



2013:20

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Jim Newkirk
Medea Gugeshashvili
Levan Kobakhidze

Vera Devine
Ian Christoplos
Jessica Rothman

Review of the Core Support for The Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), 2008-2013

Final Report

Review of the Core Support for The Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), 2008-2013

**Final Report
June 2013**

**Assignment performed by:
Jim Newkirk, Team Leader
Medea Gugeshashvili, Evaluator
Levan Kobakhidze, Evaluator
Vera Devine, Evaluator
with Jessica Rothman and Ian Christoplos**

Authors: Jim Newkirk, Medea Gugeshashvili, Levan Kobakhidze and Vera Devine with Jessica Rothman and 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 2013:20

Commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: June 2013

Published by Citat 2013

Art. no. Sida61609en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61609en

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	3
Preface.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1 Introduction.....	8
1.1 Evaluation Purpose	8
1.2 The Eurasia Partnership Foundation – The Funded Initiative.....	8
1.3 Evaluation Methodology	10
1.4 Limitations of the Evaluation.....	13
2 Findings.....	14
2.1 Relevance	14
2.2 Effectiveness	16
2.3 Efficiency	27
2.4 Sustainability	28
2.5 Impact.....	29
3 Evaluative Conclusions	30
3.1 Summary of Results Of EPF’s Programme	30
3.2 Lessons Learned	30
4 Recommendations.....	32
4.1 Recommendations for EPF	32
4.2 Recommendations for The Embassy.....	33
Annex 1 – Key Informants.....	35
Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed	40
Annex 3 – Terms of Reference.....	41
Annex 4 – Inception Report	45

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CBO	Community-based Organisation
CiDA	Civil Development Agency
CMI	Capacity Mapping Initiative
CRRC	Caucasus Research Resource Center
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EF	Eurasia Foundation
EPF	Eurasia Partnership Foundation
EU	European Union
HRBA	Human-rights based approach
JILEP	Judicial Independence and Legal Empowerment Project
NGO	Non-government Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPP	Public, Private Partnerships
SEK	Swedish Krona
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar

Preface

This evaluation of Swedish core support to the Eurasia Partnership Foundation was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi, Georgia through Sida's framework agreement for reviews and evaluations with Indevelop.

Indevelop carried out the evaluation between April and June of 2013. Jessica Rothman was the Project Manager with overall responsibility for managing implementation and the process of the evaluation; quality assurance of the methodology and reports was provided by Ian Christoplos.

The independent evaluation team included the following key members:

- Jim Newkirk, Evaluator, a Balkans-based project manager and evaluator with extensive experience with Sida-supported initiatives.
- Vera Devine, Evaluator, member of Indevelop's Core Team of professional evaluators.
- Medea Gugeshashvili, National Evaluator, a Human Rights Expert with a development background.
- Kobakhidze, National Evaluator, a Community Development Specialist with 12 years of experience working with civil society programmes in Georgia.

This report has incorporated feedback on the draft report from EPF, Sida and the Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi.

Executive Summary

Introduction

Sweden has been providing support in the Caucasus region since the end of the 1990s, and has had a Sida presence in Georgia since 2006. Sweden developed and began implementing a development cooperation strategy for Georgia in 2010, a strategy which covers the period to the end of 2013, and gives priority to the sector of democracy, human rights and gender equality. In support of this objective, Swedish funding was directed at developing ‘a more democratic and inclusive decision-making process where civil society actors are given better opportunities to both participate in and influence political processes’.

The purpose of the assignment was to evaluate Swedish core support to the Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), support which has been on-going since 2008 through two separate, but related, agreements. The latter of these two agreements ends at the end of 2013. The evaluation was to look at ‘results achieved in relation to the objectives and expected results as expressed in the original project documentation. Effectiveness and efficiency are other important aspects, as well as the assessment of sustainability and ownership of achievements.’

EPF’s mission is to empower people to effect change for social justice and economic prosperity, which EPF undertakes through hands-on programmes. EPF is both a grant maker and a programme implementer. It focuses on increasing the informed participation of civil society in Georgia (community groups, NGOs, media) in the political and economic decision-making of their communities. EPF does this through a programme that encourages and aims to improve skills and organisational capacity in monitoring. EPF also promotes civic participation and integration with the European Union, and promotes the involvement of youth in their communities as decision-makers. EPF works towards the development of an ethos of philanthropy in Georgia, coupled with a focus on the economic and organisational sustainability of NGOs. Finally, EPF is committed to building relationships and networks among civil society, media, and businesses from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.

Main findings

EPF’s support to civil society development, building organisational capacity and contributing to civil society’s influence on Georgia’s future directions, is effective. Civil society is increasing its engagement in civic affairs through the EPF programme – a programme that supports and encourages local, innovative initiatives that increase civic engagement. Particularly notable is the awareness-raising work with citizens and with municipal and state administrations.

EPF's support to civil society development includes a strong focus on the building of coalitions that improve the strength and effectiveness of the messages being delivered, as well as creating support networks for activists. These networks play a critical role in change processes.

Young people, young leaders, are being empowered; and through this they are playing a more visible role in community development.

EPF provides Sweden with an effective mechanism for the distribution of assistance to civil society organisations, to extend its civil society development support more widely.

Lessons Learned

EPF can increase their focus on deepening capacity levels through a process that encourages grantees in their development by lengthening the period of their involvement with EPF. This is particularly true when discussing the support necessary to 'grow up' grassroots organisations.

The breadth of engagement by EPF, in itself, is not deemed to detract from the EPF programme. However, the strong strategic framework that would hold the wide scope of EPF's approach together is not visible.

The programme of core support to specific NGOs has not been implemented widely enough, nor over a lengthy enough period for an effective assessment to take place. The support programme needs to include an external evaluation process.

The theory of change, as currently defined, does not assist EPF in monitoring or managing its programme, nor does it contribute to external evaluation processes. Refinements to the theory of change are required to assist EPF's management in the analysis of the work and results of EPF.

Consideration should be given to encompassing the whole EPF programme and organisation in a single strategic framework – i.e. an organisation-wide theory of change.

Impact will more likely be achieved through ensuring that partners and grantees are aware of and committed to the wider intent of programmes, rather than the specific nature of any particular funded initiative.

Recommendations

For EPF

Recommendation 1 – Given that the intent of Swedish support is to further development within a framework of Swedish priorities, it is the view of the evaluation team that stronger linkages are required between these Swedish priorities for civil society development and the directions of the EPF programme.

Recommendation 2 – In developing its future plans, EPF would benefit from the input of a *strategic planning specialist* in theories of change.

Recommendation 3 – It is recommended that EPF give *greater emphasis to engagement/civic engagement* in public (and internal) discussions.

Recommendation 4 – EPF should better understand the views of stakeholders, and vary or reaffirm its stance on its public profile, based on a detailed assessment of stakeholder views and in *dialogue with stakeholders*.

Recommendation 5 – The report discusses a grant-making programme with more *variety in its tools*. A re-assessment of the current approach to grant-making systems is recommended, including the development of a methodology that is *more strongly focused on ‘growing up’ grantees, through longer-term involvement*.

Recommendation 6 – Greater focus on the development of the core support programme is required, involving more organisations and incorporating an external evaluation/assessment process.

Recommendation 7 – The holding of a grantees’ conference would provide practical benefits to grantees in terms of systems and knowledge, and would further relationships across civil society organisations.

For Sweden

Recommendation 8 – Sweden should support EPF, as appropriate in the organisation, and/or funding of the strategic thinking/planning processes described in Recommendation 2 above. Sida’s framework agreement for advisory services on results framework may be used to access relevant support.

Recommendation 9 – It is recommended that Sweden provide support to EPF in further developing its skills (and its implementation activities) in gender equal approaches and in the development of gender equality more widely in its programme and in Georgia generally.

Recommendation 10 – It is recommended that Sweden continue to make use of EPF as a ‘framework organisation’ – providing grants to civil society and community-based organisations to build a diverse and effective civil society in Georgia.

Recommendation 11 – It is recommended that Sweden address its requirements for assessments of overall efficiency and cost-efficiency, within the scope of programme and project evaluations. It is likely that assessing, and assisting organisations with improvements in these areas, is of greater importance than *cost-efficiency* assessments.

1 Introduction

Sweden has been providing support in the Caucasus region since the end of the 1990s, and has had a Sida presence in Georgia since 2006. Sweden developed, and began implementing, a development cooperation strategy for Georgia in 2010, which covers the period to the end of 2013. Within this strategy, Sweden has given priority to the sector of democracy, human rights and gender equality, with a stated objective of ‘strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality’. Further, in support of this objective, Swedish funding was to be directed at developing ‘a more democratic and inclusive decision-making process where civil society actors are given better opportunities to both participate in and influence political processes’.

1.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the assignment was to undertake an evaluation of Swedish core support to the Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), support which has been on-going since 2008, through two separate, but related, agreements. The latter of these two agreements ends at the end of 2013. The evaluation was to look at ‘results achieved in relation to the objectives and expected results as expressed in the original project documentation. Effectiveness and efficiency are other important aspects, as well as the assessment of sustainability and ownership of achievements’¹.

1.2 THE EURASIA PARTNERSHIP FOUNDATION – THE FUNDED INITIATIVE

EPF’s mission is to empower people to effect change for social justice and economic prosperity, which EPF undertakes through hands-on programmes. EPF is both a grant maker and a programme implementer. It focuses on increasing the informed participation of civil society in Georgia (community groups, NGOs, media) in the political and economic decision-making of their communities. EPF does this through a programme that encourages and aims to improve skills and organisational capacity in monitoring. EPF also promotes civic participation and integration with the European Union, and promotes the involvement of youth in their communities as

¹ Evaluation Terms of Reference

decision-makers. EPF works towards the development of an ethos of philanthropy in Georgia, coupled with a focus on the economic and organisational sustainability of NGOs. Finally, EPF is committed to building relationships and networks among civil society, media, and businesses from Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia.

Sweden has supported EPF's activities since 2008. Phase 1 – from 2008-2010 – was a project called *Core Support for the Establishment of Eurasia Partnership Foundation*, with a budget of 18.9 MSEK. This project focused on increased participation by, and commitment from, civil society in public dialogue and political decision-making.

For the period 2010-2013, Sweden supported Phase 2 of the project – *Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation 2010-2013*. This support, which totals 22.5 M SEK, ends on 31 December 2013. The overall goal of EPF activities is:

‘through operational programs and grant-making, EPF will provide opportunities for Georgians to engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level.’

Swedish support to EPF was agreed to operate within five programme areas, to which a sixth was subsequently added. Each has a focus on the involvement and engagement of civil society at the local level:

- *Engage and Monitor for Change.*
- *Toward European Integration.*
- *Community Empowerment through Youth Initiatives.*
- *Philanthropy, Social Investment and Social Entrepreneurship.*
- *Open Door Grant-making.*
- *Civic Initiatives for an Independent Judiciary.*

Thirty-five percent of the Swedish funds were earmarked for the *Open Door Grants*, with the balance to be used for other programmes and for administrative costs. Further, EPF identified the need for delivering core funding to a small number of NGOs with a clear mission statement, while also incorporating organisations that have demonstrated a willingness to strengthen their organisational capacities and structures. Up to 750,000 SEK were set aside, annually, for this initiative.

The mandate of EPF is fairly wide. In the Terms of Reference, Sweden expressed the view that EPF's achievement of outcomes at an overall level, i.e. not just at the level of individual projects, is a priority, and therefore, was a focus of the evaluation. Within this context, a specific underlying question was to assess whether or not the wide scope of EPF's approach is the most effective at delivering intended outcomes.

1.3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology involved three basic components: preliminary discussions and document review during the inception phase, fieldwork and analysis/reporting. The intent of the inception phase was to understand EPF, and the project, as well as the needs and requirements of the Embassy in delivering the assignment. Secondly, and most importantly, the methodology sets out the approach that the evaluation team took in addressing the evaluation questions (see below), focusing on the comments and feedback of those involved in the project and those who benefit from the Swedish-funded work of EPF.

The preliminary discussions included Skype and email exchanges with the Embassy and EPF management. The document review included project documentation, reports, Sida assessments and comments, country analyses, information about other Swedish supported initiatives within the field of civil society, democracy support and Eurasia guiding documents. These processes contributed to a detailed understanding of the project, as well as project partners and beneficiaries. The inception phase concluded with an inception report that presented the finalised methodology, which was agreed upon by Sida and EPF. See the inception report in Annex 4.

Fieldwork included a wide range of interviews in Georgia and via Skype/telephone. The content of these discussions forms the bulk of the informed input to the evaluation team on the evaluation questions. These discussions included several meetings with EPF programme staff and EPF management, and meetings with the EPF President and the EPF's Director of Development and Evaluation, Embassy/Sida personnel and project stakeholders (grantees and partners). Grantee and partner discussions took place in interviews and focus group meetings, in Tbilisi, as well as in Batumi, Akhaltsikhe, Gori, Gurjaani, Kutaisi and Zugdidi. A total of 125 people participated in interviews or focus group meetings. Of these:

- Three were representatives of Sweden, based at the Embassy in Tbilisi.
- Ten were representatives of EPF. These included senior and programme management. In many cases, more than one discussion was held with each. In the case of the Country Director and Associate Country Director, a number of meetings were held, as well as phone calls and email exchanges.
- The balance were grantees and/or partners of EPF. These stakeholders were interviewed, or participated in focus group meetings. The focus group meetings were organised according to thematic areas. The format of the focus group meetings and interviews was designed to encourage and draw out participation, with discussion building on the contributions of others.

At the end of the fieldwork, a validation workshop was held at EPF and the Embassy to present and discuss preliminary findings from the fieldwork.

This report represents the outcome of the third phase of the assignment – the analysis of data and reporting on the work and findings of the evaluation team.

1.3.1 Evaluation Questions

In order to address the purpose of the evaluation, the Terms of Reference set out a number of key questions to be addressed. Through the inception process, and discussions therein, these questions were refined within the OECD/DAC framework.² The questions were defined within the five criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

Relevance

The evaluation assessed whether or not the design and activities of the EPF programme were relevant to partners, civil society development more generally in Georgia, and addressed developmental priorities appropriately.

- How do beneficiaries and other stakeholders (civil society and community groups, media, government entities, youth, and enterprises) perceive the value of the work of EPF?
- What do EPF's partners perceive as the value that working with EPF has added to their work?
- Has the choice of activities been relevant and strategic for the achievement of the set goals and results?
- Are the programme's directions strategically structured i.e., are current initiatives *and* future directions and plans well developed and focused?
- Has the programme applied a perspective of the poor on development and a rights-based perspective in their activities (through the principles of participation, non-discrimination, transparency and accountability)?
- Does the programme mainstream gender or otherwise ensure that gender equality is proactively addressed? If so, has the programme contributed to improved gender equality?
- One aspect of the focus of enquiry is the EPF programme's theory of change. Is the theory of change sufficiently well framed and focused to better deliver outcomes (and impact)?

Effectiveness

As the focus of the evaluation is on results, the focus of enquiry was on assessing the actual outputs and outcomes of the work of EPF. The enquiry focused on the perceptions of partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, by looking closely at how they perceived what has been achieved. Discussions with EPF staff also addressed this area, with a view to understanding their perspective on their work and their results.

- Has the EPF programme's theory of change been clearly described, with appropriate descriptions of activities, outputs and outcomes? Has the EPF programme been clearly delivered within the described theory of change?

² <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

- Has the theory of change been adjusted to respond to the dynamically changing context in Georgia? How did factors within the operating environment affect the project strategy and results? Were these factors managed well by EPF?
- Has the programme achieved its anticipated outputs and outcomes? If not – why not? Has EPF management responded effectively to this success or lack of success?
- Is civil society developing? Has the programme been effective in providing opportunities for Georgians to ‘engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level’?
- Is the programme contributing at the level of the grassroots organisations that are supported by EPF? Specifically, are grantees and partners developing their organisational capacity through the programme? Are outcomes being achieved by grantees and partners?

Efficiency

The enquiry addressed the general efficiency, as well as cost-efficiency of the programme’s implementation, although the scope and the detail of documentation did not allow for a detailed cost analysis of EPF’s work.

- Is the programme being implemented in an effective and efficient way? Judgements of efficiency and cost-efficiency were based on a general appraisal of programme and project management, rather than on a detailed, quantitative, comparative analysis against specific costs. The analysis addressed questions of programme and administrative structure and efficiencies based on information acquired in the fieldwork. Specific focus was given to administrative systems and policies, grant procedures and policies, finance procedures (including financial analysis and reporting) and strategy/planning processes.
- Are the systems and structures of EPF’s work with partners and grantees sufficiently flexible, while maintaining high standards of accountability?
- Has the organisational set-up of EPF been conducive to supporting the achievement of programme goals?
- What is the evaluation team’s assessment of EPF’s capacity to coordinate and cooperate with other development actors (NGOs, donors, state) in Georgia at different levels?

Sustainability

Enquiry here focused on an analysis of the existing and developing capacities of partners, in particular with a view to understanding how their organisational and developmental skills have developed, where challenges in this area still exist and how EPF contributes to the current direction of organisational developmental processes among its partners. Questions were addressed directly to partners, to EPF staff and to beneficiaries, in order to gain a number of different perspectives on this area.

- What is the assessment of the sustainability of the project? Sustainability of outputs and outcomes as well as sustainability of the partners in the project?

- Has EPF's programme contributed to sustainable results for its target groups, i.e., are organisational and management structures becoming more strategic and effective; is the financial security of organisations becoming more stable?
- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after Swedish funding ends?
- What are perceived as the most significant opportunities for, and obstacles to, sustainable development outcomes within each of the five programme areas?

Impact

In addressing the question of change, enquiry looked at *what is different* for partners and beneficiaries as a result of their involvement with EPF.

- What was the major change for partners and beneficiaries as a result of the EPF programme? This outcome question was the focus of the evaluation.
- Where possible, comment on change in society, influenced by, or as a result of, the EPF programme, was to be noted.

1.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team, EPF and the Embassy had a number of discussions on the feasibility of evaluating efficiency and cost-efficiency. Of particular concern during inception, and in the design of the evaluation methodology, was the Embassy's view that a focus on cost-efficiency was possible. In order to undertake a cost-efficiency analysis, comparative documentation and sufficient resources (in time) are required, neither of which were available for the evaluation. The evaluation's judgements are based on a general appraisal of the overall efficiency of the programme, and of programme management.

The evaluation was not an impact evaluation. The evaluation team addressed questions of change, at the partner/grantee level, as well as where that change may have contributed to a wider change in society; but the focus of the evaluation was effectiveness of programme activities, outputs, outcomes and change at the organisational level (partners, grantees, EPF).

2 Findings

2.1 RELEVANCE

The design and activities of the EPF programme are of significant relevance and importance to Georgia generally, to the development of civil society in Georgia, and specifically to EPF's partners and grantees. The priority areas of EPF's programme are appropriate, not only to Georgia's future but also within the framework of Swedish priorities. From the perspective of grantees and partners, EPF, through its programme, plays an important role in Georgian society, specifically in enabling civil society to organise and mobilise itself.

One of the key focus areas of EPF's work is the development of 'engagement', or 'civic engagement' in society – described as one of its 'mandates' as Creating Opportunities for Civic and Economic Participation.³ While the use of 'engagement' or 'civic engagement' is not extensive among partners and grantees, there is a well-expressed understanding among grantees and partners of EPF's focus on awareness-raising, advocacy, policy, legislation and capacity building. Each of these terms are repeated with regularity when partners and grantees discuss the role and relevance of EPF and its programme.

One specific component of this focus, an indicated added value, was the role that EPF plays in setting the public agenda, in responding to public agendas and in building the capacity of partners/grantees to participate in and influence public agendas. While the *Fix My Street* initiative is a regularly-used example of the effectiveness of this work, the *Internet Resource for Mtskheta-Mtianeti Municipalities* also exemplifies where citizen participation is being influenced and increased in municipal affairs. This addressing of priority issues, and working with civil society to improve their approach to and work with government (state and municipal) is notable as a way in which EPF encourages, and improves, the effectiveness of civil society, in engaging with authorities on matters that are generally important to society.

EPF's partners and grantees are largely of the view that EPF's public profile is not more pronounced and is more visible. There is wide acknowledgement that, within civil society, EPF plays a significant or even a leading role. This role is not perceived

³ <http://www.epfound.org/about-us/mission-and-approach.html>

as being so apparent in the wider community, to the disappointment, generally, of civil society organisations.

There is strong acknowledgement across partners, grantees and others (including both municipal and state governments) of EPF's rights perspective. The EPF view, supported by others, is that this rights perspective did not come as a result of Sweden's focus in this area, but has been a priority of the work of EPF from the days of its predecessor organisation, the Eurasia Foundation (EF). The emphasis has been, historically, somewhat different to that of Sweden, but remains focused on the principles of participation, non-discrimination, transparency and accountability. Indeed, these principles are described by grantees and partners outside of specific discussions on 'a human-rights based approach' (HRBA), i.e., where these stakeholders are not aware of such a concept as an HRBA; they discuss and emphasise these principles within EPF's work and priorities. A specific focus on the 'perspective of the poor' is not so evident. This is not to say that it is non-existent, and many of EPF's grantees and partners work specifically with the poor.

A gender perspective has been noted within EPF and with grantees, partners and other stakeholders. This gender perspective is clearly the result of Sweden's gender perspective, and the priority that gender-equality is for Sweden. Further, through EPF's own priorities and its provided training processes, gender mainstreaming is a focus of EPF's work with civil society organisations, and in the wider society. The EPF programme is proactively addressing gender equality – it is doing so strongly, and consistently, although it cannot yet be said that the programme contributes to gender equality in Georgia. There is some way to go, generally, across all stakeholders, in the full understanding and implementation of a gender perspective in programme design, priorities and implementation – many respondents refer to gender equality as a 50/50 split of men and women in project activities – but it is clear that the perspective is developing. The evaluation team has a clear sense that both EPF and its partners and grantees are committed to learning about and implementing gender equal approaches. At the same time, EPF has clearly indicated a need for further practical support in assisting partners and grantees in incorporating a gender equality framework in their work and in their organisations.

The evaluation team's comments on perceived weaknesses in the application of a strategic approach will be visible throughout this report. The evaluation team is of the view that the activity focus of EPF, founded on a strong set of initiatives with a dynamic group of partners and grantees, draws away from EPF's own understanding of its longer-term intent with its operational programme, and for its grantees. This view was expressed independently by partners during fieldwork. Importantly, strong

feedback in this area came from partners involved with the Youth Banks, which is used here to exemplify the discussion. As one partner said: ‘what will they have in five years with the Youth Banks? We love the work, and the kids are fantastic, but what will be the residual benefits for Georgia? We don’t think it is about having 300 trained kids, but it is not clear what the aim is.’⁴

A related commentary was expressed, in some detail, by another partner:

It looks to the intent of EPF, now after five and more years, now with something more visible as an intervention. What will they do with it? My exact point is ‘strategic intent’. Is the intention around young people as decision-makers? If so, this will keep people enthused, and maybe this is a way to keep Youth Bank operating, but somehow there must be further innovation. They must find some greater breakthroughs – they must find partner municipalities willing to put in something more significant, to put forward something more significant, to be willing to take some risk. They must look at a stronger strategic focus; on increasing, say, the bonds between EPF and partner municipalities, where they can move forward more strongly, and build something of greater significance.⁵

The specific question from Sida, as to ‘whether or not the wide scope of EPF’s approach is most effective in delivering intended outcomes’, is relevant here. The assessment of the evaluation team is that the issue is not the wide scope of EPF’s approach – i.e., the breadth of scope in itself is not problematic – but how EPF constructs its approach within a strong strategic framework is the critical issue. In this context, the questions EPF answers, across the whole of its approach, need to be ‘How does this contribute to building something of greater significance? ‘What are we building of greater significance?’

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS

Across the entirety of the six years of Swedish support, including most components of EPF’s grant-giving and operational focus, EPF’s programme can be assessed as having achieved its anticipated outputs and outcomes. Throughout the timeframe being evaluated, EPF’s initiatives have equipped citizen groups and civil society organisations with skills and knowledge, and have encouraged activism among young people. EPF does ‘provide opportunities for Georgians to engage in social, economic

⁴ Partner comment during fieldwork.

⁵ Partner comment during fieldwork.

and political developments to effect improvements'.⁶ These opportunities are provided across the whole of Georgia (and in cross-border situations), to a wide variety of partners and grantees, and within a wide range of focus areas. EPF is fostering 'increased and better-informed citizen participation in social, political, and economic decision-making',⁷ with interviews, reports and evaluation reports providing confirmation and examples. In the context of their external focus, grantees report learning new skills in advocacy and lobbying through working with EPF, and putting these skills to use, and grantees are strongly supportive of EPF's reporting in this area.⁸

Partners and grantees point to an increase in capacity within funded organisations as being the major change that they have experienced as a result of EPF funding. Specific mention is made of a higher level of sophistication in organisational planning and management systems and processes. Further, there has been wide acknowledgement of EPF's role in improving their organisational abilities in fund-raising (either direct approaches to funding agencies, or through improved capacities to respond to calls for proposals). Specific mention is made of successful approaches to the EU.

Further, there is a view among stakeholders that the role EPF plays in network/coalition building, within civil society, as a leader of civil society, and the role of these networks/coalitions in change processes, is of critical importance. According to one NGO partner, 'we did not have this perspective before – multi-stakeholder relationships at the local level – it is a unique opportunity.'⁹ Another agreed: 'What has been important is advocacy, facilitating public/private partnerships, with more involvement of civil society in training of government staff, and being more aware of the need for things to happen in government.'¹⁰

Earlier focus areas of corporate social responsibility and tourism development are not current priorities within the EPF portfolio. The 2008 war and the global financial crisis created difficulties for the business community that, in the short and medium

⁶ EPF goal statement from its proposal to Sida.

⁷ From the EPF proposal.

⁸ Extract from the EPF 2012 Annual Report: Local grassroots CSOs, receiving institutional strengthening support through the 2011 small grants programme, have demonstrated successes in building their institutional capacities and galvanising local communities to effect positive change. For example, in partnership with the Coalition for IDP Rights and the Tskhinvali House, 12 members of Tserovani Community Organisation Side by Side participated in capacity-building workshop in advocacy, monitoring, leadership, and CSO management and have since developed two project proposals to address the needs of the community. EPF support allowed the grantee to establish partnerships with local and international CSOs that provide guidance on the advocacy efforts, as well as its institutional capacity building.

⁹ Partner comment during fieldwork.

¹⁰ Partner comment during fieldwork.

term, will mean that the focus on corporate social responsibility is reduced. The earlier cross-border cooperation focus is found now within youth integration initiatives. EPF has been particularly effective in increasing local capacity in high-quality social science research, and the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) is being spun off as an independent organisation.

EPF has promoted ‘civic participation in the process of Georgia’s integration into the European Union’,¹¹ particularly through grants to media organisations which are used to inform and engage. According to one media partner, ‘People get involved, and the tools become powerful – they feel they can influence processes. It can be built on, because of networks. They are good with sharing ideas and initiatives, and with building onto impacts, through these coalitions, and joint efforts/shared efforts.’¹² Significant support was also provided to the food safety initiative, which ‘created a relationship between three key groups, consumers, producers and government, toward a mutually beneficial outcome.’¹³ Interviewed members of these groups stressed ‘two key areas, mobilising the community; mobilising stakeholders.’¹⁴ Both of these components are important in how the EPF-assisted initiative contributes to integration processes – they are both mobilisation and networking efforts, each of which builds on community-based processes that increase government effectiveness in integration activities.

In terms of internal development, grantees describe a range of areas where support from, and involvement with, EPF has been important in improving their capacity. They have developed organisational systems of management and leadership. They have learned how to plan, and have developed plans. They have learned how to report, both narrative and financial, and have used these developed skills, in many instances, with a different donor. Grantees consistently point out that EPF’s financial systems are tough, and maybe even too tough, for small, Community-Based Organisations (CBOs). However, these organisations all comment that learning how to deal with tough financial systems has been beneficial when interacting with other donors, and particularly for those organisations that have, subsequent to EPF assistance, applied for EU grants. When specifically asked about what capacity improvements they have had, the following views were expressed in grantee focus group meetings:

- We are better with fund-raising strategies.
- We are better with human resource management.
- We are better at financial management.

¹¹ From the EPF proposal.

¹² Partner comment during fieldwork.

¹³ Partner comment during fieldwork.

¹⁴ Partner comment during fieldwork.

- We have a more stable and larger structure, and are more financially sustainable.
- The management of the organisation has improved its style – we are more democratic. We are better at segregating functions between employees and between employees, management and the Board.
- Our image, within our own minds and in the community, has grown.
- The capacity of our organisation to increase involvement from the community, and to have more ‘beneficiaries’, has grown. We also involve beneficiaries in decision-making.¹⁵

A consistent theme that flows through the work of, and comments from, the young people who are involved in, and have benefited from, the Youth Banks is that they have developed both personal and professional skills. These young people make specific reference to working as a team; to project proposal development and writing; to narrative reporting; and to financial/budgetary management skills. Significantly, reference is made to the professional experience that they have gained, based, it is noted, on giving them responsibility: ‘we did not want to disappoint our partner, and independence is so important to us, independence from older people.’¹⁶ Where development makes its strongest mark, though, is in terms of leadership – the young people comment on it, and it is obvious in discussions with them. They note the new roles that they have in their communities – i.e. they are looked up to, expected to have an idea and a way of approaching the resolution of issues. Finally, there is consistent reference to the development of communication skills, both personal and public (including putting forth ideas).

The focus of work with social enterprises was on how civil society organisations can diversify their funding base. EPF acknowledges the difficulties that it has experienced in this area of its work, to a certain extent as a result of the 2008 war and the global financial crisis. The social enterprise thematic area focused on partnership, on Public, Private Partnerships (PPPs), and while this partnership aspect is developing, the most successful funded social enterprises actually function more as enterprises, or ‘collaborative enterprises’. They employ the poor, they improve skills, but they are fundamentally businesses. In this sense, there is work to be done in moving this area forward, but some important inroads are being made. One longer-term strategy involves creating a legal framework for social enterprises. A further, and important strategy, is the networking of social enterprises; currently, 15 social enterprises are involved together in promoting the concept of, and organising, enterprise markets/exhibits to promote products.

¹⁵ Partner comments during fieldwork.

¹⁶ Youth Bank member comment during fieldwork.

Four functional social enterprises are mentioned here as examples of outcomes.¹⁷

- A social not-for-profit enterprise that works with the disabled, producing hand-made products by people with hearing difficulties. This social enterprise is not necessarily economically successful, but demonstrates an effective and innovative approach that balances the social/art skills of one key person with the business skills of the other. It is likely that only one of these women could not have made it work, but the collaboration is excellent and successful.
- International Caucasus Tea Producers – this enterprise mixes the young and old, the Soviet and current. Gathering tea from a range of conflict situations, they use the process to promote peace. But, they are also improving their production and monitoring processes, and have ambitions to enter the international market.
- IDP sewing enterprise – a collaboration has taken place that joins the production of traditional products with a separate enterprise that produces uniforms.
- Car washing – the social side of the business is excellent, and significantly contributes to the socialisation processes for the young street kids that it employs.

The intent of the Open-door Grant programme was to ‘support local, innovative pilot initiatives that increase civic engagement in social, economic, and political events for replication on a larger scale’, to be responsive to the emerging community priorities rather than directive, which in turn makes it unfeasible to identify the project objectives for those projects in advance.’¹⁸ It is the view of the evaluation team that, with one reservation that is discussed below, the Open-door Grant programme is achieving its aims. Throughout the period being evaluated, community-based and civil society organisations have received support that encourages and supports local, innovative initiatives that increase civic engagement. As one grantee said, ‘They do not just do ‘projects’, they assess the needs of civil society and then fund projects based on the needs as shown up in these assessments.’¹⁹ It is worth noting that, as well as innovation, the Open-door programme allows community-based organisations and non-government organisations to move quickly: ‘Through Open-door grants, with this flexibility, we can respond quickly and directly to the changing needs of Georgia, and specifically Georgian civil society.’²⁰

There is a consistent view expressed by grantees and partners, and supported by the evaluation team, that EPF can and should increase their focus on deepening capacity levels through a process that allows, and/or encourages grantees in their development

¹⁷ Each was described by a partner of EPF during fieldwork.

¹⁸ EPF proposal to Sida.

¹⁹ Grantee comment during fieldwork.

²⁰ Grantee comment during fieldwork.

by lengthening the period of involvement with EPF. There is a view that a single grant, while beneficial, cannot achieve the necessary organisational development for many CSOs and CBOs, particularly organisations in the regions. This is specifically and particularly true when discussing grassroots organisations, and the support required for them to ‘grow up’. What changes might look like in this area are discussed in the Recommendations section.

According to the 2010 EPF proposal to Sida, ‘An additional 5 percent of funding will be set aside to provide core funding to local CSOs with a demonstrated need for and dedication to organisational development.’²¹ This funding anticipates ‘375,000 to 750,000 Swedish krona per year for three years from the Open Door Grant-making funds to provide core funding to organisations demonstrating a commitment to implementing activities around a cogent mission statement.’²²

For a small group of CSOs, EPF is making use of the Capacity Mapping Initiative (CMI). CMI is built around six modules (Board Governance, Programme Management, Communication and Public Relations, Fund Development, Human Resources and Finance Management). Each module involves an assessment and development process through a series of 10 defined stages in development.

This support, from Swedish funds, has been provided to the Civil Development Agency – CiDA. The approach to core capacity development was welcomed by CiDA, as they had noticed an expectation/requirement from donors for higher level skills in a number of management areas, without a concept about what this meant or how it could be achieved. EPF worked through a baseline with CiDA in each of the six module areas – a process in itself that CiDA found useful as it gave an external perspective on the organisation’s skills and capacities. Based on the baseline process, CiDA developed a proposal for the organisational development of the organisation. Following discussion/negotiations, a final proposal was agreed upon and subsequently implemented. A financial consultant assisted in developing a set of procedures that was both more practical and more in line with the standards of international organisations. A human resources consultant undertook an assessment of all CiDA staff, and developed an action plan for their development. A human resources management manual was developed. The Board was formalised and CiDA’s governance structure was re-worked; it no longer including the position of Executive Director on the Board. A project development manual was adopted. A communication strategy was developed and is being implemented. The models and structures have now been created, and CiDA is in the process of implementing them. A more well-developed sense of the importance of

²¹ 2010 Proposal from EPF to Sida.

²² Ibid.

the changes, and whether or not they add value, will be better known by the end of 2013, when CiDA will go through a monitoring/assessing process.²³

A further two organisations have been ‘identified for the provision of core support after EPF reviewed their project proposals that came through the open door mechanism’.²⁴ The two organisations are Peaceful Business Caucasus (APBC) and the Foundation for the Development of Human Resources (FDHR), each of whom will receive ‘at least \$65,000 during year 2 and 3 of the programme’ (as they) have made significant strides in achieving their organisational mission and require institutional capacity building to improve their already solid performance.²⁵ Each of these organisations received \$7,852 in January of 2013, and will participate through CMI.

Support was provided to another group of organisations, although they are not deemed to be able, organisationally, to make use of the CMI tool. They receive other types of support to assist the development of their organisational capacity. These are small grants.

After careful consideration, EPF decided to provide core support to different groups of CSOs. One target group is small, grassroots organisations. To this effect, in fall 2011 and then in summer 2012, EPF awarded institutional development grants, to the Tserovani Community Organisation, Gori Community Development Center, Tusheti PA Friends Association, and Alliance of Georgia Schools Students’ Unions. These organisations received core support, while at the same time implementing civic monitoring and advocacy campaign on the issue that concerns the residents of their respective communities. In a similar vein, EPF identified three grassroots organisations (Foundation for Economic Education, Helping Hand, and Koda Community Center) that wanted support in improving their institutional capacity through volunteer management and provided small grant support to them as well.²⁶

A further 10 organisations are receiving core support, using CMI, through support provided by USAID to the JILEP - Judicial Independence and Legal Empowerment Project.

In terms of a general assessment of the core support programme, it has neither been implemented widely enough, nor have the changes it has brought (particularly to CiDA, but also to EPF) been in place long enough for an objective assessment to be made.

²³ Field feedback from the CiDA representative.

²⁴ 2012 Annual Report. EPF.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ 2012 Annual Report. EPF.

There has been no external monitoring or evaluation of outputs/outcomes for CiDA, other recipients or EPF.

2.2.1 EPF's Theory Of Change

EPF's theory of change, specifically as expressed in logical frameworks (logframes) from proposals and reporting over the period of support, is much better constructed for the current period than the earlier support. However, there remain issues with both the structure and use of the theory of change. These issues are in two areas:

- The day-to-day and longer-term strategic management of the project. The structural issues have greater impact here – the lack of a clear and coherent logic of change detracts from EPF management's capacity to use the logframe in monitoring the project and making modifications as required to ensure, as much as possible, the achievement of results.
- Reporting, internally and externally, on the results (outputs and outcomes) of the project. Generally speaking, without a clearly defined results logic, organisational management is not able to focus its reporting on the intended and planned outputs and outcomes, nor to effectively express achieved results. This also constrains management in its ability to describe the management responses that it has made in modifying approaches to ensure results. EPF reporting reflects this, and reports are ineffective in defining results, as are management responses where approaches have been changed to better deliver outcomes.

Each of these two areas is discussed in further detail below.

Structural issues

The most critical function of a theory of change is to express how, logically, undertaking certain activities will deliver certain outputs that will contribute to certain outcomes.²⁷ Generally speaking, a number of activities (inputs) will *generate an output* (a tangible, visible product or service) and a number of outputs will *contribute to* an outcome.

The table below has been extracted from EPF's documents. It is a re-formatted logframe for the Engage And Monitor For Change component. The words, and the logical relationships, from the EPF proposal have not been changed, although the table has been re-formatted to facilitate the discussion of the logic. For reasons of space, and utility, only the Engage And Monitor For Change component of the logframe is analysed here. The basic questions are consistent across the logframe.

²⁷ 'a causal pathway from here to there specifying what is needed for goals to be achieved' - <http://www.theoryofchange.org/about/what-is-theory-of-change/>.

Engage and monitor for change		
Objective 1: To enhance the quality and profile of participatory civic monitoring actions by community groups, CSOs, and media outlets.		
Outcome	Output	Activity
CSOs and community groups effectively employ civic monitoring techniques.	One grant competition and minimum of three grantees.	Grant competitions in civic monitoring.
Grantees improve internal management structures and practices.	Three small grants awarded for institutional development and community engagement projects.	EPF awards small targeted grants for grassroots and newly established regional CSOs.
Grantees engage stakeholders in participatory policy formulation.		
The civic monitoring activities implemented by EPF grantees in both types of competitions have a sustainable positive impact on citizens.		
Objective 2: To increase the capacity of targeted community groups, CSOs, and the media to monitor government commitments and public service delivery.		
Trainers position themselves as experts in monitoring and advocacy and become training resources for CSOs and CBOs in their regions.		Training Of Trainers was conducted in 2012 and EPF will continue to follow up with the trainees.
CSOs trained by EPF trainers increase their involvement in the monitoring of service delivery and advocacy using negotiation, evidence gathering, and presentation.		
Objective 3: To bolster linkages among civic monitoring practitioners and improve dialogue with policy-makers		
CSOs establish cooperative dialogue with government agencies to improve policy formulation and implementation.	Two public events on the topic of civic monitoring and public oversight conducted in Tbilisi and Kutaisi.	Public discussions and roundtables.
CSOs engaged in civic monitoring post their materials and experience on blog informing and engaging other CSOs.	Special Blog: “Engage and Monitor for Change” created on EPF website www.epfound.ge .	Online exchange of experience.
Civic monitoring practitioners easily communicate with each other online.	Civic monitoring groups are created on social networks	Network Building

The following comments summarise the most critical issues with the logframe above:

- The ‘objectives’ statements would better serve their purpose if reformulated

into outcome statements, e.g., Enhanced quality of civic monitoring actions, together with an enhanced profile for civic monitoring groups (CBOs, CSOs, media).

- There are too many stated outcomes, with relatively too few output and activity descriptions. In a number of places the logframe describes no activities or outputs for intended outcomes.
- There are a number of instances of a direct, one-to-one correlation between a stated activity, an output and an outcome.²⁸ It is more effective to describe the *set of activities* that will deliver a single output, and to understand that a number of outputs will be required *to contribute to* an outcome. In many instances, merging and re-stating outcomes would address these issues, particularly where outputs and activities were re-assessed, re-stated and further developed. This process of development of descriptions is the strategic planning work associated with the development of a theory of change.
- There are some issues with the 'level' of some components of the logframe, e.g., some outputs are actually activities and some stated outcomes either outputs or activities.²⁹

Reporting

The value, to management, of a clearly defined theory of change is how it contributes to effective monitoring systems. Simply put, the first level of monitoring, undertaken by organisation management and staff, is 'did we do what we said we would do?' Assuming in this discussion that the answer is 'yes', this question is closely followed by: 'Did these activities generate (or are they generating) the intended outputs?' If the answer here is 'no', we are able to go back and revise our activities, based on our

²⁸ For example, the Activity 'Public discussions and roundtables' correlates directly with the Output 'Two public events on the topic of civic monitoring and public oversight conducted in Tbilisi and Kutaisi' and then the Outcome 'CSOs establish cooperative dialogue with government agencies to improve policy formulation and implementation.' As stated, the logframe implies that public discussions and roundtables' will deliver a cooperative dialogue between government agencies and improvements in policy formulation and implementation. More detail on Outputs, so that the Outputs can be seen as contributing to the 'cooperative dialogue' is required. 'Two public events ...' cannot alone be assessed as establishing a cooperative dialogue - visible Outputs of 'cooperative dialogue' are necessary. Visible Outputs contributing to 'improvements in policy formulation etc' are also needed. Then, it is necessary to provide more detail on Activities that will deliver the Outputs.

²⁹ For example, The Outcome statement 'CSOs and community groups effectively employ civic monitoring techniques' is an Output – it describes a 'product or service', something *tangible*, that contributes to an Outcome – in this case the Outcome might have something to do with the influence that these monitoring techniques have on policy formulation, but would need formulation. The Output and Activity statements on the '3 small grants' would be better if reversed. '3 grants' are an activity (although it would be better to describe a range of activities here related to the grants programme). 'EPF awards ...' is an Output, although again it would need some reformulation to be best stated as something tangible, as a product or service. It is also worth noting here that as currently stated, there is no logical link between the Activity and Output statements and 'Grantees improve internal management structures and practices'.

developed knowledge and experience, to better deliver our outputs. If the answer is ‘yes’, we then ask ourselves if these outputs are indeed contributing to our intended outcomes. Depending on our answer to this question, we are able to make the most appropriate decisions on expenditure of human and other resources.

As defined, the current theory of change does not assist in this monitoring (management) process. By extension, neither does it contribute to external monitoring/evaluation processes. It is not clear that ‘we are doing what we said we would do’, as the breadth of activities is not detailed – and in some cases is not expressed at all. Further, it is not certain that these activities are delivering the necessary outputs that are required to achieve results at the outcome level.

At the reporting level, refinements to the current expression of the theory of change would be required in order to assist management to provide, for itself, its Board and donors, a sufficiently analytical discussion of the results of the work of EPF. Reporting, internal and external, would benefit from a stronger analytical focus on the intended outcomes, e.g., on the *effective employment* of the civic monitoring techniques, and how this has contributed to the *quality of monitoring* and the *profile of civic monitoring groups*, rather than on a listing of ‘examples of applied civic monitoring techniques for this reporting period are community needs assessments, on-site examination, collection of photo-video evidence to document problems, and analyses of official documents.’

Finally, a ‘meta logframe’ for EPF’s Swedish-funded project was discussed by the evaluation team, Sida and EPF during the validation workshop at the end of the fieldwork. The development of a strongly expressed strategic framework, such as would be embodied in a coherent theory of change linking all aspects of Swedish funding toward the project goal, would benefit EPF in its overall directions. Indeed, it can be argued that EPF would benefit in its strategic directions from encompassing the whole of its programme and organisation in a single strategic framework, such as an organisational theory of change.

The 2007 Assessment Memo stated ‘Eurasia has plenty of success stories from their 13 years in the region, but show weakness in analysing what outcome and impact their efforts has made on a more aggregated level.’³⁰ It is the view of the evaluation team that this weakness remains, and can be addressed, at least to some extent, through more developed strategic and results frameworks.

³⁰ 2007. Assessment Memo. Sida document.

2.3 EFFICIENCY

EPF has a very clear and detailed *Manual of Procedures and Policies*³¹ that covers most areas raised during the evaluation process. The quality of administrative and programmatic support to grantees is of a high level, and adds value to the efficiency of grant processes. EPF makes use of a grant management system that provides them with a strong framework for the administration of grants that are made, irrespective of whether these grants are in response to a call for proposals or are granted as part of the Open-door programme. Through this, important information on grants and grantees is compiled, and grant-management decisions are facilitated.³²

Grantees and partners were specifically asked by the evaluation team to address the flexibility of EPF systems, in the context of maintenance of high standards. The view of the evaluation team is that, while there is little flexibility in the granting and reporting systems, on the whole there are few negatives for grantees in responding to the strict nature of the system. Further, according to one grantee, ‘they immediately help us to rectify areas where we have problems with our systems and paperwork. They are very supportive with their systems and processes where there are issues in these requirements.’³³ This is a strong indication that the strictness of EPF systems serves a purpose, and that, within this context, EPF staff work with grantees to ensure their success.

There is one exception to this general view, that was put forward in a number of ways by grantees and partners – that EPF should have a greater variety of grant-making options. The view is that the current arrangements do not acknowledge the great variety in skills and experience available in CBOs and CSOs, nor the different sets of needs which must be addressed to ensure the development of organisational stability and growth. The greater ‘variety’ refers specifically to the length of EPF’s involvement with grantees. There are ways in which EPF can maintain its strong administrative approach while having longer-term involvement with grantees. While not being prescriptive, this could happen either through single, longer grant agreements or through ‘staged’ grants, where a second, and possibly subsequent, grant(s) can be agreed upon in principle, subject to the achievement of performance targets by the grantee.

³¹ June 2011 version. *Manual Of Policies And Procedures (Georgia)*. EPF.

³² Pure administration costs for grantees and partners usually do not exceed 15% of the total project budget. Total salaries, including experts, consultants and trainers (except projects that are solely for training purposes) do not exceed 30% of the total project budget. EPF has a special monitoring system in place, which ensures that resources from different donors, or other sources, are not spent on the same item. To stimulate the effective use of financial resources, savings can be used for additional activities (not salaries) without prior approval of EPF.

³³ Grantee comment during fieldwork.

The evaluation team is of the view that EPF's organisational structure and staffing add value to the work of EPF, and are direct contributors to the effectiveness of the organisation. Of particular note is the programme management staff. Feedback from grantees and partners, and the evaluation team's own experience, is that programme staff are knowledgeable, experienced and motivated, and provide, to grantees and partners, the relevant and detailed support that is needed to achieve their desired outcomes, and to develop their organisations. There is a load of 10-30 grantees per Grant and Programme Manager (each with a portfolio of 300,000 – 1,500,000 USD). Site visitation is regular, but is, in the view of the evaluation team, not excessive. Specific focus is given to planning processes with grantees, and to analysis of the programme and financial reports.

There is significant support for the quality and value of the work and leadership of EPF in communicating with and coordinating activities and development processes with government, whether municipal or state, as well as with donors and other international organisations. As has been discussed previously, EPF is seen by civil society as a leader – i.e. an organisation that sets agendas, brings issues and agendas before the public and the administration, and assists the media, NGOs and CBOs in having an influence on the resolution of these issues, directly through their own work, as well as through its grant-making processes.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluation has shown the 'classical' issue of financial sustainability for local and regional/national CSOs/CBOs, and, to a lesser extent, for EPF itself. Notwithstanding the work done with social enterprises, with the specific intent of diversifying funding possibilities, the reality is that civil society and community-based organisations remain almost completely dependent on national or international donor funds. EPF (as with its grantees and partners) will always be an organisation that operates on the basis of its fund-raising activities. It is likely to remain successful in this for the foreseeable future, and Swedish funding provides significant strength to its programme.

On the other hand, in assessing their own *capacities*, and the growth of organisational capacity and its impact on their potential for sustainability, there is a consensus across partners and grantees that they are better able to plan and manage, and are better able to look for and access funds, from a wider group of organisations than was possible prior to their work with EPF. However, a further reference is made here to earlier comments on development, of increased focus by EPF, on the deepening of capacity levels, potentially through a longer-term granting process with selected grantees.

EPF provides Sweden with an effective mechanism for the distribution of grant monies to smaller civil society organisations – a role that Sida is not able to play due to the size and complexity of the task. The use of EPF as a *de facto* 'framework organisation', responsible to the Embassy for the delivery of grant monies to civil

society and community-based organisations, is an effective way for Sweden to extend its civil society development support more widely, assisting the development of civil society in Georgia while assisting these local organisations to influence government and international agendas in the country.

2.5 IMPACT

There is strong acknowledgement among interviewees of EPF's role in setting, and contributing to, the change agenda – particularly its awareness-raising activities and its support to advocacy and civic monitoring processes, nationally and locally. It is the view of CBOs and CSOs (partners and grantees) that EPF has contributed to change in Georgian society by supporting more effective approaches by civil society organisations to government (local and state) and by improving the capacity of civil society actors to address issues with duty bearers, whether in local or national government agencies.

It is important that the Project does not 'miss the forest for the trees', particularly in programming for longer-term impact. One example of this is in relation to the food safety programme, within the European integration thematic area. There was a sense in field discussions that, *for partners and grantees*, the focus of investment and development was on food safety, with extensive discussions about why the food safety initiative was important to Georgia's European aspirations. Within EPF's programmatic framework, however, food safety is a tool for engagement. It is not the intention of this discussion to take away from the importance of the food safety initiative, but to make the point that the *programme* is about 'interest group involvement toward civic engagement (contributing to European integration)',³⁴ rather than food safety. Impact, i.e. longer-term effects, will more likely be achieved where partners and grantees are brought closer to the wider intent of a programme, rather than on the specific funded initiatives.

³⁴ EPF proposal.

3 Evaluative Conclusions

3.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF EPF'S PROGRAMME

EPF offers Sweden an effective partnership in responding to Swedish priorities for the development of civil society in Georgia and in strengthening Georgia's relationship with the European Union. As well as being an effective partner for Sweden, EPF provides leadership within civil society in Georgia, communicates well with government (municipal and state) and is acknowledged by government and civil society as a strong contributor to Georgia's change processes.

- EPF's support to civil society development, building organisational capacity and contributing to civil society's influence on Georgia's future directions, is effective.
- Civil society is increasing its engagement in civic affairs through the EPF programme.
- Community-based and civil society organisations have received support that encourages and supports local, innovative initiatives that increase civic engagement.
- Civil society organisations are being supported in raising the awareness of citizens, and municipal/state administrations, with regard to issues of importance to Georgia.
- Coalitions are being built that improve the strength and effectiveness of the messages being delivered, as well as creating support networks for activists.
- The role EPF plays in this network/coalition building, within civil society, as a leader of civil society, and the role of these networks/coalitions in change processes, is of critical importance.
- Young people, young leaders, are being empowered, and through this they are playing a more visible role in community development.
- The young participants themselves have clearly grown in their own maturity, and their capacity to work in their community. Longer term effects are not yet known.
- EPF provides Sweden with an effective mechanism for the distribution of assistance to civil society organisations.
- The use of EPF for the delivery of grant monies allows Sweden to extend its civil society development support more widely.

3.2 LESSONS LEARNED

The breadth of engagement by EPF, in itself, is not deemed to detract from the activities, outputs and outcomes of the EPF programme. However, the strong

strategic framework that would hold the wide scope of EPF's approach together, and which is necessary for the organisation's work to have impact on Georgia's development, is not visible.

The currently defined theory of change does not assist EPF in monitoring or managing its programme, nor does it contribute to external evaluation processes. Refinements to the theory of change are required to assist management in the analysis of the work and results of EPF. Some consideration should be given by the EPF Board and management to encompassing the whole of its programme (i.e. not just the Swedish-funded component) and organisation in a single strategic framework, such as an organisational theory of change.

EPF can, and should, have increased focus on deepening capacity levels through a process that allows, and/or encourages grantees in their development by lengthening the period of involvement with EPF – which is particularly true when discussing the support necessary to 'grow up' grassroots organisations.

The programme of core support to specific NGOs has not been implemented widely enough, nor over a lengthy enough period for an effective assessment to take place. The support programme needs to be widened to include other organisations, and should include an external monitoring and/or evaluation process.

Impact will more likely be achieved by ensuring partners and grantees understand and are focused on the wider intent of programmes (as defined in EPF documentation), rather than on the specific nature of any particular funded initiative.

4 Recommendations

4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EPF

Recommendation 1 – Given that the intent of Swedish support is to further development within a framework of Swedish priorities, it is the view of the evaluation team that stronger linkages are required between these Swedish priorities for civil society development and the directions of the EPF programme.

- It is not our intention to overstate this recommendation, however EPF should be encouraged and enabled to continue the development of its strategic framework, and to set directions that are appropriate to its ethos and strengths, while having its thinking informed by Swedish priorities, and incorporating these priorities to the extent possible.

Recommendation 2 – In developing its future plans, EPF would benefit from the input of a *strategic planning specialist* in theories of change.

- A three- or four-day facilitated planning seminar, involving senior management and programme managers, is recommended.
- The focus of such a seminar would be to bring a longer-term focus to all of EPF's activities and initiatives, and will include a specific emphasis on linking the diversity of EPF's engagements into a coherent, strategic focus.

Recommendation 3 – It is recommended that EPF give *greater emphasis to engagement/civic engagement* in public (and internal) discussions.

- Seeing awareness-raising, advocacy, policy, legislation and capacity-building as components of the civic engagement focus is very relevant, but a greater emphasis on this over-arching intent is appropriate. Engagement is a strong term that describes the ethos and intent of the organisation well. It is somewhat lost in EPF's current narrative.

Recommendation 4 – EPF should better understand the views of stakeholders, and vary or reaffirm its stance on its public profile, based on a detailed assessment of stakeholder views and in *dialogue with stakeholders*.

- The strongly and consistently expressed view of these stakeholders is that EPF's role should be more visible in public, and that EPF should be more obvious in its public leadership role.
- The evaluation team does not have a view as to whether this is correct, but is of the view that EPF should better understand the views of stakeholders, and vary or reaffirm its stance based on this detailed assessment.

Recommendation 5 – The report discusses a grant-making programme with more variety in its tools, specifically in relation to the length of engagement with a given grantee organisation. A re-assessment of the current approach to grant-making systems is recommended, including the development of a methodology that is *more strongly focused on ‘growing up’ grantees, through longer-term involvement*.

- The evaluation team is supportive of the strength of systems and requirements for grantees.
- However, the consistent voice for flexibility requires consideration – not at the expense of accountability, but for a greater effectiveness by, and growth in, grantees.
- EPF can have a greater focus on deepening capacity levels through a process that encourages grantees in their development by lengthening the period of involvement with EPF.
- There is a view that a single grant, while beneficial, cannot achieve the necessary organisational development for many CSOs and CBOs, particularly organisations in the regions. One recommendation from the field was that smaller organisations, or organisations receiving their first grants, might actually be entitled, at the beginning, to a series of two, or three grants, each of a greater size and/or length. Conceptually, all three would be granted, but the second and third would only actually be given upon successful completion of certain management or administrative processes.
- While this approach is not specifically recommended, it is the view of the evaluation team that an assessment of the current approach is required.

Recommendation 6 – Greater focus on the development of the core support programme is required:

- More supported organisations need to be involved in the programme.
- More emphasis needs to be given in reporting - a direct correlation is needed between the project proposal (and its clear focus in this area), budgeted funds and provided funds, delivered activities and achieved outputs/outcomes.
- An external evaluation structure/process is required. The self-assessment and EPF assessment processes are acknowledged, but an external perspective is required.

Recommendation 7 – The holding of a grantees’ conference would provide practical benefits to grantees in terms of systems and knowledge, and would further relationships across civil society organisations.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EMBASSY

Recommendation 8 – Sweden should support EPF as appropriate in the organisation and/or funding of the strategic thinking/planning processes described in Recommendation 2 above. Sida’s framework agreement for advisory services on results framework may be used to access relevant support.

Recommendation 9 – It is recommended that Sweden provide support to EPF in further developing its skills (and its implementation activities) in gender equal approaches and in the development of gender equality more widely in its programme and in Georgia generally. The report has noted that EPF has developed significantly in this area but has expressed a need for assistance in moving gender-sensitive approaches beyond EPF itself, to its partners and grantees, and into society more generally.

Recommendation 10 – It is recommended that Sweden continue to make use of EPF as a ‘framework organisation’ – providing grants to civil society and community-based organisations to build a diverse and effective civil society in Georgia.

- See Recommendation 1.
- Sweden has established a relationship with EPF because the ethos and strengths of EPF have a synergy with Sweden’s priorities in Georgia.
- The EPF programme belongs to EPF, and should be allowed to develop within its own ethos and strengths.
- It is not inappropriate, however, for Sweden to ensure that EPF is aware of, and gives consideration to, Swedish priorities in informing its strategic directions. The ‘focus on the poor’ and the ‘gender perspective’ are two examples of this, but more specific Swedish priorities in the Georgian context are also relevant.
- The intent here is not to determine or change EPF priorities or directions, but to ensure that EPF has knowledge of, and considers, Swedish priorities in its own thinking and planning.

Recommendation 11 – It is recommended that Sweden address its requirements for assessments of overall efficiency and cost-efficiency, within the scope of programme and project evaluations. The evaluation team is of the view that an assessment of *overall efficiency* is of more value to Sida, to Embassy staff and to funded organisations, where this assessment incorporates analysis of governance, policy frameworks (human resource, finance, etc) *and* their implementation, planning processes (strategic and action) and their utility (i.e. whether or not there is a correlation between planning and actions), monitoring and evaluation systems and their impact on planning and implementation, communication systems (internal and external). Within Sweden’s development cooperation programme, it is likely that assessing, and assisting organisations with improvements in these areas, is of greater importance than *cost-efficiency* assessments.

Annex 1 – Key Informants

Eurasia Partnership Foundation

Name	Position
George Zarubin	EPF President
Ketevan Vashakidze	Country Director
Nino Khurtsidze	Associate Country Director
Camrin Christensen	Director of Development and Evaluation
Mariam Kobalia	Programme Manager, Youth Integration
Viktor Baramia	Senior Programme Manager
Vahtang Kobaladze	Senior Programme Manager, European Integration
Zaal Anjaparidze	Senior Programme Manager, Engage and Monitor for Change
Tamar Mosashvili	Programme Manager, CIJ
Nino Dzotsenidze	Organisational Development Director

Sida/ Embassy of Sweden in Tbilisi

Name	Position
Charlotte Lundqvist	Second Secretary; Development Cooperation Sida
Peeter Kaaman	First Secretary; Development Cooperation Sida
Eva Gibson Smedberg	Counsellor; Head of Development Cooperation

Grantees and Partners

Name	Organisation	Thematic group
Tatia Kereselidze	GSMEA	CIJ
Geno Geladze	Institute of Democracy	CIJ
Nino Zuriashvili	Studio Monitor	CIJ
Tamar Gabisonia	Article 42 of the Constitution	CIJ
Abel Gegia	Center protection constitution rights (CPCR)	CIJ
Kakha Kvashilava	CPCR	CIJ
Aleko Tskitishvili	Human Rights Centre	CIJ
Nino Merebashvili	Transparency International Georgia	CIJ
Zaur Khalilov	Civic Integration Foundation	CIJ
Giorgi Andguladze	Union of Democrat Meskhetians	CIJ
Anna Jobava	East West Management Institute -	CIJ

	JILEP	
Giorgi Kldiashvili	Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI)	CIIJ
Nino Jajanidze	Small and Middle Business Association of Georgia	CIIJ
Alu Gamakharia	Association - “Piece of Caucasus” Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Khatuna Khurtsidze	Human Right and Anti-Corruption Association “Sachino”, Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Khvicha Vashaqmadze	Information Centre of Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Khatuna Babunashvili	TV and Radio Company “Rioni”, Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Ilia Bodokia	Social Enterprise Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Laura Gogoladze	Newspaper – “My Kharagauli”, Kutaisi	Open Door Grant
Nana Phantsulaia	Women’s Fund Georgia	Open Door Grant
Maia Mamulashvili	Khakhetis Khma	Open Door Grant
Davit Gogoladze	Meskheta Development Center	Open Door Grant
Elene Chkheidze	ICSRPA	Open Door Grant
Lika Jamburia	Radarami	Open Door Grant
Tengiz Qiria	NGO – “Local Governance and modern challenges”	Open Door Grant
Ia Makharadze	NGO “Association of women Journalist”	Open Door Grant
Giorgi Gigolashvili	Georgian Insurers Company	Open Door Grant
Maia Chikoidze	Center of Environmental law	Open Door Grant
Elizabet Gogliardi	“Koda” Community Education Center	Open Door Grant
Mathias Huter	Transparency International Georgia	Open Door Grant
Magda Cockhelashvili	“Tiflisi Hamqari” Union	Open Door Grant
Jumber Khantadze	Union of mountaineers	Open Door Grant
Iago Kachachishvili	Institute of Social research and Analyze	Open Door Grant
Izolda Tigievi	International Association of Ossetian Women	Open Door Grant
Tinatin Barblishvili	(WPCA)	Eco-awards
Tamar Qachashvili	Caucasus Genetics	Eco-awards
Nino Gamisonia	Independent Feminist Group and	Eco-awards

	Partisan Girls, Georgia	
Tamila Chantladze	Communications Team Leader, BP	Eco-awards
Guram Jinchveladze	Rural Advisory Service	Eco-awards
Davit Kharazishvili	Association – “Mta-Bari”	Eco-awards
Zurab Manvelidze	Development Association of Adzharia	Eco-awards
Ramaz Miqueladze	Association “Flora-Fauna” F&F	Eco-awards
Shorena Chichikani	Association of Blind Persons	Support of civil society development
Teona Kalandadze	Center of Civil Society	Support of civil society development
Lia Todua	CSR DG	European Integration
Eka Mrulishvili	European Initiative – Liberal Academy Tbilisi	European Integration
Eteri Sarjveladze	Food Expert Association	European Integration
Ekaterine Kardava	Association “European Time”	European Integration
Shalva Melqadze	National Association of Independent Experts of Georgia	European Integration
Matti Lampi	Imprescon partners – Caucasus	European Integration
Natia Kalandarishvili	Office of the state Minister of Georgian on European and euro-Atlantic integration	European Integration
Mamuka Kupharadze	Studio- “Re”	European Integration
Mikheil Sokhadze	Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia LEPL – National Food Agency	European Integration
Vano Chkikvadze	OSGF	European Integration
Niko Nergadze	RFE/RL	European Integration
Rezo Kobakhidze	CFG Vice-president	European Integration
Kakha Gogolashvili	GFSIS	European Integration
Elene Shatberashvili	Elkane	European Integration
Mariam Gabunia	Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development	European Integration
Oleg Shatberashvili	Association European Studies for Innovative Development of Georgia	European Integration
Tamar Darchia	Economic Education Fund of Georgia	EMC
Mariam Merabishvili	Economic Education Fund of	EMC

	Georgia	
Ia Mamaladze	Georgian Regional Media Association	EMC
Anzor Gogitidze	Tusheti PA Friends Association	EMC
Zurab Mdzinarashvili	Gori Community Development Union	EMC
Mamuka Iskanderashvili	Georgian Civil Development Association	EMC
Giorgi Bokeria	Georgian Civil Development Association	EMC
Zviad Devdariani	Executive Director, Civil Development Agency - CiDA	NGO Core Support
Khvicha Gunia	Union “Hera”	Social enterprise
Boris Shkriabai	Union “Hera”	Social enterprise
Nana Chkareuli	Coalition or IDP Rights	Social Enterprise
Nodar Iashvili	Child and environment	Social Enterprise
Leila Miqaia	LTD “Giganti”	Social Enterprise
Tea Shamtava	LTD “Giganti”	Social Enterprise
Maka Dvalishvili	International Centre of Art	Social Enterprise
Zviad Archuadze	Head of Economic Affairs Office Tbilisi City Hall	Social Enterprise
Eka Datuashvili	Director, The Center for Strategic Research and Cooperation in Georgia (CSR DG)	Social Enterprise
R Michael Cowgill	First Vice-President, American Chamber of Commerce in Georgia	Social Enterprise
Jana Ledvinova	Czech Fundraising Centre, Prague	Social Enterprise
Vernon Ringland	Youth Bank International Coordinator, The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland, Belfast	Youth Integration
Fleur Just	Peaceful Change Initiative	Youth Integration
Valeri Gogichovi	Tserovani Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Rusudan Revazishvili	Tserovani Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Sulkhan Chargeishvili	Union of School Children	Youth Integration
Tako Khundadze	Chokhatauri Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mariam Gvenetadze	Chokhatauri Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Tornike Toria	Batumi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Salome Varshanidze	Batumi Youth Bank	Youth Integration

Beqa Beridze	Batumi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Temur Faghava	Batumi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Shmagi Apakidze	Rustavi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Viktor Sharapov	Rustavi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Davit Bezhashvili	Dedoplistskaro Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mari Khitarishvili	Akhalsikhe Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Vano Khitarishvili	Akhalsikhe Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mania Zalalian	Ninotsminda Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Arman Harutiunian	Ninotsminda Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Ophelia Vardanian	Ninotsminda Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Ani Datuashvili	Aspindza Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mariam Papelishvili	Gori Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Meri Tinikahvili	Gori Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mariam Lazarashvili	Gori Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Iza Modebadze	Tkibuli Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mariam Gabriadze	Tkibuli Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Diana Gocaze	Tkibuli Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Natia Dvali	Tkibuli Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Medea Zhvania	Zugdidi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Giorgi Kvaratskhelia	Zugdidi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Maia Kvikvinia	Khobi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Mari Iosava	Khobi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Givi Kuchava	Khobi Youth Bank	Youth Integration
Giorgi Tvalishvili	Georgian Association of Instructive Initiatives “ Siqa”	Youth Integration

Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed

- October 2007, *Core Support for the Establishment of Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, A proposal to the Swedish International Development Agency*, EPF document.
- November 2007, *In-depth Assessment Memo of – Core support for the Establishment of Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia*, Sida document.
- December 2007, *Agreement Between Sida And Eurasia Partnership Foundation On Core Support For Eurasia Partnership Foundation In Georgia During December 1 2007 and December 31 2010*.
- August 2010, *Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, A proposal to the Swedish International Development Agency*. EPF proposal.
- November 2010, *Assessment Memo Support to Georgian civil society through the Eurasia Partnership Foundation, 2011-2013*. Sida document.
- February 2011, *Evaluation of Eurasia Partnership Foundation Youth-Bank Project*, GeoWel Research.
- Undated, *Management/Programme Response to Georgia Youth Bank Programme Evaluation*, EPF management response to the external evaluation. EPF internal document.
- March 2011, *Towards European Integration Programme Evaluation*, Norman Dooley and Elguja Khokrishvili, Pacific Educator Group Inc.
- April 2011, *Impact Evaluation Final Report*, Strategicus Consulting.
- Undated, *Characterization of the Evaluating Organisation Strategicus Consulting*, EPF management response to the external Engage and Monitor for Change Evaluation.
- July 2011, *Management/Programme Response to Evaluation of the Programme Towards the European Integration (TEI)*, EPF internal document.
- June 2011 version. *Manual Of Policies And Procedures (Georgia)*. EPF.
- July 2011, *Core Support for the Establishment of Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, Completion Report, January 1, 2008 – December 31, 2011* (Executive Summary and 5 Attachments).
- May 2012, *Core Support to Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, Annual Report, January 1 – December 31, 2011*
- May 2012, *Sida comments to Eurasia Partnership Foundation Annual Report 2011 on the core support for EPF in Georgia covering the period 2011-2013*.
- August 2012, *Core Support to Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, Semi-Annual Report, January 1 – June 30, 2012*
- April 2013, *Core Support to Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Georgia, Annual Report, January 1 – December 31, 2012* (Narrative, 3 Annexes, 4 Work plans).
- Undated. EPF documentation on the NGO Core Support Processes – assessment templates etc.
- 2013, *Building A Young Constituency For Peace Across The South Caucasus And Turkey*, EPF Youth Bank brochure.
- 2013, *The results of CMI diagnostics*. EPF Powerpoint Presentation

Annex 3 – Terms of Reference

Review of the Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), 2008-2013

Evaluation Purpose: Sida wishes to procure a team of consultants for the review of the Swedish Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation 2008-2013. The main purpose of the review is to look at results achieved in relation to the objectives and expected results as expressed in the original project documentation. Effectiveness and efficiency are other important aspects, as well as the assessment of sustainability and ownership of achievements.

Intervention Background: Sida has been active in the region since the end of the 1990s and opened an office in Georgia in 2006. Since 2010 Sweden has a development cooperation strategy for Georgia, covering the period 2010-2013. One of the three prioritised sectors for the Swedish development cooperation with Georgia is democracy, human rights and gender equality. One of the objectives for this sector is “strengthened democratic structures and systems, with a focus on human rights and gender equality” and to achieve this objective it is stated that “Sweden will also support a more democratic and inclusive decision-making process where civil society actors (...) are given better opportunities to both participate in and influence political processes.”

Sida has supported EPF’s activities since 2008, in Phase 1 of the “Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation” during 2008-2010 (18,9 MSEK), focused on increased participation and commitment from the civil society in the public dialogue and political decision-making.

In 2010, Sida made a decision of a Phase 2 of the project lasting until December 2013. “The Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation 2010-2013” is therefore ongoing. The overall goal of EPF activities is “through operational programs and grant-making, EPF will provide opportunities for Georgians to engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level.” The ongoing projects supported by Sida (22,5 M SEK) has five programmes, each with a separate programme goal:

- *Engage and monitor for change* – to foster increased and better-informed citizen participation in social, political and economic decision-making.
- *Toward European Integration* – to promote civic participation in the process of Georgia’s integration into the European Union.
- *Community Empowerment through Youth Initiatives* – To increase capacity and give opportunity to local youth to engage as active citizens in identifying and addressing local needs.

- *Philanthropy, Social Investment and Social Entrepreneurship* – To enable CSOs to employ income generating activities in support of their organisational stability.
- *Open Door Grant-making* – To support local innovative pilot initiatives that increase civic engagement in social, economic and political events for replication on a larger scale.

35% of the Swedish funds have been earmarked for the “*open door grants mechanism*” and the remaining part used for the other programmes as well as for administrative costs. The idea behind the earmarking is to continue to stress the need for support to local community initiatives and local ownership as well as to provide an opportunity for organisations with ideas on addressing local needs in an innovative way.

EPF has furthermore in dialogue with Sida identified the need for delivering core funding to a few local NGOs with a clear mission statement, having demonstrated a willingness to develop organisationally. EPF set aside up to 750 000 SEK per year for this purpose. The involvement and engagement by the civil society on a local level is the core feature of EPF:s all different programmes. In order to reach the programme goals it is thus of central importance that EPF manages to identify the “right” actors that are striving for change in a participatory manner and that also are ready to defend minority rights.

Sida and EPF has established a close dialogue between the parties during the first phase of cooperation. The main issues that Sida has decided to follow during the present agreement phase, of which is of specific interest for the review, are the following:

- EPF core funding to a few local NGOs organisational development
- The earmarked support to the open door grants mechanism
- Gender equality related matters and how the issue is included in the different programmes
- Philanthropy, Social Investment and Social Entrepreneurship component

The mandate of the organisation is fairly wide and this has been discussed thoroughly between Sida and EPF, mainly with regards to the LFA and assuring that such a wide approach with fairly small grants to different organisations also can generate outcomes on an overall level and not only on the level of individual projects, which is of specific interest for the review. The focus should be to evaluate if the scope of the objectives and activities are most effective value added approach for EPF.

Review questions:

- Has the project achieved its goals and expected results? If not – what are the main reasons for that? Have the set goals and expected results been realistic? Have the choice of activities been relevant and strategic for the achievement of the set goals and results? How did factors within the operating environment affect the project strategy and results?

- How do beneficiaries and other stakeholders (civil society and community groups, media, government entities, youth, and enterprises) perceive the value the work of Eurasia? What do Eurasia's partners perceive as the value-added of working with Eurasia? What was the major change attained through the project?
- What is the assessment of the sustainability of the project? Sustainability of outputs and outcomes as well as sustainability of the partners in the project? Are there sustainable results for the target groups that the project has contributed to? To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after Sida funding ends? What are the opportunities and obstacles within the different components?
- Was the project implemented in an effective and cost efficient way? Has the organisational set-up of Eurasia been conducive to supporting the achievement of programme goals?
- What is the assessment of Eurasia's capacity to coordinate and cooperate with other development actors (NGOs, donors, state) in Georgia at different levels?

Methodology: The team will need to conduct a desk study of relevant documentation including project documentation, reports, Sida assessments and comments, country analysis, information about other Swedish supported initiatives within the field of civil society and democracy support, Eurasia guiding documents etc. This will be complemented by a visit to Georgia in order to conduct interviews with relevant stakeholders, including partner organisations and grantees. Local consultants would preferably be used. Meetings shall be held with the responsible officer at the Embassy in Tbilisi, as well as with Eurasia in Tbilisi. More details on methodology should be presented by the consultant.

Work Plan and Budget: The consultancy team should be able to start working in the end of March 2013. The review is expected to take maximum twenty working days, including five working days in Georgia (preferably during first weeks of April) for conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders. The budget ceiling for the assignment is 300 000 SEK.

The consultant should plan for an initial meeting with Sida when arriving in Georgia as well as a debriefing before leaving Georgia.

The consultancy team should present a draft report by April 25 and a final report should be submitted one week after having received comments from Sida and Eurasia on the draft.

Reporting: The team of consultants shall write a report of maximum 25 pages, (excluding appendices) including an executive summary and be structured mainly in accordance with Annex B in Sida's evaluation manual "Looking Back, Moving Forward". The draft as well as the final report shall be produced in electronic versions, the final report in PDF format.

Required skills and qualification:

- experience from conducting similar evaluations
- documented experience of international development cooperation, preferably from Eastern Europe
- at least five years of experience in evaluating/reviewing projects
- knowledge of civil society
- fluency in English
- knowledge of Georgian or other language spoken in the region will be an asset

Annex 4 – Inception Report

Executive Summary

This report summarises the evaluation team's understanding of the scope of the evaluation, and the Terms of Reference, and addresses both an understanding of the Evaluation Questions and how these questions will be assessed and reported on. Finally, the report details the evaluation team's approach and methodology for the evaluation, including initial thinking on the time frame for each component of the assignment.

Assessment of scope of the evaluation

Background to the assignment

Sweden has supported the Eurasian Partnership Foundation (hereinafter EPF) since 2008. In the original support – *Core Support for Eurasia Partnership Foundation* from 2008-2010, focus was placed on *increased participation and commitment from civil society in public dialogue and political decision-making*. In 2010 Sida decided to fund a Phase 2, for the period to the end of 2013. The overall goal of the on-going *Core Support* is that EPF will provide, *through operational programmes and grant-making*, 'opportunities for Georgians to engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level.'

Current Swedish support (22.5 MSEK over the programme duration) initially covered five programme areas, each with its own goal:

- *Engage and monitor for change* – To foster increased and better-informed citizen participation in social, political and economic decision-making.
- *Toward European Integration* – To promote civic participation in the process of Georgia's integration into the European Union.
- *Community Empowerment through Youth Initiatives* – To increase capacity and give opportunity to local youth to engage as active citizens in identifying and addressing local needs.
- *Philanthropy, Social Investment and Social Entrepreneurship* – To enable CSOs to employ income generating activities in support of their organisational stability.
- *Open Door Grant-making* – To support local innovative pilot initiatives that increase civic engagement in social, economic and political events for replication on a larger scale. Thirty-five percent of Swedish funding has been earmarked for this component of EPF's work.

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation scope is very large, given the nature of EPF's programme. In particular, the number of partners and grantees and the geographic spread of funded

initiatives are considerable. Each of these will impact the approach taken by the evaluation team. This has a bearing on the impact on the evaluation logistics as well as analysis, and has therefore influenced the proposed methodology.

The purpose of the evaluation is to ‘look at results achieved in relation to the objectives and expected results as expressed in the original project documentation. Effectiveness and efficiency are other important aspects, as well as the assessment of sustainability and ownership of achievements.’ Focusing on results, value-adding, change, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, Sweden is specifically interested that the evaluation look at the following areas of EPF’s work:

- EPF core funding that supports the organisational development of a number of local NGOs.
- The earmarked support to the open door grants mechanism.
- Gender equality related matters and how the issue is included in the different programmes.
- The Philanthropy, Social Investment and Social Entrepreneurship component.

Relevance and evaluability of evaluation questions

The Embassy wishes to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the EPF approach, as a way to encourage the development of broad civic engagement. The specific work of EPF, as well as the work and approaches of its partners/grantees are all relevant to this discussion.

The evaluation will address a range of questions around the aims and programmes of EPF, both in the current framework, and with regards to the programme of the initial three-year agreement. The focus is in relation to outcomes, within the stated EPF framework described in the project documentation: that EPF will ***provide opportunities for Georgians to engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level***. The work of EPF within the current framework intends to achieve this goal through two things:

- Operational programmes in six areas (the five described above, plus civic initiatives for an independent judiciary).
- Grant-making (through competitive processes and through the open-door mechanism described as one of the operational programmes).

The evaluation will attempt to assess the effectiveness of EPF’s focus on operational support and small grants, to a variety of organisations, and in developing organisational capacity (strategic and management) that contributes to outcomes beyond the level of individual operational programmes and grantees; i.e., to understand *if, and how*, this approach has contributed to outcomes. Are these approaches effective? Are some more so than others? Are they efficient in their use of resources – is it possible to make comparisons between different organisations and approaches in this area? Is EPF effective in addressing the ambitious nature of its goals, or would it be more effective with a more focused strategy and portfolio?

The evaluation team has undertaken a document review in preparation of its approach and methodology, and this Inception Report. The documentation provides a clear point of departure for analysis of the work and intended outputs and outcomes of the EPF programme.

Evaluation questions

The inception report proposes that the structure of the evaluation questions, as described in the Terms of Reference, be adjusted somewhat to bring it into line with the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria. Some additional questions have been added to enhance the analysis.

Relevance

The evaluation will assess whether or not the design and activities of the EPF programme were relevant to partners, civil society development more generally in Georgia, and addressed developmental priorities appropriately.

- How do beneficiaries and other stakeholders (civil society and community groups, media, government entities, youth, and enterprises) perceive the value of the work of EPF?
- What do EPF's partners perceive as the value that working with EPF has added to their work?
- Have the choice of activities been relevant and strategic for the achievement of the set goals and results?
- Are the programme's directions strategically structured i.e., are current initiatives *and* future directions and plans well developed and focused?
- Has the programme applied a perspective of the poor on development and a rights-based perspective in their activities (through the principles of participation, non-discrimination, transparency and accountability)?
- Does the programme mainstream gender or otherwise ensure that gender equality is proactively addressed? If so, has the programme contributed to improved gender equality?
- One aspect of the focus of enquiry is the EPF programme's theory of change. Is the theory of change sufficiently well framed and focused to better deliver outcomes (and impact)?

Effectiveness

As the focus of the evaluation is on results, the focus of enquiry will be here, in assessing the actual outputs and outcomes of the work of EPF. Enquiry will focus on the perceptions of partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, looking closely at how they perceive what has been achieved. Discussions with EPF staff will also address this area, with a view to understanding their perspective on their work and their results.

- Is the EPF programme's theory of change clearly described, with appropriate descriptions of activities, outputs and outcomes. Is the EPF programme clearly delivered within the described theory of change?

- Has the theory of change been adjusted to respond to the dynamically changing context in Georgia? How did factors within the operating environment affect the project strategy and results? Were these factors managed well by EPF?
- Has the programme achieved its anticipated outputs and outcomes? If not – why not? Has EPF management responded effectively to this success or lack of success?
- Is civil society developing? Has the programme been effective in providing opportunities for Georgians to ‘engage in social, economic and political developments in order to effect substantive and sustainable socio-economic improvements at the local, regional and national level’?
- Is the programme contributing at the level of the grassroots organisations supported by EPF? Specifically, are grantees and partners developing their organisational capacity through the programme? Are outcomes being achieved by grantees and partners?

Efficiency

Enquiry will address the general efficiency, as well as cost-efficiency of the programme’s implementation, although the scope of the study and the detail of documentation will limit the study of cost efficiency. The scope of the evaluation does not allow for a detailed cost analysis of EFP’s work.

- Is the programme being implemented in an effective and efficient way? Judgements of efficiency and cost-efficiency will be based on a general appraisal of programme and project management, rather than on a detailed, quantitative, comparative analysis against specific costs. The analysis will attempt to answer questions of programme and administrative structure and efficiencies based on information acquired in the fieldwork. Specific focus will be given to administrative systems and policies, grant procedures and policies, finance procedures (including financial analysis and reporting) and strategy/planning processes.
- Are the systems and structures of EPF’s work with partners and grantees sufficiently flexible, while maintaining high standards of accountability?
- Has the organisational set-up of EPF been conducive to supporting the achievement of programme goals?
- What is the evaluation team’s assessment of EPF’s capacity to coordinate and cooperate with other development actors (NGOs, donors, state) in Georgia at different levels?

Sustainability

Enquiry here will focus on an analysis of the existing and developing capacities of partners, in particular, with a view to understanding how their organisational and developmental skills have developed, where challenges in this area still exist and how EPF contributes to the current direction of organisational developmental processes among its partners. Questions will be addressed directly to partners, to EPF staff and to beneficiaries, in order to gain a number of different perspectives on this area.

- What is the assessment of the sustainability of the project? Sustainability of outputs and outcomes as well as sustainability of the partners in the project?
- Has EPF's programme contributed to sustainable results for its target groups, i.e., are organisational and management structures becoming more strategic and effective; is the financial security of organisations becoming more stable?
- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after Swedish funding ends?
- What are perceived as the most significant opportunities for, and obstacles to, sustainable development outcomes within each of the five programme areas?

Impact

In addressing the question of change, enquiry will look at *what is different* for partners and beneficiaries as a result of their participation with EPF.

- What was the major change for partners and beneficiaries as a result of the EPF programme? This outcome question is the focus of the evaluation.
- Where possible, comment on change in society, influenced by or as a result of the EPF programme, will be noted.

Limitations to the evaluation

Discussions and quantitative analysis of *cost-efficiency* will be constrained by the quality and extent of programme and comparative documentation and discussions. Documentation that has been received to date will not allow a detailed discussion of cost-efficiency to be undertaken, and the data required for a comparative analysis does not exist. *As described above*, judgements will be based on a general appraisal of the efficiency of programme and project management.

The work being undertaken is not an impact evaluation. The evaluation team will address questions of change, at the partner/grantee level, and where that change may have contributed to a wider change in society, but the focus of the study is the change at organisational level (partners, grantees, EPF), and on outputs and outcomes.

Proposed approach and methodology

Approach

The evaluation has been divided into four phases. Each phase is discussed below.

Phase 1: Inception phase – 1 - 9 April 2013

This report is the deliverable from the inception phase, although it is noted that, due to the compressed nature of this phase, further preparatory work is being undertaken concurrent with inception processes. The inception phase included the desk review of relevant documents (although it is anticipated that further documentation is yet to be provided). Apart from the document review, developing a detailed understanding of the numbers and locations of partners and grantees is deemed critical for the inception processes, and specifically in development of the evaluation methodology (and in particular the specifics of the field enquiry). This has not yet been possible to be completed, as detailed documentation on partners and grantees is not yet available to

the evaluation team. It is anticipated that this detail will be developed between the 5th and 9th of April, with interview and focus groups being arranged concurrently.

Field instruments (interview questions and focus group conversation formats/questions) are being developed and will be shared with The Embassy and EPF ahead of the fieldwork.

Phase 2: Fieldwork/Data collection – 10 - 19 April

An initial plan for the fieldwork has been developed, although it requires refinement when the evaluation team receives contact details (geographical information). It is based on the team's methodological approach, described below. The fieldwork will take place in Georgia between 10-19 April. At this stage it is anticipated that early fieldwork (week 15) will be with EPF, the Embassy and 'non-stakeholders', to enable schedules with partners and grantees to be arranged with more time available, to be undertaken during week 16.

The evaluation team will seek, from EPF, both budgets and expenditure follow-up, broken down by the components/objectives/results and activities found in the results framework to analyse the efficiency of the programme.

After the conclusion of the fieldwork, it is proposed that the evaluation team facilitate a validation workshop with EPF and the Embassy on 19 April. This will be an opportunity to enhance learning with the stakeholders by sharing preliminary findings and validating the conclusions and recommendations.

Phase 3: Data analysis and draft report – 22 April through 10 May 2013

The evaluation team will undertake a thorough analysis of the inputs and feedback from the fieldwork (M&E data from EPF, documents and interview notes). The team will analyse the findings from the fieldwork, and, where necessary, raise questions or obtain further information and feedback from the Embassy, EPF or partners/stakeholders.

Phase 4: Final report - 7 June 2013.

Following the analytical process, the evaluation team will prepare the draft evaluation report, which Indevelop will quality assure.

The Draft Evaluation Report will be submitted to the Embassy on 15 May 2013. A Skype/phone meeting will be held following submission of the Draft Evaluation Report. This meeting, which will include the Embassy and the evaluation team, will allow the team to present its findings. Following the meeting the Embassy and EPF will provide comments (by 22 May) and the evaluation team will finalise the report.

The Final Evaluation Report will be submitted on 5 June 2013.

Methodology

As is indicated previously, enquiry will focus on EPF documentation and the views of stakeholders and non-stakeholders with knowledge of EPF.

The evaluation team has met, via phone, with both the Embassy and EPF, as part of the inception process, and has studied a range of project and project-related documentation. On the basis of the Terms of Reference, Indevalop's proposal, these early discussions and the documentation, a methodology has been developed for the evaluation. The methodology is focused on qualitative enquiry, addressing the experience and thinking of four groups:

- The Embassy.
- EPF personnel.
- EPF partners and grantees.
- Other knowledgeable actors (key experts /none stakeholders).

The approach to each of these groups will vary, to some extent.

The Embassy

Subject to conversations with Embassy staff, it our intention to meet with, and interview, Charlotte Lindquist and Peeter Kaman. This interview is intended to gain a Sida/Embassy perspective on EPF – its work, outcomes and challenges. This meeting will take place earlier in the fieldwork, and, as well as being useful to the analysis in its own right, will help to refine the questions of the evaluation team with other groups.

EPF personnel

The evaluation team will meet with the Country Director and Associate Country Director, and separately with the President and programme officers. The first of these meetings will be quite extensive, and therefore lengthy, as it will address all questions of the evaluation in some detail. It is likely that many additional questions will come out of this interview, questions that will be addressed to an extent with partners and grantees. A follow-up meeting is likely, although not certain. The interview with the President is intended to provide an organisational (but not operational) perspective on EPF's activities and results. The discussion with programme officers will be done as a focus group, give a field perspective and allow some triangulation of the discussions with the higher level staff.

EPF partners and grantees

The focal point of the field enquiry will be, of course, EPF partners and grantees in Tbilisi and across Georgia. The evaluation team has given considerable consideration as to how this large and geographically diverse group can best be covered most effectively, in order that the feedback to the evaluation's enquiry is as detailed and considered as possible. There must be a focus on 'grassroots' organisations and on impact at the local level. To this end, criteria for selection of individuals and organisations for participation in the fieldwork have been developed, rather than applying random selection, which will ensure a methodological approach. It is not intended that this criteria be exclusive, but that it ensures certain aspects of EPF's

work are covered. Four selection criteria are proposed for the selection of partners and grantees (individual and organisations):

- *Geographical coverage.* The criteria will work to ensure a complete, or relatively complete, coverage of the regions where the programme works.
- *Thematic coverage.* All thematic areas will be covered.
- *Contribution size.* Organisational (or project) size. Some variation in size will be ensured, although it is intended that there be a greater overall coverage of larger projects and organisations.
- *Period of implementation.* Both current and earlier projects will be included. Less recent initiatives have the potential to show greater or lesser sustainability and impact, while more recent programmes offer the possibility of greater detailed reflection from partners and a more current sense of priorities and relevance.

As a further consideration, the evaluation team will seek, from EPF staff, inputs on the projects/organisations that they feel are most representative of ‘success’ and organisations/projects that they feel were less successful, or failed. The juxtaposition of these aspects will hopefully provide some insight into success factors and factors for failure, and the evaluation team will address some specifics related to ‘success’ when making enquiries with these stakeholders.

Other knowledgeable actors

This enquiry will focus on organisations such as other donors (EWMI, USAID, CIDA, the EU, the Open Society Foundation) with a knowledge of Georgia generally and the issues and priorities in the fields in which EPF works. They will also have some knowledge of the work of EPF. Further interviews will take place with NGOs working in fields related to the work of EPF, organisations such as Transparency International, GYLA and Kvinna till Kvinna. Finally, discussions will be held with relevant government representatives, as appropriate.

The intent of this component of the field enquiry is to cross-check and verify to feedback and inputs from other interviewees, and to provide comments on the key issues that should be addressed in ascertaining the relevance and effectiveness of the results of EPF and its stakeholders. It is not expected that any of these interviewees have specific or detailed knowledge of EPF, or its work; but where this knowledge exists it will be drawn on in the analysis.

Enquiry methodology

The evaluation methodology begins with a thorough document review. This review includes a detailed assessment of the project proposals (including logical frameworks) and project reporting. The programme documentation provides the evaluation team with an understanding of the described theory of change for the programme, and provides the background for understanding the work and intent of EPF. Reporting is analysed against planned activities and intended outputs and outcomes. The document review will, together with the evaluation questions and responses from EPF, partners

and grantees, allow the evaluation team to understand activities, outputs and outcomes against plans, and to engage in an analysis/comparison through these processes.

The basic field methodological approach will be interviews and focus group meetings/workshops. The focus group approach has two benefits in this type of analysis.

- The format of the focus group meetings will encourage and draw out participation from participants that goes in a direction different to that which occurs in an interview – participants will be encouraged to build on the discussion of others, and the conversation will be structured and designed to draw out analysis from the group.
- While the focus groups will address all aspects of the enquiry described above, the structure of the meeting will be to focus on results and effectiveness.

These focus groups will be the key component of the fieldwork, and the evaluation team is structured and organised to hold a number of these meetings in a range of locations.

Method for interviews and focus group discussions

The following discussion provides some description of the methodological approach that will be taken by the evaluation team in the field. As indicated above, some variation to this approach may be indicated upon receipt of all relevant information related to partners and grantees, but it is likely that this will be only minimal.

The specific ‘field instruments’ (interview guides and focus group discussion formats) are being developed, and will be shared with The Embassy and EPF when they are completed.

Interviews

Interviews will be held with key informants from EPF, the Embassy, other donors, Government and civil society organisations that do not receive support from EPF. The interview guides focus on the likely knowledge and experience of each interviewee, and therefore vary as to content and length.

Discussions with donors, government and other civil society organisations will have a greater focus on the relevance of the EPF approach and programme, although the discussion of effectiveness and results is appropriate where this knowledge is present. These individuals provide a cross-check/triangulation perspective on the views of EPF and its partners/grantees, particularly in relation to relevance, and what can be described as the strategic trajectory of the EPF programme.

Discussions with EPF personnel will be extensive, as they will have the most detailed understanding of the programme, and partners and grantees. They will also be in a position to comment on all aspects of the enquiry. These discussions are, by their nature, from an organisational perspective, and require some cross-checking/verification. They will therefore be held earlier in the timeframe of fieldwork, as much as this is possible, with some variation to other interview questions based on the responses from EPF’s staff.

Focus group discussions

It is intended that all partners and grantees contribute to the field enquiry in focus group discussions, although where required by logistics, interviews with single organisations/individuals will be held. In these cases, the content of the interviews will largely follow the programme of the focus group meetings.

Together with the work done with EPF staff, the focus group discussions with partners and grantees will be the key component of the fieldwork. By its nature, the EPF programme looks to have impact *through* its partners/grantees, while at the same time having impact *on* these organisations, specifically in terms of the growth of organisational capacity. Questions to be addressed with the focus groups include the relevance and effectiveness of the EPF approach, as well as a number of questions related to change and development within each organisation. The evaluation team will be specifically interested in hearing about examples of changes in strategy, structure, methodology and outputs/outcomes within partners/grantees as a result of the work they are doing with EPF support/inputs.

Timeframe and deliverables***Timing***

The inception phase will be completed between 1 and 9 April.

Fieldwork will be carried out between 10 and 19 April.

Analysis will be undertaken between 22 April and 10 May.

Reporting will take place between 10 May and 5 June.

Milestones/deliverables

Submission of Inception Report: 5 April 2013.

Inception Report approved: 9 April 2013.

Submission of Draft Report: 15 May 2013.

Comments from The Embassy: 22 May 2013.

Submission of Final Report 7 June 2013.

Other issues and recommendations**Evaluation standards**

The evaluation and the reporting will follow DAC's evaluation quality standards. Per these DAC standards (see:

<http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/dcdndep/36596604.pdf>) the overarching considerations include:

- **Development evaluation** - Development evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed development intervention, its design, implementation and results. In the development context, evaluation refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of a development intervention. When carrying out a development evaluation, the following overarching considerations are taken into account throughout the process.
- **Free and open evaluation process** - The evaluation process is transparent and independent from programme management and policy-making, to enhance credibility.

- **Evaluation ethics** - Evaluation abides by relevant professional and ethical guidelines and codes of conduct for individual evaluators. Evaluation is undertaken with integrity and honesty. Commissioners, evaluation managers and evaluators respect human rights and differences in culture, customs, religious beliefs and practices of all stakeholders. Evaluators are mindful of gender roles, ethnicity, ability, age, sexual orientation, language and other differences when designing and carrying out the evaluation.
- **Partnership approach** - In order to increase ownership of development and build mutual accountability for results, a partnership approach to development evaluation is systematically considered early in the process. The concept of partnership connotes an inclusive process, involving different stakeholders such as government, parliament, civil society, intended beneficiaries and international partners.
- **Co-ordination and alignment** – To help improve co-ordination of development evaluation and strengthen country systems, the evaluation process takes into account national and local evaluation plans, activities and policies.
- **Capacity development** - Positive effects of the evaluation process on the evaluation capacity of development partners are maximised. An evaluation may, for instance, support capacity development by improving evaluation knowledge and skills, strengthening evaluation management, stimulating demand for and use of evaluation findings, and supporting an environment of accountability and learning.
- **Quality control** - Quality control is exercised throughout the evaluation process. Depending on the evaluation's scope and complexity, quality control is carried out through an internal and/or external mechanism, for example peer review, advisory panel, or reference group.

Quality assurance

Indevelop strives to provide high quality in all of its evaluations and we will carry out systematic quality control to meet both Swedish and OECD/DAC requirements. The evaluation will have quality control as an integrated part of the assignment management procedure, regardless of the different scales of the activities. Our commitment to delivering high quality services requires effective quality assurance mechanisms. For this we have developed, and apply, a quality assurance system, which is compliant with ISO 9001:2000, and managed by Indevelop's Project Manager.

We will request feedback on the evaluation through a performance assessment form, both on the process, the team, deliverables (reports) and other outputs. The feedback will ensure the continuous improvement of the services.

Ms Jessica Rothman is the appointed Project Manager (category 2) at Indevelop's office in Stockholm who is responsible for managing the assignment's implementation. She will ensure coordination that leads to the kind of evaluation process that Sida has committed itself to in the evaluation guidelines, which include learning and utility (usefulness). She will specifically have contact and liaison with Sida, managing the financial and contractual aspects of the assignment, providing

monitoring and coordination of the quality assurance process during implementation, back stopping and support to the team and to facilitate support as needed.

Dr Ian Christoplos is the Project Director (category 1) responsible for quality assurance on all assignments implemented under the framework agreement. He will provide technical backstopping and quality assurance on methodology and the draft and final reports to ensure that the reports are in line with Sida's requirements. He will ensure that the evaluation is in line with Sida's Evaluation Guidelines and meet the OECD/DAC quality standards for evaluation. His role is in ensuring that evaluators without extensive experience with Sida norms are guided and briefed accordingly.



Review of the Core Support for The Eurasia Partnership Foundation (EPF), 2008-2013

The evaluation assesses the core support provided to Eurasia Partnership Foundation since 2008 by Sida. EPF's support to civil society, which includes building organisational capacity and contributing to civil society's influence on Georgia's future direction, is effective. Civil society is increasing its engagement in civic affairs, particularly in awareness-raising work with citizens and with municipal and state administrations. EPF's support to civil society includes a focus on building coalitions which play a critical role in change processes. Young leaders are being empowered, and are playing a more visible role in community development. EPF provides Sweden with an effective mechanism for the distribution of assistance to civil society organisations. Some refinements are required to EPF's strategic approach and its theory of change to better assist EPF's management in the analysis of EPF's work and results.

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>

