to 2013, Development Co-operation Strategy with Georgia. The review, which was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia, aims to map results from the existing portfolio of projects, as well as lessons learned against the background of the strategic objectives; it is intended to inform the development of the new co-operation Strategy, which will take effect from 2014 onwards.

The review was carried out through a combination of a desk review of available project documents of 26 projects in the portfolio with a series of in-country stakeholder and expert non-stakeholder workshops in February 2013. The in-country phase served to generate information on results that were difficult to extrapolate from the project documentation, which, in most of the cases, lacked a results focus; stakeholder participation and involvement has also added legitimacy to the process. Limitations during the review were a shortage of time available for in-country work, which resulted in some key non-stakeholders not having been consulted, as well as stakeholders' difficulties in discussing their projects in relation to results achieved (and in this aspect, echoing the written reports). A number of projects have started relatively recently, and their results were not available at the time of the review.

Objectives, as set out in the current Strategy, are, in the main, *relevant*. There are, however, questions as to the focus of some of the projects towards contributing to the achievement of the strategic objectives in the sectors of Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality on the one hand; and in Market Development on the other hand.

In terms of results, the review finds that the most noticeable achievement across the entire portfolio is on gender equality, which has been addressed through specific projects, as well as being a cross-cutting priority for Sweden in Georgia. At the level of projects, Swedish support has contributed to the passing of gender legislation and the establishment of relevant institutions; the participation of women in politics, too, has increased as a result of two of the projects, and awareness on gender-based domestic violence has risen; a shelter for women who are victims of domestic violence is now being run by the respective Georgian institutions. Gender equality has become an accepted topic of the dialogue between the Government of Georgia (GoG) and the international donor community, and Sweden has been credibly linked with a shift among the international community on incorporating gender equality into their work in Georgia. Gender equality has also resulted in changes in many of the organisations implementing projects with Swedish funding. The greatest challenge ahead is for the Embassy to work with partners to build their capacity to mainstream gender in a more meaningful way, and to equip them with the tools to do so. Gender mainstreaming has, however, not been accepted, or incorporated by all of Sweden's partners, and

there should be reflection on how to ensure that all implementing partners share Swedish values.

In terms of working with civil society, Sweden has been crucial in supporting small local-level activities that would not have otherwise received funding. A key issue for further reflection is the conceptual conflation of supporting civil society by supporting NGOs—NGOs are (at least in theory) part of civil society, yet, civil society extends beyond NGOs. Georgia’s vibrant NGO sector is supported by donors, including Sweden, without there being a viable alternative to such external funding in the near future. At the same time, civil society at the grassroots level is still weak; small grants provided through EPF (Eurasia Partnership Foundation) try to work with nascent community-based organisations at the very local level and thus try to support emerging grassroots activities; whether this type of support leads to sustainable civil society at that level remains to be seen, and an ongoing review of EPF might be able to offer specific insight into this. The review found that projects such as “Clean Up Georgia!” could serve as an example of an initiative that has been able to mobilise communities at grass-roots levels around an issue of direct concern to these communities: part of its success stems from being able to make a demonstrable link between citizens’ engagement on the one hand, and the quality of life in the communities affected on the other hand.

While human rights have been an emphasis in the Strategy, the human rights focus has not come out very clearly in the projects, and stakeholders have struggled to associate their interventions with contributing to human rights.

The environment portfolio has been marred by some difficulties stemming, not least, from the previous government’s reluctance to embrace reforms in the sector as a priority. The projects supported in the portfolio are contributing to achieving the objectives of the Strategy. Big infrastructure measures and smaller pilots, and support to capacity and institution-building on the one hand, in combination with a citizens’ initiative to raise public awareness on the other hand, seem particularly pertinent and useful.

Although relevant, the market development sector is possibly the least coherent in terms of the project portfolio that supports it: one of the four projects is planned to be phased-out in 2014, and another project, while important in its own right, does not work towards the specific objectives of the sector; the two other projects are clearly focussing on the achievement of the objective; however, both projects are too recent to be able to report on results.

The portfolio of projects employs a variety of aid modalities, with this variety being a strength, as it allows for the funding of a range of interventions, some of which (in particular to support small, grass-roots level activities through EPF) would not otherwise receive funding. There are some concerns about the “twinning-like” projects where a permanent presence of the Swedish partner organisation was originally part of the project design, but where there is no permanent presence from the Swedish

side. This contrasts with the positive experience of those “twinning-like” projects where there is a permanent presence and which are appreciated by the Georgian “receiving” institution, as they provide direct, day-to-day access to expertise.

Feedback on the Embassy/Sida by stakeholders and non-stakeholder experts was very positive. Particularly, strong stewardship, support with gender equality and Results-Based Management (RBM) were pointed out in the civil society/Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) portfolio, while technical support with RBM-specific indicators was appreciated by stakeholders working on projects in the environment portfolio.

The donor community respects Sweden as a reliable partner in aid co-ordination, and identifies it as driving the gender equality agenda.

Recommendations:

- Reconsider the focus of the project portfolio to more clearly reflect Strategy objectives, in particular with a view to the institution-building projects that are currently part of the portfolio of projects under the Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality; and Market Development sectors.
- Ensure that all Swedish implementing partners understand and share core Swedish values.
- Set out, more clearly, to partners that gender mainstreaming in the interventions is neither optional nor negotiable, and that the organisations will have to account for how gender is addressed on a regular basis early on during project implementation.
- Consider capacity building with partners on RBM and gender mainstreaming.
- Facilitate lesson sharing and connections between projects to enhance synergies and learning between implementing partners, specifically with successful contributions to gender equality and RBM.
- All of the current strategy objectives are relevant for Georgia, but the project portfolio to support the achievement of these objectives would require some minor revisions.
- Involvement in Abkhazia should continue; limited engagement inside Abkhazia is preferable to no engagement at all; continued presence could prove useful should windows of opportunity arise during the protracted conflict or afterwards.

Potential future areas for support:

- Discuss lessons learned from support to NGOs and additional ways of assisting the emergence of a genuine civil society, as reflected in Sweden’s civil society policy.

- Consider interventions in the justice sector for Sida support, including support to the office of the Public Defender (ombudsman); the justice sector is currently the most critical sector in Georgia, and support would tally well with Sweden's human rights imperative.
- There is potential for Sweden to support sensitive issues that are not currently supported by many donors, but where Sweden enjoys great credibility, such as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) rights, and ethnic minority rights.
- Regional activities could be considered in the area of environment, specifically in solid waste management and cross-border dialogue, if this were to become a requirement of the new regional strategy.

1 Introduction and Background

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

At the end of 2012, the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia commissioned Indevlop AB to conduct a review of the results of Sweden's Strategy for Development Co-operation with Georgia.¹ According to the Terms of Reference (ToR; see Annex 1), the "purpose of the review is to provide input to Sida for its preparation of results proposals within the framework of a new strategy on Sweden's cooperation with Georgia". The ToR specified two outputs to be produced under the review: "1) Compilation and description of the main results that can be verified from evaluation reports" and "2) analysis of results from project reporting, including lessons learned – what has worked well and what hasn't." The ToR further specifies that "the results should be compared with the objectives in Sweden's cooperation strategy to highlight the relevance of the portfolio to the objectives."

1.2 CONTEXT

1.2.1 Timeframe for current strategy and plans for next

The current Strategy for Sweden's Development Co-operation with Georgia (hereafter: Strategy) has been in place since 21 January 2010, and covers the time span from 2010 through 2013. It is expected that future development cooperation to Georgia will, from 2014 onwards, be part of a regional strategy comprising Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus, as well as Armenia and Azerbaijan (bi-lateral support to the latter two has been phased out recently), and that the new strategy will span from 2014 to 2020. The current Strategy has been informed by a Sida-internal review of its predecessor document (covering the period from 2006 to 2009).

The Strategy is the Swedish Government's main instrument for steering and managing bi-lateral development cooperation with Georgia. The overarching objective of Swedish development cooperation with Georgia is for the country to develop towards becoming a democratic and accountable state, which will facilitate/lead to closer ties with the EU.

¹ The Strategy can be found at <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/4510/a/145628>.

Sweden's Strategy converges with the priority of closer integration with the EU of the previous and current Georgian governments.² The financial envelope for the Strategy period is MSEK 480, with annual allocations of MSEK 120 each (see Annex 4 for detailed information of all the contributions in Sweden's current portfolio).

1.2.2 The current strategy in a changed context

Parliamentary elections were held in October 2012, which led to a change in government. At the time of the review, there was considerable uncertainty about key directions of the new government's policy and reform agendas, as well as its technical expertise to run the country.

While pre-election rhetoric of the winning Georgian Dream party to reverse some of the previous government's reforms has not necessarily materialised, there is also a widely held view that the new government is more conservative than its predecessor. The new Strategy will have to factor in developments in the forthcoming months in order to identify windows of opportunity for cooperation, as well as areas where Sweden should be an advocate for core Swedish values, in particular if they do not coincide with the new government's, such as on minority (including ethnic, religious, and sexual) rights. A further area that the new government will have to focus on is the situation in the Georgian justice system, which is widely held to be the single most problematic sector in Georgia at the moment; here, too, there would seem to be windows of opportunity for Sweden to focus attention in the framework of the new Strategy.

1.2.3 Role of other donors

Georgia has had considerable funding from the international community in the aftermath of the 2003 Rose Revolution, and in support of the previous government's reform agenda. Georgia has benefited from substantial aid from the US Millennium Challenge Corporation, as well as through USAID. The European Union is another significant donor. The current Strategy highlights the links and imperative of coordination with the EU in particular. In practice, the review team has confirmed that coordination is considered excellent by the EU, as well as frequent. At the level of individual projects (for example the project working with the National Food Agency), stakeholders have reported that they struggle with the conflicting policy advice provided by US-funded projects, and the previous administration's readiness to go for quick deliverables as opposed to the pursuit of a considered, medium-to long-term reform agenda.

1.2.4 Links between Swedish strategies for Georgia and the region

It is now clear that cooperation with Georgia will be part of a regional cooperation strategy embracing a group of countries that share very limited commonalities. However, the review identified a few, albeit limited, areas that could be further explored through a regional prism.

2 Methods

2.1 PROCESS

The review was carried out through a three-step process involving: a) desk review of project documentation and existing evaluations (see Annex 4); b) data collection through in-country focus group discussions with stakeholders and expert non-stakeholders (from 11 to 15 February 2013; see Annex 2 for a list of people interviewed); and c) a further review of selected project documentation for the purposes of triangulation. Preliminary findings were discussed with Sida Georgia (15 February 2013) and Sida HQ in Stockholm (21 February 2013) following the work in-country.

The in-country work had not initially been foreseen in the ToR for the assignment, which proposed the review to only be desk-based. It was added during the preparatory phase in discussions between Sida and Indevlop, to serve as an additional source of data, as well as being important in terms of the accountability and legitimacy of the review findings.

2.2 SELECTION OF METHODS AND THEIR DESCRIPTION

The Desk Review screened existing project documentation, and included (as available) project proposals; project assessment memoranda; project progress and final reports; as well as six independent evaluations that had been carried out on specific projects in the portfolio under review. The availability of documentation was uneven, and there were a number of documentation gaps across the portfolio (see Annex 4 for a list of the projects in the portfolio, along with an indication of the available documentation).

Focus Group Discussions: the rationale for introducing this into the review was two-fold. First, discussions with stakeholders (implementers of Sida-projects from the portfolio under review) were expected to generate information that would directly address the objectives of the review, and would contribute to closing information gaps that became evident after the desk review. Second (and in line with Indevlop's mission statement), it was felt that involving stakeholders in a participatory process would add important perspectives to the review, as well as serve accountability purposes and provide legitimacy to the findings. The review team held workshops, which were attended by 37 participants in total; of these, 22 participants were women, and 17 were men. Participation was roughly even between Georgian and international experts.

Six workshops were held in total, as follows: four workshops for the projects that fall under the objective of Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality. The portfolio was divided up to cover: a) projects that work with public institutions; b) projects that work with multi-laterals and with civil society in its own right; c) projects that work with Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and in the breakaway region of Abkhazia. This division was applied as the 18 projects that fall into this portfolio are very diverse, and the review team intended to capture perspectives from similar stakeholder groups. As the Human Rights, Democracy, Gender Equality sector comprises the greatest number of projects, and because choices had to be made in view of the limited time available for the in-country work, the review team decided to have a non-stakeholder workshop, i.e. with participation by experts within the sector who had no direct stake in any of the projects, but who knew of the projects, as well as about Sida's place within the international community in Georgia. One workshop was held for each of the Strategy objectives of environment and market development. Because of the shortage of time, it was not possible to hold non-expert discussions on this part of the portfolio, but non-stakeholders from the sectors were separately consulted in individual interviews.

The Embassy provided the review team with a contact list for focal persons for each project, but was not involved in the actual organisation of the workshops. The review Team Leader sent invitations to stakeholders, and not including a structured agenda was a deliberate choice, as for the participants not to “over-prepare”. The discussion was structured, however, with the review team using a questionnaire that had been used during similar strategy reviews that are currently being undertaken by Indevlop for Sida (Albania and Kenya, respectively). This, too, was a deliberate choice, as it is hoped that using a comparable methodology will yield more generalizable lessons learned for review exercises. The questionnaire was structured to enhance a discussion about results; what the projects intend to achieve (outcome objectives), what has been achieved, factors of success/failure, relevance of and in relation to the Strategy objectives, and attribution to Sweden's support. Other questions related to how the projects have contributed to gender equality, empowered marginalised groups to access their human rights and enhanced government accountability to provide human rights to poor and marginalised groups. Using the same questionnaire for all five workshops provided a wealth of useful data allowing analysis towards the Strategy's objectives.

The review team ensured that the purpose of the discussions was well understood, and also clarified to stakeholders that the consultation was of a one-off character, i.e. that a draft report would not be shared with them in a second round of consultations.

While all projects were not represented in the focus group discussions, the turnout of stakeholders was very high, and the discussions covered the majority of projects in the overall portfolio. The level of goodwill of stakeholders to participate in this exercise was impressive; this was somewhat surprising, given that the discussion was clearly ring-fenced as a “looking back”, not as a “possible future funding” exercise, which the review team was in no position to engage in; and five of the six workshops

were very constructive. Stakeholders also expressed a wish to learn more about other Sida-funded projects, as the workshops had given them, for the first time, the opportunity to find out what other organisations were trying to achieve. In some cases, there was clear potential for synergies between projects, which, to date, remains under-explored.

Feedback to the review team was overwhelmingly positive, with stakeholders genuinely appreciating the opportunity to be part of this type of brainstorming. For the review team, the meetings were crucial, in terms of both confirming some of the tentative findings from the documentation analysis and providing additional information on achieved results, as well as in yielding a number of important insights on aspects of the Strategy that would not have come out in this way by studying project documentation on its own; this is specifically the case for the findings on gender mainstreaming.

2.3 LIMITATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

In terms of coverage, the following projects were not covered by the Focus Group workshops:

*Human Rights, Democracy, Gender Equality - Kvinna till Kvinna (KtK); the Civil Registry; Public Finance Management Reform Project
Market Development – Competition Authority; International School of Economics at Tbilisi University (ISET)*

While representatives from the above projects were invited, the reasons for non-attendance varied: in most of the cases, a confirmation of attendance had been received, but stakeholders did not show up on the day; in one case, there was no reply, and in another case, the reply came a day after the workshop had been held.

Overall, it would have been useful to have more non-stakeholder workshops to triangulate findings from the stakeholder workshops, which is something that was not possible to accommodate in the tight time frame for this exercise. The only non-stakeholder focus group was also relatively small in terms of the number of experts that attended, which is a caveat that needs to be kept in mind wherever the report draws on statements from that workshop.

A limitation was posed by the fact that quite a few projects had only recently started, and therefore, it was too early to reflect on results (for example Transparency International's "The Business of Government" project; the UN Programme to Enhance Gender Equality; projects in Abkhazia; or the project "Capacity Building and Technical Support to Georgia's National Food Agency" under the market development sector).

Attributing specific results to Sweden's funding has been a key limitation, too, specifically in cases where project partner institutions had either a number of donors, in some cases eight (e.g., the Civil Registry, the GeoStat), implementers were funded by

more than one donor, or project activities were a continuation of interventions that were initiated prior to Sida-funding (for example in some of the projects in Abkhazia). Where Sweden is one of several donors, the team can ascertain contribution to the overall results rather than attributing specific results to Sweden's support.

As mentioned above, the Focus Group discussions were an important source of information for the review. A significant limitation – and an important finding in itself – was the difficulties that stakeholders had across the portfolio (but with exceptions – for example the “Clean Up Georgia!” project) to discuss results. Many projects struggled to understand and describe outputs and outcomes, and the objectives they intend to achieve. It was a challenge to prompt a reflection on *what* difference the interventions are intended to make, and *how* they are making a difference. The level of accountability can also be questioned: some projects clearly felt accountable only for undertaking activities, rather than for delivering results. The discussion with stakeholders was a clear echo of the lack of this prism/perspective in the project reports.

In the context of this discussion, the following issues appear important:

- Stakeholders were, in the main, aware of the increased focus that Sweden places on results-orientation and the expectation Sweden had of them (the implementers) to report in these terms.
- A number of stakeholders were able to point out the value of this “re-orientation” for their own organisation. (“Prior to Sida’s insistence, we did not look at our own work in this way. We looked at it in terms of outputs. Sida now forces us to consider what difference we are making, and why. This has changed us as an organisation.”)
- At the same time, organisations clearly pointed out the need for more methodological help on re-framing their interventions in Results-Based Management (RBM) terms. None of the stakeholders questioned the usefulness – but there was a clearly perceived lack of knowledge on how to do this. The review team was specifically asked to feed this back to the Embassy as a clearly identified capacity gap.
- The need to focus on RBM is not new, and it would seem important that desk officers across the portfolio insist, early on, that reports from implementers reflect on results. The dilemmas encountered in this exercise partly stem from the fact that no short-term review can make up for the lack of long-term, systematic processes over the implementation period of projects to harvest results.

3 Findings: Democracy, Human Rights and Gender Equality

The *specific* Swedish Strategy objectives for this sector are:

- Objective 1 - Strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality
- Objective 2 - Better conditions for free and fair elections
- Objective 3 - Better living conditions for the country's internally displaced persons

Each of these objectives is discussed below in terms of relevance, and then in terms of effectiveness.

3.1 RELEVANCE OF CURRENT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: Strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality

Overall, the on-going relevance of the sector objectives is not in question, according to stakeholders and non-stakeholder experts.

There were, however, questions about whether those projects that work on institution-building [the National Bureau of Enforcement (NBE); the National Agency for Public Registry (NAPR); and the Civil Registry Agency (CRA) of Georgia]³ were really the most appropriate to achieve the Strategy objectives.

Stakeholders from the public administration had noticeable difficulty providing a theory of change that plausibly linked their project with the achievement of the Strategy sector objective 1 – in terms of the projects' contributions to democratic structures and systems, and human rights. They did so eventually, but were not immediately able to make this link. The three projects in question have been supported by Sida since before the current Strategy period. Stakeholders and non-stakeholders have highlighted the importance of the government reforms that these projects supported,

³ The World Bank Public Sector Financial Management Reform Support project would fall into this group as well, but was not specifically discussed in focus group meetings.

and that the interventions were, essentially, demand-driven by the Government of Georgia (GoG). Government ownership was also frequently highlighted to have been the pre-condition for the projects' success. Non-stakeholders have pointed out that the donor community (i.e. not necessarily only Sweden) in Georgia had been keen to accommodate the previous Government's requests for support in specific sectors – but questions were raised as to whether there were not more “worthy” areas that could have been supported in pursuit of Swedish co-operation objectives instead.

Specific concerns were:

- The three projects support institutions that are well-resourced; reforms have led to these institutions becoming financially sustainable, and taking away some of the rationale for Swedish taxpayer-funded assistance.
- The specific Swedish expertise “niche” for supporting the institutions in question could not easily be identified (as compared, for example, to the environment sector - see below), i.e., it was not clear why Sweden was funding the interventions when other donor countries could be said to have a similar profile on the specific subject areas.

It is clear that the partner institutions themselves are very keen to continue co-operation, and there could be a number of arguments in favour of this:

- The portfolio of projects supported under the sector is very diverse, with projects working directly on public administration reforms being a relatively small share (3 out of 18 projects). Supporting a number of demand-driven projects might give a donor the leverage to support other, less popular projects (a proposition put forward by some interlocutors).
- The fact that the projects support government-driven reforms makes them successful. While it might not be *immediately* obvious that these projects support the Strategy sector objectives, they do so in an *intermediate* way, such as institutional capacity to provide better service delivery, (so called bridging objective). They certainly do not contradict the sector objectives. However, the theory of change of the projects must provide stronger linkages between project outputs and the overall sectoral outcome objectives to enable measurement and attribution, where bridging outcomes would be feasible.
- Funding projects that are a high priority of the Government, but which already receive substantial support by other donors, may be an approach that allows Sweden to work in other more sensitive areas.

Arguments against continued support would include:

- The considerable support that these institutions have already received over the past years, and their relatively strong financial situation: the institutions could pay from their own resources for technical assistance if there is a continued requirement for such assistance.
- Do the supported areas reflect specific Swedish expertise, and are there areas that are more “in need” of Swedish support? Stakeholders mentioned more “obvious” areas for specific Swedish support in the future, such as support to the institution of the Public Defender (the institution of ombudsman as a dis-

tinct and recognisable Scandinavian model); Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) rights (uncharted territory in Georgia); religious minority rights; and rights of ethnic minorities.

The co-operation Strategy has been pursuing gender equality in two ways: first, through support of projects specifically working on gender issues (United Nations Development Programme/UNDP, UN Women, Kvinna till Kvinna); second, by a requirement to mainstream gender into all projects.

The relevance of the Strategy's and the specific objective's emphasis on Gender Equality was confirmed by stakeholders; this was also confirmed by the independent evaluation carried out of the Kvinna till Kvinna project in support of women's organisations at the local level. It is in the area of gender equality that results from Swedish support are most apparent. Swedish support is credited with having: a) established the issue of gender equality on the agenda not only of the Government of Georgia, but has also contributed significantly to a shift in the way other donors are approaching gender equality – while for many years, gender equality was a “Swedish” topic, other donors have now picked this up too. Stakeholders also confirmed, however, that the issue is in further need of support, and that, if left to the Georgian government, it would likely disappear from the agenda.

In terms of mainstreaming gender considerations into projects (including projects that are not part of this portfolio, i.e. projects on market development and environment), there was a significant variety of approaches and opinions among stakeholders.

On the encouraging end, organisations report that the Swedish emphasis on gender mainstreaming had changed the organisations themselves, in that they had to internally reflect on how to best achieve this aim. In the case of the Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies (GSFIS), the organisation has, as a result of the imperative of gender mainstreaming, become a respected source of expertise on gender equality in Georgia. One project (in the environment portfolio, “Clean Up Georgia!”) made adjustments to the project work plan one year into its operations as it became clear that there was an obvious potential to work with women to achieve better results, and that women were the main drivers for reform.

Many stakeholder organisations expressed a clear wish to receive more guidance and know-how on gender mainstreaming from Sida – organisations want to make changes, but feel that they currently lack the instruments to do so effectively – this is the case both for the civil society organisations/NGOs, as well as for projects working with the public administration and in sector-specific projects, including the environment and market development.

Resistance towards discussing gender equality was pronounced among stakeholders from the public administration (it was in this group that gender equality was first and foremost approached in terms of quantitative breakdowns of male vs. female partici-

pants in trainings or among staff); and this is possibly indicative on how gender equality is perceived in the Georgian public sector.

At the other end of the spectrum, organisations implementing interventions in Abkhazia (with the exception of UNICEF) showed a disturbing lack of understanding of the basic concept of gender equality. Views from this stakeholder group were hostile to the point of being detrimental and even deliberately counter-productive to contributing to gender equality. Non-stakeholder experts questioned why Sweden would support organisations that do not share its core values.

The focus on Human Rights as part of Strategy objective 1, and a pro-poor perspective cutting across the strategy was understood, by stakeholders and non-stakeholders, in terms of its on-going relevance for Georgia; yet, stakeholders did not immediately view “their” projects as contributing to this overall. Among the civil society projects, the Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF) was able to make out the contribution of their interventions, for example through facilitating participation of the poor and vulnerable groups, as contributing to this focus under Strategy objective 1, as well as the cross-cutting pro-poor Strategy focus. The UNICEF project working in the breakaway region of Abkhazia, where it does not only work with IDPs but wider parts of the population, does, in part, have a clear focus on the poor and vulnerable, and considers itself to contribute to human rights and democracy-building, albeit mainly by proxy, through making communities more resilient to conflict.

There seems to be scope to further sharpen the Swedish portfolio’s focus on human rights in the next strategy period. Stakeholders, non-stakeholders, and the wider expert community agree that while institutional reforms under the previous government have been impressive, the overall situation in the justice sector remains of grave concern. Interventions/projects aiming to improve access to justice would seem relevant to consider. As mentioned above, areas such as LGBT, ethnic and religious minorities would very much fall under a human rights rationale and are, as yet, underexplored in Georgia; stakeholders and non-stakeholders have pointed out the pioneering role that Sweden could play on these issues. While it is too early to tell the direction in which the government of Prime Minister Ivanishvili will take Georgia, analysts have pointed out that the values of his Georgian Dream coalition are, on a number of parameters, significantly more conservative than those of his predecessor; this would seem to make it all the more important to have a respected voice advocating for the above issues.

Objective 2: Better conditions for free and fair elections

Stakeholders and non-stakeholders alike confirmed the on-going relevance of this objective. The October 2012 parliamentary elections, and specifically, the handing over of power to the Georgian Dream coalition was widely lauded as an exemplary democratic transition of government; it was also somewhat unexpected: many observers had not predicted a defeat of the United National Movement (UNM), and those who had doubted that the transfer of power to a new government would go

smoothly. This, overall, reflects an on-going lack of trust in the electoral system, which is still seen to be susceptible to manipulation.

The portfolio of projects contains one project that is specifically working to support the achievement of this objective – the NDI intervention is perceived, by expert non-stakeholders, as very relevant in working towards fairer election legislation and towards issues-based election campaigning.

Objective 3: Better living conditions for the country's internally displaced persons

Projects in this part of the portfolio deal with support to IDPs in Georgia proper, as well as in the breakaway region of Abkhazia. They target capacity building of the Ministry for IDPs on the one hand, as well as working directly with IDPs through an integrated approach including legal advice to individuals, support to income generation, food security and community building measures.

Stakeholders and non-stakeholders considered this objective to be of continuing relevance. With regards to the Abkhazia part of the portfolio, there was also an acknowledgment that sustainable solutions were pre-conditioned on resolving the underlying causes of the conflicts that have led to displacement. None of the stakeholders or non-stakeholder experts saw prospects for an improvement in the situation in the short- to medium-term future. But it was a shared view that it was more important to stay engaged and be able to react if and when the situation should change.

The current Strategy emphasises the need for “democracy-building contributions – mainly channelled via civil society - and confidence-building measures” in Abkhazia and South Ossetia (the latter has not materialised). Confidence-building measures have been/are part of all four projects that were/are part of the project portfolio. A separate evaluation of the Swedish support to Abkhazia, which is starting while this review is being finalised, will seek to examine the results of these measures.

Some stakeholders have pointed out that “IDPs in Georgia are not worse off than other poor people”. Stakeholders also questioned whether the emphasis, at this point in time, should be on “living” conditions, which they understood to mean ‘housing’, as housing seemed, in their view, to no longer be a priority in the work with IDPs (although it remains a priority for the Government of Georgia).

3.2 RESULTS

Objective 1: Strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality

With respect to the projects that fall in the institution-building category, the following results can be extrapolated:

The National Bureau of Enforcement is working along an institutional Code of Conduct that was developed under the project, which results in its work being undertaken in a fair manner and including respect for human rights. In terms of accountability and transparency, according to monitoring undertaken by the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF), the NBE's website is, for the second consecutive year, the most transparent website of 104 websites of public institutions in Georgia.⁴ The NBE addresses the rights of the poor and marginalised by acknowledging the need to publish information that can be understood by non-native Georgian speakers.

The National Agency for Public Registry and the NBE have transformed to become modern and professional institutions.

The project "Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR" contributed to expanding the NAPR computer network to incorporate the notary offices; enabling on-line access to registry records by property owners; and establishing essential routines for enhanced IT security. It has also facilitated an internal process of strategic planning within NAPR and successfully helped to establish a network of GPS stations to improve the precision of cadastral information. It has also attempted to improve cadastral standards and to establish a register on property sales. The number of property transactions increased by 30% between 2010 and 2011; the processing time has dropped from 29 days to 2 days. A market website has been created by NAPR to display information about properties offered for sale on a nation-wide basis.⁵ These changes provide transparent information in a non-discriminatory manner, and ensure participation from people and accountability from the public administration.

Through the project "Promoting the Integrity of Civil Data in Georgia", implemented through the Civil Registry Agency, the efficiency of state institutions was raised through access to the CRA's database; public services were improved through the creation of online access to the CRA's database, with access having become less time-consuming and less prone to falsification.⁶ The reforms in the civil registry have been widely held as the most significant reforms in Georgia since 2003; while Sweden has contributed to this, attribution, as discussed above, is difficult to ascertain. Again, the results have a strong democracy and human rights aspect.

A project co-founded by Sida and implemented by the World Bank on Public Sector Financial Management Reform Support, while marred, overall, by difficulties in implementation, "contributed to significant improvement in several dimensions of PFM

⁴ http://nbe.gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG&sec_id=32&info_id=5524

⁵ See 2012 Review of the NAPR project.

⁶ See 2012 Mid-Term Review of the CRA project.

performance, including a stronger multi-year perspective in budgeting, improved public access to key fiscal information, and improvement in the scope, nature, and follow up of external audit.”⁷

With regards to gender equality, results that can be ascertained are as follows:

Sida-funded interventions (through consecutive UNDP good governance programmes) have left a clearly attributable track record of facilitating the passing of gender legislation in Georgia, as well as of the creation of an institution in charge of gender issues: the Gender Equality Law was adopted in 2010, and there is now a permanent structure under the Chair of the Parliament, the Gender Advisory Council.

The project “SHiEld – Enhancing Prevention and Response to Domestic Violence in Georgia”, implemented by UN Women trained law enforcement officers; capacity building efforts also involved members of the Inter-Agency Council Implementing Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence and NGOs, and representatives of the Public Defender’s Office.

SHiEld established two shelters, in Tbilisi and Gori, respectively. A 24-hour toll-free domestic violence hotline is in operation since October 2010. The funding for the two shelters and hotline was taken over by the Government of Georgia in May 2011.

Gender equality has been mainstreamed into trainings for civil servants through the trainings provided in the framework of the project “Capacity Building of the Georgian Leadership Community for Improved Decision-Making and Negotiation Skills (CBGL)”, with the implementing organisation, GFSIS, having become a centre of excellence in Georgia for gender equality issues.

The Eurasia Partnership Foundation has made the inclusion of gender mainstreaming considerations compulsory for grantees applying for funding under their small grants scheme. EPF also reports having undergone organisational changes in order to better address the need for gender mainstreaming in its own operations.

Through a recent awareness campaign fronted by the UN in Georgia in co-operation with the national rugby team of Georgia, awareness on domestic violence has been created – “everyone is talking about this”. Kvinna till Kvinna’s partner organisations have become experts at providing shelter services and psychological support for victims of domestic violence; results have also been report in that partner organisations have been using their competence and experience to advocate for political change. At

⁷ See World Bank Implementation Completion and Results Report, November 14, 2012.

the municipal level, the authorities' knowledge about domestic violence has increased.

The NDI project “Rebuilding Public Confidence in the Electoral Process” increased women's participation in politics in quantitative terms, and thus laid the groundwork for women's increased opportunities to influence the political process. Parties have adopted an action programme for women in politics and are actually in the process of implementing it.⁸

In terms of the Strategy's emphasis, under this objective, of support to “decentralise both political and administrative power as resources for regional and local levels”,⁹ interventions through the UNDP Good Governance Programme (and falling mainly outside of the Strategy period), the introduction of a special chapter on Local Self-Government in the revised Georgian constitution in 2010, which is a first in any Georgian constitution, is a result of Swedish support. On the issue of decentralisation, Sweden has also been credited, by stakeholders and expert non-stakeholders, as having consistently kept this issue on the agenda for dialogue with the Government of Georgia. Interlocutors have confirmed the importance of this, and the need to continue efforts to effect reforms in this area, even if the willingness for reform of the Georgian leadership is not pronounced.

Civil society has been part of objective 1 (it is also a cross-cutting issue of the Strategy) through support to the Eurasia Partnership Foundation and Kvinna till Kvinna. EPF credits Sweden with allowing it to become a genuinely Georgian-driven NGO, as Swedish funding supports EPF's core operations. It also allows the running of a micro-grant scheme, which currently has over 100 open grants at the local level. The results of these grants were difficult to ascertain in the framework of the review. However, stakeholders convincingly claimed that the micro-grant scheme was a niche that is not filled by other donors, and that it allowed support to local-level activities where no other donor would risk involvement. One of the mentioned examples was the topic of social enterprises, where EPF pointed out that through Swedish funding, they were in a position to test the potential traction that this concept could have in the context of Georgia. These, along with the UNICEF project in Abkhazia, were also the initiatives that most clearly targeted minority and vulnerable groups, including the disabled.

The portfolio includes two projects – the Eurasia Partnership Foundation, and Kvinna till Kvinna – through which core support to NGOs is provided. EPF is, at the time of the writing of the review, being separately evaluated, while an independent evaluation

⁸ See Review of the NDI project, at draft stage.

⁹ See page 3(18) of current Co-operation Strategy.

of KtK took place in 2012. The evaluation identified a number of important results from the programme, as follows:

- A partial achievement of the programmes' objective of 'Women are strengthened and take more active part in the development of a democratic and equal society on all levels and contribute to conflict resolutions in Georgia, Abkhazia and South Ossetia', and a contribution to the overall objective of strengthening women's positions and the respect for women's rights in a society that has been affected by several conflicts.
- Through capacity building, KtK's partner organisations are now "more capable of assisting women in demanding their rights, can provide capacity development and training, know how to carry out advocacy and networking, and inclusive as organisations, and have public recognition." The evaluation specifically pointed out the added value of the partnership between the local and the Swedish partners in the programme.
- The evaluation finds that in the areas of women's work against gender-based violence, Women's sexual health and rights and women's work to increase political participation there are substantial results on the outcome level. Women's ability to be active in society, and Women's organising are weaker areas, with results mainly on output level. For the beneficiaries of the partner organisations, women and girls in Georgia, the KtK programs have resulted in capacity development and awareness building, provision of important services, networks and knowledge on an individual level.
- "On an outcome level the KtK programs have contributed to sustainable effects such as new legislation and policy frameworks and progress with the inclusion of gender and domestic violence knowledge in the curriculum of the Police academy. New structures exist on local level such gender budgeting, more women in politics and gender units within administrative entities, voters clubs etc. During this program period the transition has started towards more sustainable effects in regards to gender equity on policy and institutional levels. was supposed to contribute to the capacity-building of Georgian women's NGOs."¹⁰

Transparency International's "The Business of Government" project is in its early stages, and it is therefore not possible to extrapolate results. In support TI received through an EPF grant, the organisation was able to launch a quick response mechanism between citizens and the city administration in Tbilisi through an internet portal called "Fix my Street", resulting in increased accountability and transparency of the administration.

¹⁰ See Final Report KtK Georgia 28 June 2012, Orgut and Partners.

Through UNICEF, and its co-operation with World Vision (WV) and local partner organisations/NGOs, support is currently provided to 45 social community centres in Abkhazia.

The forthcoming results of a review of EPF should inform the discussion on whether this type of support contributes to the development of civil society at the grassroots level, and whether it leads to “a strong, vibrant and pluralistic civil society in its own right”, and the expectations associated with this (in the Swedish Strategy, the theory of change is that support to civil society actors will “promote broad democratic participation”).¹¹ However, in the framework of the strategy review the team was unable to verify results in this regard.

Stakeholders (including EPF themselves) and non-stakeholders acknowledged that the NGO community, while vibrant, was donor-created and remains entirely donor-dependent; this is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. Sustainability in the absence of continued funding was also flagged as a key concern in the independent evaluation of the KtK programme that was carried out in 2012.

Interlocutors also conceded that genuine civil society at the grass-roots level, including in locations outside the cities, was limited. The noticeable exception the review team has seen in the portfolio is the support to “Clean up Georgia”, which seems closest to supporting genuine civil society in its own right.

Objective 2: Better conditions for free and fair elections

As mentioned above, this objective has been addressed through the NDI-implemented project “Rebuilding Trust in the Electoral Process”. The project made a clear contribution to election campaigning based on evidence (as expressed in pre-election polls), and thus election campaigning based on issues of concern to the electorate. Media reporting has improved both in terms of quality and as regards issues that are reported on. Domestic election monitors are able to track actions and appointments of election administrators, and the professional capacity of the Central Election Commission (CEC) has been strengthened;

The project has also been crucial in the passing of legislative amendments to make the elections fairer; in this, NDI has worked with local NGOs who lobbied for amendments; this was deemed to be more legitimate and credible than it would have been to lobby through an International NGO.

¹¹ The objective of the *Policy for Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries* adopted by the Swedish Government in 2009 is: *a vibrant and pluralistic civil society in developing countries that, using a rights-based approach, contributes effectively to reducing poverty in all its dimensions.*

Objective 3: Better living conditions for the country's internally displaced persons

The following projects fall under this objective: “Community Support to Children and Youth in Abkhazia”, carried out by UNICEF (which works with IDP and non-IDP communities), and with World Vision as the implementing partner; “Innovative and Applicable Durable Solutions to Displacement in Georgia” and “Durable Solutions – A Way forward for IDPs in Georgia” implemented by the Danish Refugee Council (DRC); and “Promoting Self-Reliance and Improving the Welfare of IDPs and the Vulnerable Population in Eastern Georgia and Abkhazia Region”, implemented by Action Contre la Faim (ACF).

Among the projects falling under this objective are several that have commenced relatively recently, and where results are too early to report on. Two of the implementing organisations (ACF and WV) will also be affected by operating restrictions in Abkhazia (limiting their geographic area of work to Gali) as of May 2013, which raises concerns regarding their ability to achieve the results that have been planned for.

Results as reported by stakeholders and non-stakeholders, as well as through an independent evaluation carried out in 2011 for the project “Durable Solutions – A Way forward for IDPs in Georgia” in 2011 are as follows:

- Provision of models for possible Government of Georgia and international community adoption; contribution to the durable solution and integration methodologies that have become standard operating procedures in Georgia (rehabilitation and self-privatisation of collective centres; alternative accommodation for IDPs);
- “relieving some of the challenges faced by IDPs, providing housing and economic opportunities, empowering IDPs by giving them a voice in their future and providing opportunities for IDP youth to gain future employment”;¹²
- the Ministry responsible for IDPs increased its efficiency and its policy making capacities; the Ministry’s service provision has improved - the way in which IDPs are being received has been cited, by stakeholders as an example; IDPs are now being received in a transparent and organised way;
- Swedish support ensures that interventions that have commenced earlier, and that were funded by other donors, have been maintained and expanded (the community centres are supported in communities with IDPs, but also in other communities in Abkhazia). This was reported with regards to the community centres in Abkhazia, which are supported by World Vision, through a sub-contracting arrangement via UNICEF. The main results from the operation of

¹² See Monitoring and Evaluation of “Durable Solutions – A Way forward for IDPs in Georgia”, Guy Hovey, 2011.

these community centres are the breaking of the population's isolation, by providing platforms, in otherwise cut-off communities, for meeting and socialising, as well as by increasing the demand for social services and opportunities for participation. Activities supported through the projects are, according to stakeholders, improving living conditions for returnees by increasing interaction within communities, food security and access to services;

- The ACF project has established agricultural training centres, school and integrated home gardens, targeting returnee and IDP communities in Eastern Georgia and in Abkhazia.¹³

3.3 EFFICIENCY AND CHOICE OF MODALITIES

3.3.1 Range of modalities for different purposes

The portfolio of projects employs a range of modalities. Institution-building projects that are using “twinning-like” arrangements, similar to the “Twinning” used by the EU, but are more flexible in their approach. In the NBE project, an expert from the Swedish National Enforcement Bureau works with the Georgian institution on a continuous basis. Although not planned, the civil registry project has effectively been implemented by providing direct financial support to the Civil Registry Agency; this has been a success. The NAPR project works as a partnership between the Georgian institution and its Swedish counterpart, but without a permanent presence on the Swedish side. Where there is permanent presence, i.e. in the NBE project, this is an arrangement that is appreciated by the Georgian side as giving them direct, day-to-day access to technical expertise.

Other modalities used are the funding of UN organisations; in the case of projects in Abkhazia, UNICEF then further sub-contracts part of the funds to World Vision. The efficiency of the funding to and through the UN system would merit more extensive analysis than was possible in this review, which would also require greater access to budget-related documentation.

Sida-funding is also provided through two framework organisations, one Georgian/local (EPF) and one Swedish (KtK). As mentioned above, Sida provides core funding to EPF, but also gives funding for EPF's micro-grant programme, i.e. effectively, EPF is running a grant scheme for local initiatives that would be too resource-intensive to be run by Sida as individual grants to organisations. Without having gone into details of the resource implications for EPF to run the scheme, it would seem a

¹³ The review team has screened the latest, 2012 ACF interim report covering the first half of 2012, which reports on outputs; it is difficult, however, to ascertain from the report the specific results at this stage.

suitable arrangement enabling Sida to provide grass-roots level support that would otherwise not be possible given the human resource constraints of Sida. Efficiency concerns have been raised with regards to KtK, but the independent evaluation was unable to come to more conclusive findings beyond these concerns.

Finally, within this portfolio, there is direct funding to NGOs, such as the Georgian chapter of Transparency International, and the National Democratic Institute (NDI) – the latter having the possibility to subcontract on an activity-basis to local NGOs.

It is difficult to draw conclusions regarding efficiency in a broad review such as this at an aggregated level. We can draw some broad conclusions about the overall efficiency of the structure of the support but we cannot present an aggregated analysis of the cost efficiency or cost effectiveness of such a broad variety of interventions. Overall, it would seem that the variety of modalities in the portfolio of projects is a strength rather than a limitation. It allows Sida to support a range of interventions in pursuit of the Strategy objectives in this sector, and stakeholders and non-stakeholders alike have been keen to point out the unique profile that Sida has vis-a-vis other donors, whose funding arrangements are less flexible, and who would see support to very small grass-roots initiatives as too risky.

3.4 FINDING COMPLEMENTARITIES AND SYNERGIES

As pointed out above, one of the issues clearly come out from the stakeholder discussions is the untapped potential, in the sector portfolio, of synergies between projects. By way of example, the UN interventions relating to gender equality and domestic violence were unaware of the Kvinna till Kvinna interventions, although these could have been seen as working towards common objectives from different angles.

There was, overall, a keen interest among stakeholders to be informed about other Sida interventions; something that the review team feels can be easily addressed in a relatively modest and informal manner. For example, there could be a once-a-year or half-a-year get together of all projects, on an informal and voluntary basis. This could provide a valuable opportunity for Sweden to engage in dialogue with partners regarding Swedish core values.

3.5 SUSTAINABILITY AND OWNERSHIP

Ownership has been strong in the three institution-building projects. As discussed above, the projects have been demand-driven by the Government of Georgia and ownership and commitment to the projects has remained strong throughout. Stakeholders and non-stakeholders have identified this as a key condition for the success of the projects. Ownership has been theoretical, rather than supported through an on-going commitment in other areas, decentralisation being a case in point. Key legislation to bring Georgia formally in line with international standards had been adopted, although the government's interest in implementing reforms has not followed suit.

The same applies to gender equality legislation, where decisive implementation is missing. Sweden has been credited by interlocutors to keep both decentralisation and gender on the agenda of the dialogue between the international community and the Government of Georgia, and there was consensus that even if progress should be incremental, Swedish continued persistence was important.

In terms of sustainability, the current transition from one government to the next can provide valuable insights. On the institution-building projects, nothing has changed in terms of the technical staff that the projects deal with on a day-to-day basis—which is something that had not necessarily been clear prior to the elections, when there was some concern that a change in government might cause a replacement of staff even at technical level, threatening gains made by the projects. Sustainability prospects are high for the civil registry and NAPR projects, in part, in that the reforms have been so successful and popular that reversing them would be void of any logic. As discussed above, the sustainability of the gains made on the gender equality agenda depends on a continued effort by Sweden and the donor community on the issue. Interlocutors did clearly point out that if left at this point, the issue would disappear from the agenda.

Sustainability in the civil society projects is less certain, which is in great part a function of the lack of alternative sources of funding for civil society as a whole, and specifically NGOs. There is little prospect that the NGO community in Georgia will become less donor-dependent for the foreseeable future. In terms of sustainability outside of funding, the review cannot assess the potential of the sustainability of NGOs and other civil society actors.

3.6 FEEDBACK ON SIDA

The review team had, during the briefing with Sida staff at the onset of the mission, been asked to solicit feedback from partners and implementers on what Sida is doing well, and what they might be able to do better. Specifically on those projects that deal with civil society and IDP issues, feedback was specific and very positive. This included statements such as:

- “Sida is passionate about what they are doing. This really matters.”
- “Sida is the one among our donors that really reads our reports, gets back on substance and with specific recommendations, is always in time, constructive in providing useful feedback to improve our projects, and to the point”
- “The access we have to Sida is unlike anything that we have with other donors. It is a true partnership relation, and we are treated as equals.”
- “We are involved in designing the projects through a dialogue from the very beginning. This is not the same with other donors, where we are basically implementing what they think we should be doing.”
- “Where it not for Sida being ready to take some risks, we would not be able to explore certain topics in Georgia. We have tried with other donors, but Sida is the only donor that is ready to give us the opportunity to try.”

Areas for improvement were highlighted as follows:

- More guidance on what organisations should do to better implement Sida/Swedish core values, specifically those related to gender equality.
- More guidance/capacity-building on RBM, so that organisations are better equipped to understand how to manage for and report on results.
- Co-ordination with the Delegation of the European Union (EUD) is very good. But it could even be better, in particular with regards to the projects in Abkhazia, where the same set of organisations is being funded for very similar activities. This could help remove doubts about these organisations' accountability to donors, and avoid double-dipping.

4 Findings: Environment

4.1 RELEVANCE OF CURRENT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: Improved water supply and waste water and waste management systems in selected urban areas

Stakeholders confirmed the on-going relevance of the waste water and waste management systems part of the objective, while improved water supply was not considered immediately relevant (despite the fact that one of the earlier projects in the portfolio addressed improved water supply/Poti). Relevance was discussed in terms of the value-added and expertise that could be provided by the Swedish experience. The Swedish model and best practices coming from the Swedish experience were highlighted as highly credible and desirable.

Objective 2: Strengthened capacity at relevant institutions at central and local level to regulate and plan water and waste management in an effective and sustainable manner

Stakeholders confirmed the on-going relevance of the objective, but pointed out that it should also include an emphasis on *solid* waste management – something that had been addressed through the projects. Stakeholders also acknowledged the linkage/complementarities of the two objectives.

4.2 RESULTS

The theory of change, as well as reflecting on their intervention in RBM terminology, was strongest and most convincing in this stakeholder group. It was this stakeholder group that thought most clearly and stringently about transparency and participation, gender equality, accountability, perspectives of the poor and a rights perspective.

In this portfolio, four projects were looked at – the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) Adjara Solid Waste Management project (which at the time of the review had not started because of protracted problems and delays with identifying and agreeing on a suitable location); the Mtskheta Municipal Waste Water Project implemented through a Swedish grant by the World Bank (for which the review team had no documentation on file); the project in support of the Government of Georgia's Solid Waste Management Action Plan for the Solid Waste Management Company of Georgia, implemented by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA); and the "Clean Up Georgia!" project. Because of the complementarities of the objectives, results are discussed together, and have been identified as follows:

- Solid waste treatment practices, habits and actions have changed at the local level (“Clean Up Georgia!” project)
- A Solid Waste Management Action Plan and a Waste Water Management Strategy have been developed and adopted, or are in the course of being adopted using stakeholder consultation and thereby contributing to transparency, accountability, and community participation
- “Clean Up Georgia!” was able to mobilise communities and municipalities around the issue of waste, and has sparked vibrant civil society (as opposed to NGOs – see above) activity in the communities that it worked in
- Women have taken political and leadership positions in the “Clean Up Georgia!” project
- Pilot character of the EBRD Rustavi solid waste plant – synergies (inadvertent) between “Clean UP Georgia!” and EBRD project, which is used by “Clean Up Georgia!” for educational purposes (to explain to communities the complexity of solid waste management at the plant and to make an argument for reducing and sorting solid waste at source).

4.3 SUSTAINABILITY AND OWNERSHIP

Sustainability was reported to be likely on the SEPA/GoG solid waste management strategy, although SEPA admits it is too early to tell with a degree of certainty. SEPA considers it important that the new GoG appears to have a more tangible commitment to environmental issues, and has noticed a positive shift in working relations with the government counterparts. “Clean up Georgia!” perceives that the change in attitudes of communities that have been involved in the project will be sustainable. Finally, the World Bank is working towards sustainability as the ultimate goal – “Otherwise, this will be nothing else than a pilot project.” They are confident that the project will be scaled up in the near future.

Ownership is a problem for the EBRD project in one of the two intended sites, Adjara, where the tension between wanting a solid waste plant, on the one hand, and the inability to decide on a suitable location has never been resolved, and has led to a literal standstill on project activities.

4.4 FEEDBACK ON SIDA

Stakeholders pointed out that technical support from Sida was highly specialised and valuable, which translated into a strong RBM focus inside the project. Stakeholders highlighted their wish for more synergies between the projects, and the focus group meeting provided a valuable opportunity for information-sharing between the projects.

Gender mainstreaming was clearest in the “Clean up Georgia!” project, where working with women had become an obvious entry point in the first year of the project. EBRD and SEPA did acknowledge the importance of gender mainstreaming, but in particular for EBRD, to address gender equality in a meaningful way inside a very technical project proved difficult, and more guidance was necessary from Sida on how to best incorporate gender considerations.

5 Findings: Development of a Market Economy

5.1 RELEVANCE OF CURRENT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The objectives under this sector are:

Objective 1: For Georgia to sign a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the EU and

Objective 2: For Georgia to have the capacity to adapt to the EU's trade-related regulatory framework in at least one area.

There are formally four projects in this portfolio – the International School of Economics at Tbilisi State University; the Co-operation between the Swedish and Competition Authorities and the Georgian Agency for Free Trade and Competition; the Co-operation between the National Statistics Office of Georgia and Statistics Sweden (SCB); and the project “Capacity Building and Technical Support to the National Food Agency of Georgia”.

In terms of relevance of Objective 1, there is consensus that for rapprochement between Georgia and the EU, the signing of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) is of the utmost importance; Objective 2 would seem to be subordinated to Objective 1; the objectives are not at the same level, but do, in themselves, present an implicit theory of change.

There are concerns as to whether all projects in this portfolio are relevant to achieving the objectives. Questions apply in this regard to the International School of Economics project – the review team understands that support, which had been provided for many years, will be discontinued in 2014. The statistics project clearly did not see itself as contributing to the objectives, and rather located itself in the Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality sector.

The relevance to achieving the sector objectives is clear for the food safety and competition authority projects.

5.2 RESULTS

Both projects that are directly relevant to the sector objectives are too early in their implementation to report on results.

With regards to the statistics co-operation, results as highlighted by the stakeholders are the improvement of the quality and use of statistics, as well as accessibility (through PC Access) of data to a wider public, thereby contributing to transparency, participation, and accountability. The main drawback on these reported/perceived results is that the project would need to install a much more stringent monitoring mechanism to verify these results.

With regards to results of the support to the International School of Economics, non-stakeholder experts have pointed out that the information provided by the school is one of the few instances of impartial, evidence-based research in the field of economics in Georgia, and therefore, is a valuable resource. This, possibly more than any other project across the portfolio, illustrates the difficulty of attribution – ISET has had multiple sources of funding over the years, and it is difficult to determine what the results of the respective contributions have been. Rather than attributing specific results to Sweden’s funding, we can affirm that Sweden has contributed to the overall results.

5.3 SUSTAINABILITY AND OWNERSHIP

Sustainability is problematic with regards to ISET, which has not, as planned, been transformed into an institution that can survive without outside funding. With regards to the statistics project, the capacity built in GeoStat is likely to be retained (here again, there is an issue with attribution, given the extent of technical assistance that GeoStat has received over the years).

With regards to ownership of the project working with the National Food Agency of Georgia, the project reports an increase in ownership resulting from the change in government. Project stakeholders explain this with a renewed focus on agriculture, which has triggered a greater interest in and commitment to food safety issues. No information has been available on the competition project to make any statements on this aspect.

5.4 MODALITIES

This portfolio currently contains three projects that operate using a “twinning-like” model. However – only in the Geostat project – this is actually fully implemented, i.e. a resident expert is based at the institution. Non-stakeholder experts have pointed out that in order to be more effective, an arrangement with a permanent expert presence is preferable to a frequent part-time presence in the country.

5.5 FEEDBACK ON SIDA

Stakeholders (not all) have reported a wish to have more engagement and stewardship from Sida. There was also a wish to be better linked up with other projects.

6 Conclusions

The review found the strategic objectives, as set out in the current Co-operation Strategy, to be relevant. However, there are some concerns with regards to the focus of a number of projects in the Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality, as well as the Market Development sector. Overall, the human rights perspective of the portfolio could be clearer; few projects make an explicit link.

The results of Swedish engagement have been greatest in the area of gender equality: gender equality has become an accepted issue of dialogue between the government of Georgia and the international community; the latter has itself embraced the topic and is following the leadership provided by Sweden; Swedish support has led to the establishment of relevant institutions and the passing of legislation; the number of women in politics has increased; Swedish implementing partners have made efforts to mainstream gender in their own operations and that of their partners. Further efforts are needed, in particular to help partners to mainstream gender more efficiently, but also, to keep gender equality on the agenda, as well as in order to improve the quality of women's involvement in policy-making.

Swedish support has helped NGOs to maintain activities in Georgia, and has proven crucial to supporting activism at the grass-roots level. More remains to be done to bridge the gap between funding for and through established NGOs, on the one hand, and support to genuine civil society at the local level, on the other hand.

Sweden has been one of the few remaining donors funding activities in Abkhazia. While results have been difficult to ascertain in the framework of the review, there are some general considerations that provide arguments in favour of continued Swedish engagement against the background of deteriorating operating conditions for Swedish implementers, with results being incremental at best. These include the advantage of being present on the ground and thus, potentially being able to react swiftly should the conditions change; showing the humanitarian imperative, and a political message about Sweden's commitment to Georgia's territorial integrity.

Projects in the environment portfolio have been relevant, although implementation has been marred by problems, pointing, inter alia, to a lack of ownership of the environment reform agenda. There are cautious signs that this might change with the new government. The combination, in the current portfolio of "big" projects with a grass-roots level civil society project seems to be particularly pertinent, and should be considered for the future strategy. There could be lessons learned from a similar approach in Ukraine, which could also be explored under a regional angle, depending on the requirements posed by a regional strategy approach.

Market development has been the least coherent of the three sectors in the Strategy. While support to the sector is clearly relevant, the current choice of projects to support sector objectives is less clear; two out of the four projects seem not to contribute in an identifiable way, while the remaining two projects, to date, have no results to report.

There are a number of funding modalities that are employed, which allows Sweden to fund projects that would otherwise struggle to find financing. This is appreciated among implementing partners, as is Sweden's partnership approach, stewardship, and readiness to co-ordinate with other partners in Georgia.

More has to be done to ensure that projects are designed, managed, monitored and reported on using a RBM approach. The overall importance of RBM is understood by most implementing partners, but capacity-building is needed to address this. Incorporating RBM into projects will ultimately lead to stock-taking and the review of exercises to be better able to map results.

7 Recommendations

- Reconsider the focus of the project portfolio to more clearly reflect Strategy objectives, in particular with a view to the institution-building projects that are currently part of portfolio of projects under the Human Rights, Democracy, and Gender Equality and Market Development sectors.
- Establish more clearly to partners that gender mainstreaming in the interventions is neither optional nor negotiable, and that the organisations will have to account for how gender is addressed on a regular basis early on during project implementation. For some of the organisations, this means that Sweden has to go back to “first questions” to ensure that they share Swedish values. For other implementing partners, it means that the Embassy consistently, and early on, follows up on how their pledges on gender mainstreaming, as reflected in the project proposals and documents, are implemented.
- Explore how, in addition to support to NGOs, genuine grassroots initiatives can be supported.
- Consider capacity building with partners on RBM and gender mainstreaming. For most of the stakeholders that were met in the framework of the review, the need to concentrate on RBM and gender mainstreaming was not in question, but they lacked the tools to address both areas consistently.
- Facilitate lesson sharing and connections between projects to enhance synergies and learning between implementing partners, specifically with successful contributions to gender equality and RBM.
- All but one of the current strategy objectives are relevant for Georgia, but would require some minor revisions to remain valid for the next strategy.
- Involvement in Abkhazia should continue; limited engagement inside Abkhazia is preferable to no engagement at all; continued presence can provide useful should windows of opportunity arise during the protracted conflict or after.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference - Review of the Strategy on Sweden's Support to Georgia, 2010- 2013

Background

Swedish international cooperation with Georgia is governed by a cooperation strategy for the period 2010-2013. As the strategy ends in December 2013 Sida and the Swedish government is in the process of reviewing the results of the implementation of the strategy and assessing the prerequisites for a new strategy.

The overarching objective of Swedish development cooperation with Georgia is for the country to develop towards a democratic and accountable state, forging closer ties with the EU.

Swedish cooperation during the strategy period has focused on three sectors, with a set of objectives for each sector:

1. Democracy, human rights and gender equality
 - 1.1. strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality
 - 1.2. better conditions for free and fair elections
 - 1.3. better living conditions for the country's internally displaced persons
2. Environment
 - 2.1. improved water supply and waste water and waste management systems in selected urban areas
 - 2.2. strengthened capacity at relevant institutions at central and local level to regulate and plan water and waste management in an effective and sustainable manner
3. Market development
 - 3.1. for Georgia to sign a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the EU
 - 3.2. For Georgia to have the capacity to adapt to the EU's trade-related regulatory framework in at least one area.

Objectives and scope of assignment

The purpose of the review is to provide input to Sida for its preparation of results proposals within the framework of a new strategy on Sweden's cooperation with Georgia. It is expected that the Swedish government will decide on one strategy covering several countries in Eastern Europe, including bilateral support to Georgia.

This review will take stock of evaluations that has been made of projects in the present strategy as well as results described in annual reports from projects in Georgia.

As preparation for the planning of the new regional strategy, two evaluations are being undertaken; one on the environmental sector and one on gender equality. A strategic review and advice on regional comparative advantages in Eastern Europe and the Eastern Partnership countries has also been undertaken. These evaluations/reviews have different focus and don't look at the results of the Georgian strategy.

Outputs will be two-fold:

- 1) Compilation and description of the main results that can be verified from evaluation reports.
- 2) Analysis of results from project reporting, including lessons learned – what has worked well and what hasn't.

These results should be compared with the objectives in the Swedish cooperation strategy to highlight the relevance of the portfolio to the objectives.

Methodology

The assignment is to be carried out mainly through a desk study of the strategy, project documents, project reports, evaluations, reviews, lessons learned exercises and assessments as well as other documents deemed pertinent for the assignment.

Interviews with the Swedish and Georgian cooperation partners should be included when possible (could include Sida and Embassy staff working with the projects and implementing partners).

The review is not expected to cover the views on end users/beneficiaries unless they have been expressed in evaluations or other accessible documents.

The Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi and the Department for Reform Cooperation in Sida, Stockholm are responsible to provide information related to the contributions in the portfolio and will collate all available relevant reports/data (electronically) to provide to the review team.

Time frame and reporting

The assignment is expected to be implemented during the period 15 December 2012 – 5 March 2013.

A draft report should be presented to Sida and the Embassy in Tbilisi no later than 15 February 2013. Inputs from Sida and the Embassy in Tbilisi to the draft report should be made by 22 February and the final report submitted no later than 1 March 2013.

The report should be written in English. Format and outline of the report should follow the guidelines in Sida Evaluation Manual "Looking Back, Moving Forward, annex B, Format for Sida Evaluation Reports. The complete evaluation manual including annexes is retrievable from Sida's home page.

Budget

The budget shall include fees and reimbursable costs. The levels of fees shall be in accordance with those stated in the framework agreement. The proportion between fees and reimbursable costs should be realistic and cost-efficient. The assignment is expected to be implemented during the period 15 December 2012 – 5 March 2013 and include: desk studies, a visit to Georgia, advice and a final seminar in Stockholm with participation from the Embassy via video link. The cost shall not exceed 500 000 SEK.

Annex 2 – Key Informants

Participants in the Focus Group Discussion Workshops

<i>Projects that work with public institutions</i>		
Tuesday, 12 February 2013, 10:00 - 12:30, 4 women, 2 men		
Institution/Organisation	Name	Position/Title
Lantmäteriverket/National Agency for Public Registry	Ms. Eka Meskhidze	Project manager, Head of the International Relations
National Bureau of Enforcement	Ms. Gurnda Goglidze	Deputy Chairwoman
National Bureau of Enforcement	Mr. Papuna Papiashvili	Head of Administration Office of NBE
National Bureau of Enforcement	Mrs. Ana Kurasbediani	Head of the HR office of NBE
National Bureau of Enforcement	Mr. Patrik Berglund	Project long term Expert
Landmaterial Project/NBE	Mrs. Rusudan Mikautadze	Project Coordinator
<i>Projects that work with multi-laterals and with civil society in its own right</i>		
14:00 – 16:30		
Institution/Organisation	Name	Position/Title
UNDP	Mrs. Natia Natsvlashvili	Cov. Team leader
GFSIS/Sipu	Mrs. Eka Metreveli	Research Fellow
National Democratic Institute	Mr. Ian Woodward	Project Manager
National Democratic Institute	Mr. Luis Navarro	NDI country director
National Democratic Institute	Mrs. Teona Kupunia	NDI programme officer
Eurasia Partnership Foundation	Mrs. Nino Khurtsidze	Associate Country Director
Eurasia Partnership Foundation	Mr. Vakhtang Kobaladze	Project Manager
Eurasia Partnership Foundation	Mr. Victor Baramia	Project Manager
Eurasia Partnership Foundation	Mr. Zaal Anjaparidze	Project Manager
Transparency International	Mrs. Mariana Chicu	Project Coordinator
<i>Projects that work with internally displaced persons and in the breakaway region of Abkhazia</i>		
Wednesday 13 February 2013, 10:00 – 12:30		
Institution/Organisation	Name	Position/Title
Danish Refugee Council- IADS	Mr. Guy Edmunds	Policy Advisor
Danish Refugee Council- IADS	Mr. Paul Mackintosh	Regional Representative
World Vision	Mrs. Lesley Orr	Operations Director
World Vision/(with UNICEF in	Mr. Paolo Ferraris	National Director

Abkhazia)		
Action Contre la Faim	Ms. Marcella Maxfield	Technical coordinator in South Caucasus
Action Contre la Faim	Mrs. Maia Gabedava	Head of the Project
UNICEF	Mr. Dragan Markovic	Emergency Specialist & Abkhazia, Programme Coordinator
UNICEF	Mr. Aaron Greenberg	Chief, child protection
Non-stakeholder Experts		
14:00 – 16:30		
Institution/Organisation	Name	Position/Title
EEAS-TBILISI	Mrs Eva Pastrana-Gutierrez	Human Rights focal point
EEAS-TBILISI	Mrs Caroline Stampfer	IDP Folder
Human Rights Watch	Mr. Giorgi Gogia	Senior South Caucasus Researcher
Norwegian Refugee Council	Mrs. Tina Gewis	Protection and Advocacy Adviser
Projects within the Market Development Portfolio		
14:00 – 16:30		
Institution/Organisation	Name	Position/Title
Swedish Board of Agriculture	Mr. Lars Plym Forshell	Senior Expert
Statistics Sweden (SCB) Geo-stat	Mrs. Kaisa Bendaher	Chief Advisor
Statistics Sweden Geostat	Mrs. Ia Kakichashvili	Local Project Coordinator
Statistics Sweden Geostat	Mrs. Maia Guntsadze	Deputy Executive Director
GeoStat	Mr. Teimuraz Gogishvili	Chief Advisor
Total 39 participants, 22 women and 17 men		

Individual Interviews

Virginie Cossoul, EUD Georgia, 11 February 2013, 17:30

Joakim Holmdahl, Swedish Board of Agriculture, 5 February 2013, 13:00

Annex 3 – Documents Consulted

- Sweden's Strategy for Development Co-operation with Georgia, 2010 – 2013; <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/14/56/28/f361b6af.pdf>
- European Commission Joint Staff Working Paper: Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2010, Country report: Georgia; <http://www.enpi-info.eu/library/content/georgia-progress-report-2010>
- European Commission Joint Staff Working Document: Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in Georgia – Progress in 2011 and recommendations for action: http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2012_enp_pack/progress_report_georgia_en.pdf.
- Sida Assessment Memo on project UNICEF Community Support to Children and Youth in Abkhazia, Georgia, 2011 – 2013, dated 29 November 2011 (Ref Number: 2010-001626); received through Sida Georgia
- UNICEF Community Support to Children and Youth in Abkhazia, Georgia Project Proposal to Sida, dated 26 November 2011; received through Sida Georgia
- Logical Framework (Annex 2) of UNICEF Community Support to Children and Youth in Abkhazia, Georgia, not dated; received through Sida Georgia
- Sida Assessment Memo on UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality 2011 – 2014, dated 2 November 2011 (Ref Number: 2011- 000938); received through Sida Georgia
- On Equal Footing – Policy for Gender Equality and the rights and role of women in Sweden's international development cooperation 2010-2015; <http://www.government.se/content/1/c6/15/22/97/a962c4c8.pdf>
- Sida Assessment Memo for project Support to Georgian civil society through the Eurasia Partnership Foundation, 2011-2013, dated 3 November 2010 (Ref Number: 2010-001605); received through Sida Georgia
- Eurasia Partnership Forum proposal to Sida for Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, dated 20 October 2010; received through Sida Georgia
- Core Support to Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia; Annual Report January 1 – December 31, 2011; Submitted to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, dated 21 May 2012; received through Sida Georgia
- Indevalop AB/K. Eduards: A Swedish Eastern Europe regional strategy – a strategic review. Final Report (17 December 2012); received through Indevalop AB
- A Brief Evaluation of Capacity Development Fund Sub-Projects; Governance Reform Fund, UNDP Georgia; dated June 2012; received through Sida Georgia

- Review of the partnership cooperation between the National Bureau of Enforcement of Georgia and the Swedish Enforcement Agency, Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2012:4, dated June 2012; received through Sida Georgia
- Assessment Memo “Promoting Integrity of Civil Data in Georgia”, dated 17 June 2010 (no reference number); received through Sida Georgia
- Mid-Term Review of the project “Promoting Integrity of Civil Data in Georgia”, May 2012, Indevelop; received through Sida Georgia
- Assessment Memo “International Trade and Economic Integration Concentration at the International School of Economics-ISET, Tbilisi State University”, dated 24 April 2010; received through Sida Georgia
- Initial Assessment “International School of Economics at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University – Three Year Request for Core Funding 2011 – 2014”, dated 24 November 2011; received through Sida Georgia
- Appendices (?) to the request for core funding
- Completion Report International School of Economics at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University December 2006 – December 2011, dated 27 March 2012; received through Sida Georgia
- Proposal for a co-operation project between National Statistic Office of Georgia (GeoStat) and Statistics Sweden (SCB), no date; received through Sida Georgia
- Proposal for a cooperation project between National Statistic Office of Georgia (GeoStat) and Statistics Sweden (SCB), revised report, March 2011; received through Sida Georgia
- Adjara Solid Waste Project; Sida Assessment Memo; dated 3 February 2010; received through Sida Georgia
- Adjara Solid Waste Project – Project Proposal and Results Matrix; no date; received through Sida Georgia
- Adjara Solid Waste Project Funding Decision; dated 9 February 2010; received through Sida Georgia
- Adjara Solid Waste Project; Progress Report October 2012; no date; received through Sida Georgia
- Clean-Up Georgia – Raising Public Awareness and Involvement in Solid Waste Management Improvement; project proposal,
- Annex to Clean-Up Georgia “Duration and indicative action plan for implementing the action”; no date; received through Sida Georgia
- Sida Assessment Memo for Clean-Up Georgia project – Raising Public Awareness and Involvement in Solid Waste Management Improvement, dated 15 July 2010; received through Sida Georgia
- <http://www.ick.ge/ka/photogalleries/2811-2010-09-17-11-04-51.html>
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g6kvBdy7AWI>
- Progress Report Clean-Up Georgia, 2010 - 2011, First Annual Report; dated 30 April 2011
- Progress Report Clean-Up Georgia, 2011 – 2012, Second Annual Report; dated 30 April 2012
- <https://www.facebook.com/#!/cleanup.georgia?fref=ts>
- www.cleanup.ge

- Sida Assessment Memo for Cooperation between the Swedish Board of Agriculture and the Georgia Food Safety Agency (CBA-G); dated 29 August 2011, provided through Sida Georgia
- Activity Report September to December 2011 CBA-G, dated 12 January 2012, submitted through Sida Georgia
- CBA-G Annual Workplan Document 2013, 4 December 2012, submitted through CBA-G
- Sida Assessment Memo Public Sector Financial Management Reform Support Project, Extension of Closing Date (March 1, 2012), dated 3 March 2012; submitted through Sida Georgia
- Mid-Term Review of the project Capacity Building of the Georgian Leadership Community for Improved Decision-making and Negotiation Skills (CBGL) – Final Report, 2012, Indevlop AB
- Notes and conclusions from internal outcome assessment exercises of Sida's programme with Georgia, January and February 2009, case number 2008-002272, 13 February 2009, submitted by Sida Georgia
- Annual Report III Promoting the Integrity of Civil Data in Georgia January 2012 to January 2013, submitted by Sida Georgia
- Annual Report 2012 of project Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR of Georgia, draft report February 2013, submitted by Sida Georgia
- Building Public Confidence in the Electoral Process; semi-annual report to Sida, January – June 2012
- www.electionportal.ge
- Terms of Reference Development of a Solid Waste Management Action Plan for the Georgian Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure/Solid Waste Management Company of Georgia; submitted by SEPA (Leonid Kalashnyk)
- UNDP Final Report for the Project Governance Reform Fund, 2012, draft, submitted by Sida Georgia

Annex 4 – Projects in the Portfolio and Consulted Documentation

The table below provides information on the contributions in the portfolio and maps the available documentation (received from the Embassy/Sida) per project that were included in the review.

Sida Project List - Georgia, 2010-2012 (2012-12-20)		Evaluations	Project reports	Sida Assessment
SECTOR: DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY				
1				
Project Title: Public Sector Financial Management Reform Support Project (PSFMR-SP)				
Period /Contribution No:	March 2006 – March 2012 (76003582)		Project document Implementation Completion and Results Report, 2012	Assessment memo 2010
Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance			
Implementing Agency:	Ministry of Finance, World Bank			
Counterpart:	Ministry of Finance			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 37,000,000			
2				

Project Title:	Governance Reform Fund, Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2011 - June 2012 (53040047)	Annex of an evaluation		Assessment Memo 2012
Area of cooperation:	Democratic governance		Final report 2012 Project Document	
Implementing Agency:	UNDP			
Counterpart:	Georgian Public Institutions			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 4,900,000			
3				
Project Title:	Partnership between the National Bureau of Enforcement, Georgia, and the Swedish Enforcement Agency			
Period /Contribution No:	August 2010 - July 2013 (76003983)	MTR Evaluation 2012		
Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance		Annual reports 2011, 2012	Assessment Memo 2010 Sida contribution decision 2010
Implementing Agency:	Kronofogden – Swedish Enforcement Agency		Project log-frame	
Counterpart:	National Bureau of Enforcement (NBE), Georgia		Partnership agreement	
Sida Commitment:	SEK 13,994,000		Protocoll Project Review 2012	
4			Budgets	
Project Title:	Promoting Integrity of Civil Data in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	July 2010 - December 2012 (76004181)	MTR Evaluation 2012		
			Annual report 2010, 2011, 2012	Assessment Memo 2010

ANNEX 4 – PROJECTS IN THE PORTFOLIO AND AVAILABLE DOCUMENTATION

5	Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance		Project inception report 2010	
	Implementing Agency:	Civil Registry Agency (CRA)		Results framework	
	Counterpart:	CRA		Project document/proposal	
	Sida Commitment:	SEK 23,500,000			
	Project Title:	Capacity Building of the Georgian Leadership Community for Improved Decision-making and Negotiation Skills			
6	Period /Contribution No:	May 2009 - November 2013 (760004100)	MTR Evaluation 2012	Annual report 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012	Assessment memo 2009
	Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance		Project ToR	
	Implementing Agency:	Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies (GFSIS) with support from Sipu International		Project document	
	Counterpart:	GFSIS and various Georgian State organisations			
	Sida Commitment:	SEK 11,500,000			
	Project Title:	Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR			
	Period /Contribution No:	June 2008 – December 2012 (76003992)	MTR Evaluation 2012	Annual reports 2009,2010,2011, 2012	Assessment memo 2008
	Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance		Project ToR	

Implementing Agency: Lantmäteriet Counterpart: National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR), Ministry of Justice Sida Commitment: SEK 23,500,000		Project document Proposal for no-cost extension	
7			
Project Title: The Business of Government	Note: Since this project had just started it has been excluded from the assessment of results		
Period /Contribution No: July 2012 – June 2015 (55030035) Area of cooperation: Democratic Governance Implementing Agency: Transparency International Georgia Sida Commitment: SEK 15,300,000			
8			
Project Title: Rebuilding Public Confidence in the Electoral Process in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No: November 2009- June 2013 (7600417801) Area of cooperation: Democracy/Human Rights Implementing Agency: National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) Counterpart: CEC, CRRC, Leaders of Democracy, ISFED, GYLA Sida Commitment: SEK 15,500,000		Annual report 2011, 2012 Project document/proposal Workplan 2013	Assessment memo 2009

9				
Project Title:	Innovative and Applicable Durable Solutions to Displacement in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	May 2012 – December 2014 (55030010)	M&E Report	Final report 2008-2012	Assessment memo 2008
Area of cooperation:	Human Rights		Project proposal	
Implementing Agency:	Danish Refugee Council (DRC)		Audit report	
Counterpart:	Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation (MRA)			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 30,000,000			
10				
Project Title:	ALIR Programme Manager	Note: Due to limited size this contribution has not been included in the review		
Period /Contribution No:	August 2010 – July 2013 (53040036)			
Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance / Human Rights			
Implementing Agency:	UNDP			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 5,890,000			
11				

Project Title:	Promoting self-reliance and improving the welfare of IDPs and vulnerable population in Eastern Georgia and Abkhazia region			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2011- December 2013 (53040045)		Annual report 2011 LFA	Assessment memo 2010
Area of cooperation:	Human Rights		Project proposal	
Implementing Agency:	Action Contre La Faim, ACF		Semi-annual report 2012	
Sida Commitment:	SEK 16,000,000			
12				
Project Title:	Community Support to Children and Youth in Abkhazia			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2011- December 2013 (530410046)		Annual report 2011 Project proposal LFA	Sida assessment
Area of cooperation:	Human Rights			
Implementing Agency:	UNICEF			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 28,500,000			
13				
Project Title:	Core support to Eurasia Partnership Foundation			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2011 - December 2013 (76004179)		Annual report 2011 Project proposal LFA	Assessment memo 2010
Area of cooperation:	Democratic Governance / Human Rights		Semi-annual report 2012	
Implementing Agency:	Eurasia Partnership Foundation			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 22,500,000			

14				
Project Title:	Kvinna till Kvinna			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2010 - December 2012 (530417701)	Evaluation 2012	Project proposal LFA semi-annual report 2012	Assessment memo 2009
Area of cooperation:	Human Rights/Gender Equality			
Implementing Agency:	Kvinna till Kvinna			
Counterpart:	Local Women's organisations			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 22,000,000			
15				
Project Title:	UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	December 2011 – November 2014 (53040031)		Project proposal LFA	Assessment memo 2011
Area of cooperation:	Human Rights/Gender Equality			
Implementing Agency:	UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA			
Counterpart:	Parliament of Georgia, Various state institutions, NGOs			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 32,000,000			
16				
Project Title:	Democratic Governance Programme in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	January 2007 – March 2010 (76003710)	Evaluation 2011	Annual report 2012 Project proposal	
Sector:	Democratic Governance / HR			
Implementing Agency:	UNDP			

Counterpart:	Various ministries and public bodies			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 29,100,000			
17				
Project Title:	Improving access to water, sanitation and hygiene for IDPs in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	August 2009 – December 2010 (53040020)		Final Report 2011 Project proposal	Assessment memo 2009
Sector:				
Implementing Agency:	UNICEF			
Counterpart:	ACF, IRC Ministry for Refugees and Accomodation			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 21,000,000			
18				
Project Title:	“Shield”-Enhancing Prevention and Response to Domestic Violence in Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	December 2009 – June 2011 (53040030)		Final Report 2011 Project proposal	Assessment memo 2009
Sector:	HR/gender equality			
Implementing Agency:	UNIFEM			
Counterpart:	Interagency Council on the Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence and the State Fund for Protection and Assistance of Victims of Human Trafficking and Domestic Violence			

Sida Commitment:	SEK 4,700,000			
19				
Project Title:	Conflict Prevention and Integration Programme for Samtskhe- Javakheti Region			
Period /Contribution No:	November 2005 - December 2010 (76003583)		Annual reports 2010,2011	
Sector:	Democratic Governance / HR			
Implementing Agency:	OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 6, 600 000			
SECTOR: ENVIRONMENT				
20				
Project Title:	Adjara Solid Waste Project			
Period /Contribution No:	October 2009-December 2012 (53040014)		Annual report 2012	Assessment memo 2010
Implementing Agency:	EBRD, The Government of Adjara		Project fiche	Contribution decision
Counterpart:	SWECO, WYG			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 42,000,000 (Investment Grant)			
21				
Project Title:	Regional Infrastructure Municipality-Mtskheta SW			
Period /Contribution No:	March 2012-December 2013 (55030045)			

Implementing Agency:	World Bank			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 11 000 000			
22				
Project Title:	Clean Up Georgia			
Period /Contribution No:	August 2010-December 2012 (53040038)		Annual report 2010, 2011, 2012	Assessment memo 2010
Implementing Agency:	Greens Movement of Georgia/Friends of Earth Georgia		Project proposal	
Sida Commitment:	SEK 4,576,000			
23				
Project Title:	Preparatory Phase for support to GOG in Solid Waste Management through SEPA Technical Assistance			
Period /Contribution No:	July 2012-January 2013 (55030091)		Project document Terms of reference Scoping mission report Project concept note Project matrix	Assessment memo 2011 Contribution decision
Implementing Agency:	SEPA			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 2 550 000 SEK			
SECTOR: MARKET DEVELOPMENT				
24				
Project Title:	International School of Economics at Tbilisi State University (ISET)			
Period /Contribution No:	December 2011-December 2015 (76004189)		Project proposal	Assessment memo 2011

Area of cooperation: Implementing Agency: Counterpart: Sida Commitment: 25	Democracy and Human Rights, Market Development Partnership for Economic Education and Research (PEER) Tbilisi State University, ISET SEK 9 200,000		Requests for funding Completion report 2011	Initial assessment
Project Title: Period /Contribution No: Area of cooperation: Implementing Agency: Counterpart: Sida Commitment: 26	Cooperation between the National Statistics Office of Georgia (GeoStat) and Statistics Sweden (SCB) May 2011- April 2014 (55030006) Democracy and Market Development Statistics Sweden (SCB) GeoStat SEK 16,841,000 SEK		 Project proposal Annual reports 2011-12	 Assessment memo 2011
Project Title: Period /Contribution No: Area of cooperation: Implementing Agency:	Cooperation between the Swedish Competition Authority and the Georgian Agency for Free Trade and Competition July 2011- December 2013 (55030025) Democracy and Market Development Swedish Competition Authority (Konkurrensverket)		 Project document Annual report 2011	 Assessment memo 2011

Counterpart:	Georgian Agency for Free Trade and Competition			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 15,950,000 SEK			
27				
Project Title:	Capacity Building and Technical Support to Georgia National Food Agency			
Period /Contribution No:	September 2011 – December 2014 (55030033)			
Area of cooperation:	Democracy and Market Development			
Implementing Agency:	Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA)			
Counterpart:	Georgia National Food Agency (GNFA)			
Sida Commitment:	SEK 29,900,000 SEK		Activity reports 2011 project proposal	Sida assessment



Review of the Results of Sweden's Development Cooperation Strategy in Georgia

This Review of Sweden's Co-operation Strategy with Georgia 2010 – 2013 was undertaken early 2013, and commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia. The review finds that overall, the Swedish strategy perspectives—human rights, democracy, and gender equality; environment; and market development—continue to be highly relevant for Georgia. Moving the gender equality agenda forward in Georgia, both at a political level with the Georgian counterpart institutions, as well as among implementing partners, has been Sweden's most valuable achievement during the current (and previous) strategy period. However, there is some scope for making the portfolio of projects more coherent, and adjusting it so as to even better reflect Sweden's strengths and values.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 [0]8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 [0]8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34–9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

