Mid-Term Evaluation
Citizens Advocate! Program

Final Report
April 2004

Evaluation team members:
Jennifer Stuart
Elena Kordzaya

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The USAID-financed Citizens Advocate! Program (CAP) is designed to promote civil society development in Georgia, improve the capacity of CSOs and create an enabling environment so that CSOs can promote citizen interests and effectively advocate their cause. This program operates through a three-year, $2.2 million cooperative agreement with Save the Children Federation, US (SC).

Save the Children Federation, US (SC) works with a team of leading local organizations with complementary strengths to implement this civil society development program. CAP is directed and largely implemented by the Advocacy Steering Committee (ASC), composed of SC and the following six local NGO partners: United Nations Association of Georgia (UNAG), Center for Change and Conflict Management/Partners-Georgia (PG), Civil Development Center "Alternative" (CDCA), Civil Society Institute (CSI), Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSRDG), and the Caucasian Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD). The partnership between these seven organizations provides the opportunity for extensive mentoring and training over the life of the program. The team also includes the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL) to provide technical assistance and support on legal reform issues.

The strategy for implementing CAP focuses on four inter-related components:
1. Effective CSO issue-based advocacy through coalitions made up of Tier 1 and Tier 2[1] NGOs and other stakeholders from the community;
2. Increasing the institutional and financial viability of CSOs, pursued largely through the provision of technical assistance packages to members of the above-mentioned coalitions;
3. Improving the legal framework and regulatory environment for CSOs; and
4. Increasing citizen participation in the policy process and oversight of CSOs.

A key component of the exit strategy of CAP is the creation of an Advocacy Resource Center (ARC), an indigenous institution which will further develop advocacy skills and practice within civil society in Georgia.

This document summarizes the mid-term evaluation of CAP conducted in Georgia in January 2004 by a team of independent evaluators. The purpose of this evaluation is to analyze the progress of CAP by: reviewing actual versus planned progress toward achieving key expected results, identifying progress to date, delays, issues and the reasons for them; and identifying new opportunities and directions for the program over the remaining year and a half.

The two-member evaluation team spent one week in Georgia. It reviewed program documents, conducted face-to-face interviews with USAID/Caucasus, Save the Children/Georgia Field office staff, ASC members, and representatives of the NGOs benefiting from CAP assistance. The team met with members of 5 of the 8 coalitions supported through CAP.

---

[1] Four Development Tiers were identified based on Cumulative Organizational Development (COD) scores of interviewed Georgian NGOs. Tier One organizations are at a higher level of organizational development, and Tier Four at the lowest.

I. BACKGROUND

A. USAID/Caucasus' Civil Society Reform Objectives

The Citizens Advocate! Program (CAP) contributes to USAID/Caucasus' Strategic Objective (SO) 2.3, "Increasingly Efficient, Transparent and Accountable Local Governance" and Intermediate Result (IR) 2.3.2, "NGOs/CBOs and Media Actively Promote Citizen Interests," and its sub-IR 2.3.2.2 "Increased Institutional Capacity of NGO/CBOs Involved in Advocacy."

B. Goals and Objectives of the CAP Program

As part of its new approach, USAID initiated CAP in 2001 to enhance democracy and governance in Georgia by introducing the concept of advocacy, as well as to build the capacity of local NGOs. The program is designed to promote strong and capable NGOs that have the means to mobilize the citizenry and build coalitions with other stakeholders to advocate for citizen interests, lobby for policy reform, and strengthen democratic institutions. The overall goal of CAP is: *To improve the capacity of CSOs and create an enabling environment so that CSOs can promote citizen interests and effectively advocate their causes*. This goal will be achieved through three sets of results, relating to 1) issue-based advocacy via coalitions of targeted CSOs working with the public, 2) an enabling legal and regulatory environment and 3) public support for the Third Sector in Georgia.

CAP activities are broken down into four categories:
1) Effective CSO Issue-based Advocacy;
2) Increased Institutional and Financial Viability of CSOs;
3) Improved Legal Framework and Regulatory Environment for CSOs; and
4) Increased Citizen Participation in the Policy Process and Oversight of CSOs.

C. Evaluation Approach

1. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology

The objectives of this evaluation are (1) to assess CAP accomplishments and continuing challenges within a context of the overall development of civil society in Georgia, determining what works well and what does not and why, and to evaluate impact of the program both on the local and national levels, and (2) based on that assessment, to recommend ways that USAID and the grantee might improve the current program during its final year and a half of implementation. This second point is particularly relevant in light of the rapidly changing political conditions in Georgia, sparked by the so-called "Rose Revolution", which has led to dramatic changes, including the appearance of many new players on the political map.

Program document review. The evaluation team reviewed a considerable number of program documents prior to beginning the evaluation, including:

- SC's CAP technical proposal
- USAID-SC cooperative agreement
- SC's detailed implementation plans (Years 1 and 2)
- SC quarterly reports
- SC request for applications (RFA)
- Countrywide NGO Assessment (authored by SC's Georgian partners UNAG and CSRDG)
- Public Opinion Survey on Attitudes towards NGOs (authored by partner CSRDG)
- Legal Barriers Survey (authored by partner CSI, formerly known as GBLC)

- Georgia NGO Sustainable Index, 2002 and 2003 (written by SC for USAID)
- CPG summaries
- Various documents on Advocacy.ge website (http:/www.advocacy.ge)
- CAP press release
- CAP briefing paper
- USAID/Caucasus Annual Report (results/accomplishment)
- Georgian partners' annual reports, training manual, questionnaires, plans
- PG's and UNAG's annual report and brochures

Personal Interviews. Interviews began in Tbilisi, Georgia with USAID/Caucasus team members. The team then met with members of the CAP Advocacy Steering Committee, Save the Children CAP staff, and representatives of all six local members of the ASC – Partners Georgia (PG), Civic Development Center "Alternative" (CDCA), Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD), Civil Society Institute (CSI), United Nations Association of Georgia (UNAG) and the Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSRDG). The team also met with many recipients of CAP assistance, including participants in various training programs, participants in drafting the Code of Ethics, members of the Non-Profit Legal Monitoring Group, and CPG members. The team met with all of the members of the CPGs in Ozurgeti (led by the Young Scientists' Club of Ozurgeti) and Kutaisi (led by the Georgian Young Economists' Association), as well as CSO members from the CPGs led by Civitas Georgica, ICCC and IIEPPM. In total, the team interviewed more than 75 people. (A full list of institutions and individuals met with can be found in Annex C.)

2. Evaluation Team Members
The evaluation team consisted of two professionals, one American and one Russian:
- Jennifer Stuart   NGO Specialist in the Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, USAID/Washington
- Elena Kordzaya   Independent Evaluator from Russia who has completed MSI training courses in program evaluation

The evaluation team extends its thanks for the time, effort and hospitality extended to it by the Georgian citizens who generously devoted their time in interviews and/or responded to the team's questions. These individuals clearly shared the team's commitment to finding ways to improve the effectiveness of future USAID efforts supporting Georgian NGOs. The findings and recommendations contained in this report are based on the team's collective data gathering and analysis effort. The opinions and recommendations should not be attributed to individuals who provided some of that information.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and recommendations resulting from this evaluation are presented in five major sections: management structure, effective CSO issue-based advocacy, increased institutional and financial viability of CSOs, improved legal framework and regulatory environment for CSOs, and increased citizen participation in the policy process and oversight of CSOs.

Before proceeding with the findings and recommendations, it is necessary to clarify that the evaluation team had a very short period of time (6 days) in country to talk with stakeholders. While all possible efforts were made to obtain the necessary and relevant information, it is possible that some details about CAP activities or other programs may have been overlooked or misinterpreted due to the limited time available. Any mistakes or omissions are the team's

responsibility alone. It is further necessary to clarify that recommendations are based on an ideal case scenario, recognizing that it may not be possible for SC to incorporate all suggestions due to funding or human resources limitations. These recommendations will need to be discussed and prioritized by USAID/Caucasus and CAP. Finally, many of the recommendations may be best pursued through links with other programs rather than directly incorporating them into CAP. These are noted, where possible.

A. Management Structure

As indicated above, the CAP program is administered by Save the Children's Georgia Field Office. USAID awarded a cooperative agreement to Save the Children in August 2002 with expected three-year funding totaling $2.2 million. SC provides the bulk of these funds to various Georgian NGOs who help implement the project or who carry out programs in issue-based advocacy and lobbying.

A key feature of CAP is the active participation of a coalition of six Georgian NGOs in the design and implementation of the program in the form of the Advocacy Steering Committee (ASC). This management model combines collective planning and individual inputs from the seven agencies. The ASC members plan joint activities, monitor and evaluate activities, and cooperate with CPG recipients. This partnership provides the opportunity for extensive mentoring and training over the life of the program. The International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL) is also an important partner in the implementation of CAP, with a focus on legal reform issues. ICNL's involvement in CAP includes: building NGOs' awareness of the legal environment in which they operate and closely monitoring how laws and regulations affect NGO operations.

CAP's management structure is somewhat unique in that the lead organization (SC) shares responsibilities for the program equally with its Georgian implementing partners. While SC is the primary recipient of USAID's funds, all of the members recognize the partnership as an effective mechanism for management and decision-making. The leading role of SC in this partnership is intended to strengthen the partners and the linkages between them, respond to new ideas, and to comply with USAID rules, procedures and reporting requirements. The ASC's local members play an active role in project implementation, with each member specializing in different areas, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities.

As a result of this partnership, each organization's capacity is enhanced, allowing the ASC to consolidate its role and transform itself into the Advocacy Resource Center (ARC), an independent organization that will enable the Georgian partners to continue working together to promote advocacy and civic activism. Local ASC members are taking the lead in defining the ARC's mission, working principles and organizational structure.

The decision was made to establish the ARC in the middle of Year Two instead of Year Three to ensure a smooth transition from USAID project funding via SC to a Georgian entity serving Georgian civil society. Much time has been spent defining the concept and the form of the future entity. It was decided that the ASC's local members would serve as founders for this locally-registered institution (which will likely be registered as a foundation) and that resources from the founders' organizations will be contributed and consolidated for ARC's development. By the end of the CAP, the new entity will allow donors to build on accomplishments to date.

Findings

Strong/Neutral:

- The combination of an American lead organization enforced by Georgian partners seems to be an effective management arrangement with the added benefit of increasing the Georgian partners' experience and sustainability. (See general findings on page 17)
- Despite its many benefits, working as a team of equal partners and managers is time-consuming when it is time for decisions to be made, given the number of opinions that must be heard and reconciled, the lengthy discussions that must be had, and issues of quality control.
- Each member of the ASC specializes in different, specific directions with roles clearly defined from the beginning of the program. CDCA covers training, media monitoring and ethics; CSI focuses on the legal component; CSRDG is involved with promotion campaigns, surveys, and NGO strengthening; CIPDD initiates NGO sector study and debate on critical issues, and is creating a donor database; PG provides trainings and consultations; and UNAG is involved in research, NGO promotion campaigns, and website design and development.
- Program decisions and activity design have been based on good research and information, including the use of several surveys.
- CAP established effective and transparent systems for the competitive award of grants, including the issuance of Requests for Application and a four-tiered evaluation system that included a review for basic technical requirements, review by an expert panel, pre-qualification visits, and then selection of the "best and final". During the first year, the RFA was circulated widely to appropriate audiences and generated proposals from 48 coalitions.
- Monitoring of grantees, conducted through regular reports and site visits, is very thorough, as evidenced by SC staff's high level of knowledge about the progress of individual projects. Knowledge gained through monitoring is shared with the CPGs, and solutions are jointly developed to address problem areas.
- ASC's members play an active role in monitoring, providing technical assistance and advice to CPGs. This is particularly relevant as ASC's members are also a CSO coalition, providing them with first-hand insight into the potential challenges CPGs may face.
- USAID's hands-on role in project oversight is highly appreciated and found to be both substantial and beneficial.

Weak:

- The significant changes in the country caused by the "Rose Revolution", which has included numerous personnel changes in official structures and high expectations within the NGO community, points to the need to further improve the process of planning and learning how to work together in a constantly changing environment. ASC members have been very flexible to date, reacting quickly to this changed environment.
- The purpose and rationale for establishing the ARC is agreed upon by all ASC members. However, the role and management of the ARC is not yet fully developed, and would benefit from additional thought and work concerning concept and design. Future funding for an independent ARC is also undefined. Given these uncertainties, the decision to create the ARC earlier in the program cycle is commended.
- Quarterly programmatic reports provide a detailed picture of operations and financial activity, but provide little substantive information on results or impact.

Recommendations

❑ The transition to a local Chief of Party in the final year of the program needs to be more structured and carefully planned. While the team has confidence in Indira Amiranashvili's capacities, many important changes will be taking place in the program simultaneously, and a step-by-step plan should be devised to shift responsibilities gradually in order to ensure a smooth transition. It is important to note that the transition from an ex-pat to a local Chief of Party will not only effect these two positions – changes in responsibilities will likely be needed throughout the small program staff and detailed thought will need to take place to determine how to manage the same work-load in the final year of the program with one fewer staff member. Furthermore, it is possible that this management transition will require a shift in responsibilities between SC and the ASC members. (See general findings on page 18.)

❑ Given the unique and successful management arrangements for this program, the evaluation team recommends documenting the management system and process and disseminating this experience throughout the development community. While much of its success depends on variables that are not necessarily replicable, certain aspects may be easily incorporated into other programs.

❑ Programmatic reports should focus more on results, impact, and analysis, in addition to documenting program activities over the previous quarter. The evaluation team recommends the addition of analytical sections to the program reports to demonstrate the impact of the project.

❑ In order to facilitate the establishment of the ARC, the team recommends having a retreat to formulate a strategic plan that covers the ARC management, operation, beneficiaries, services, and sustainability. This process would benefit from the use of outside facilitators or experts in strategic planning and organizational development to ensure that the plans developed for this complicated structure are realistic. In particular, for the sustainability of this initiative, it is important that the ARC is structured in a way that allows it to continue operating even if the six ASC members choose to no longer work together in the future. Sustainability will also require flexibility to respond to new clients and the changing needs of the environment. Other important issues to cover are ownership of ARC's combined resources and the responsibilities of the founders. Measurable indicators of success should also be developed for the ARC, to ensure that this important process remains on target. It is vital that the ARC founders agree on a common vision and strategic plan for the operation of this entity.

❑ While an in-depth discussion should be had about the ultimate relationship between ARC and CAP, the team presents the following possibilities for this relationship. First, during the life of CAP, there will be an automatic, although informal, relationship between CAP and ARC due to the fact that CAP's steering committee members will be the ARC's founders. It may be desirable to formalize this relationship by having the CAP Program Director (or other relevant staff) sit on the Board of Directors of ARC. Additionally, it may be desirable for ARC to be used as an implementing partner during the final year of CAP. This would have the benefit of giving it a track record with donor funding, which may facilitate getting additional donor funding in the future. However, contractual issues should be explored to see if this is allowable under USAID regulations.

❑ While the local ASC members are amongst the most developed NGOs in Georgia, they could also benefit from additional explicit organizational development assistance than that currently provided under the program, which is largely focused on financial management.

B. Improve and Strengthen Issue-based Advocacy

"It has been almost a decade since Communist governments fell like dominoes in the countries of the former Soviet bloc. The democracies that have emerged since then were shaped in large part by their citizens' desire for an open society. A democratically elected government does not guarantee an open society, however. The people in these countries had to learn to forge dynamic links between themselves and their governments…"… NGOs should "… strengthen democracy by identifying problems requiring public action, studying and analyzing options for dealing with them, and making their findings widely available to the public"

-- Raymond J. Struyk,
Reconstructive Critics: Think Tanks in Post-Soviet Bloc Democracies,
The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1999, p. xiii

Thirteen years after Georgia gained its independence and aspired to become a democracy, Georgia's NGO sector has yet to realize its full potential as a partner in the reform process. NGOs have limited skills and experience in determining constituency needs and efforts and pushing these issues with the relevant authorities, while also facing a legal and regulatory environment that undermines their financial sustainability and does not support linkages with the governmental and private sectors. At the same time, governmental bodies are not yet accustomed to the practice of soliciting or incorporating input from NGOs. Finally, citizens rarely look to NGOs to as a means of solving their problems. All of these hurdles will need to be overcome in order to develop a sustained practice of issue-based advocacy in Georgia.

In order to develop skills in issue-based advocacy, CAP competitively awarded Civil Partnership Grants (CPGs) to coalitions of NGOs to address issues they identified as vital in their communities. CPGs are led by Tier 1 and Tier 2 NGOs After a thorough review process, CPGs totaling $599,748 were awarded to nine coalitions, which included 37 NGOs. One of these grants, to Partners for Social Initiative, was later canceled due to inadequate performance.

#	Lead NGO	Project title	Duration	Total grant amount ($)
1	Georgian Young Lawyers Association	Improving Governance in the Sphere of Social Security	18 months	71,576
2	Civitas Georgica	Power of the Powerless	14 months	68,083
3	International Institute of Educational Policy, Planning and Management	Democratization of the Educational System and Financial Transparency	12 months	71,702
4	Partnership for Social Initiatives	Informed choice	23 months	73,260
5	Georgian Young Economists' Association	Campaign for the Protection of Social Interests in Kutaisi	23 months	70,995
6.	Association for Legal and Public Education	Let's build out School	18 months	69,017
7	Young Scientists Club "Intellect"	Trio	23 months	70,667

8	Young Scientists Club of Ozurgeti	The City Awakens	18 months	65,454
9	International Center for Civic Culture	Realization of Voters' Rights	9 months	38,994
	TOTAL			599,748

For the most part, coalition members did not have direct experience working together. However, CPGs were required to sign memoranda of understanding and to clearly divide responsibilities before grants were awarded. While legal restrictions necessitated individual grants to each coalition member, systems were put into place to ensure that the lead NGOs, listed above, were responsible for coordinating both programmatic and financial reporting, and for ensuring that the project stayed on track.

Experience to date indicates that working with coalitions has several benefits. The lead organizations gain valuable experience in leading and coordinating projects. All organizations benefit from the experience of working in a team and sharing responsibilities. However, in order to full realize these benefits, it is apparent that coalition members still need coaching and assistance at this stage.

Findings

Strong/Neutral:
- CAP created a detailed mechanism for awarding the multi-year grants to coalitions and networks around issue-based advocacy. Perhaps most importantly, the mechanism was transparent, serving as an important demonstration of good governance to the NGO community.
- Due perhaps in part to the rigorous CPG selection process described above, nine well-developed proposals by coherent coalitions were funded. (One of these was later terminated due to inadequate performance.)
- Three of the projects funded were based in Tbilisi, five were based in secondary cities, and one covered the whole country.
- The pre-proposal training in advocacy that was provided through World Learning was found by local NGOs to be very beneficial, and undoubtedly contributed to the high quality of project proposals developed, noted above.
- Lead NGOs gain valuable experience in how to lead others, share responsibilities, and work in a team.
- CPGs are addressing important issues in their communities, which they were able to identify themselves, rather than being limited to specific donor-identified priorities.
- From the CPGs that the team visited in Ozurgeti and Kutaisi, it seems that coalition members are working together fairly well as a team with shared responsibilities, although the degree of equality among members seems to vary.
- Some CPGs are successfully attempting to expand their coalitions. For example, through the IIEPPM-led CPG, each coalition member is responsible for creating a local education support network.
- CPGs seem to recognize the advantages of working in coalitions, citing benefits such as being able to launch activities in different regions at the same time and spreading information more widely.

- At least some CPGs are capitalizing on projects funded by other donors. For example, the Kutaisi coalition as well as IIEPPM had links with Soros and Eurasia Foundation socially active schools projects.
- Some campaigns have made significant use of formal mechanisms, e.g., Young Economists' and Young Scientists' public hearings in Kutaisi and Ozurgeti, Intellect's use of FOIA in Batumi, GYLA's work with Sakrebulo commission, IIEPPM's accessing budget info through FOIA, etc.

Weak:
- CPGs are finding ways to develop positive working relationships with local officials, but have been unsuccessful or have not attempted to include businesses in their efforts, despite the intentions evidenced in SC's proposal.
- Since the Rose Revolution, NGOs have been debating whether their role should be one of watchdog over the government or partners to the government.
- Due to limited Internet access in many areas of Georgia and the generally weak understanding of the benefits of using the Internet, advocacy.ge is somewhat limited in its outreach. (These areas include the following regions: Akhaltsikhe, Akhalkalaki, Tsalka, Tetri Tskaro, Dmanisi, Kvemo Kartli, Samkhret Djavakheti, mountain regions, etc.)

Recommendations

While the environment in which advocacy is taking place has changed significantly over the past few months, the team sees no need to dramatically re-direct CPG campaigns. However, each campaign should revisit their strategic plans to see if actions can be completed sooner or if steps need to be repeated due to changes in key personnel. This may also be a good time to initiate additional advocacy efforts. Recommendations to improve and strengthen issue-based advocacy are grouped around three main themes:
- Spread impact – Given the fact that the program only works directly with a relatively small number of NGOs, the team makes the following recommendations to spread the practice of issue-based advocacy in Georgia and increase the impact of their work through relatively low-cost interventions.
  - Develop advocacy tools and materials based on CPG experiences and disseminate them for others to use.
  - Develop systems to ensure that TOT efforts are maximized, such as requiring trainers to deliver a minimum number of trainings after going through TOT courses.
  - As the program is winding up in year 3, plan a retreat or conference for all CPG members to come together and discuss lessons learned, with a focus on advocacy tools and approaches, as opposed to progress and successes of individual projects.
  - Spread the information published on advocacy.ge and other related Internet sources more widely, for instance through use of an information hub system in places with active CPGs or through the use of EF and Horizonti citizen information centers and programs. Ideally, these resources would be available not only to NGOs, but also to businesses and government agencies.
  - Add additional links to advocacy.ge to other sites, including other organizations and donors in Georgia and relevant resources in other countries. Also provide additional explanations about what information can be found in various sections in order to make more user-friendly.
  - Translate more materials into Georgian on advocacy.ge.

- Make sure that advocacy.ge is being used to present materials developed by different international agencies and USAID partners concerning issues of interest, such as electoral reform, taxation, legislation, anti-corruption activities, and freedom of information.
- Develop a plan to ensure that the advocacy.ge website continues to be used after the project, if this has not been done yet.

❑ <u>Involve other partners more</u> – Successful advocacy efforts involve productive partnerships among individuals and institutions from all segments of society. The following are a few specific recommendations to better engage key partners outside of the NGO sector in such efforts:
- Businesses should be more directly targeted for involvement in several of the supported advocacy campaigns. In many cases, businesses' interests would seem to converge directly with the issues being advocated. Businesses can bring many resources to bear to promote these efforts.
- As successful advocacy campaigns often depend on the willingness of local authorities to cooperate, including local authorities in advocacy training in some way may be beneficial. This would be particularly useful if targeted at the relevant local authorities in CPG locations, and could take the form, for example of role-playing, with local authorities and NGOs switching roles. Unless local authorities have an understanding of this process and more positive impressions about NGOs and their activities, advocacy campaigns will have limited success.
- Provide training for journalists working on social issues to increase media coverage of CPG programs. This could be done through coordination with the IREX media program. Alternatively, journalists could be more actively engaged in the program by linking CPGs working on social issues and journalists covering these issues to increase collaboration. Finally, professional journalists could perhaps be used to train NGO managers on communication skills and publications.

❑ <u>New skill development</u> – As advocacy becomes more widely understood and pursued in Georgia, there will be greater demand and capacity for more sophisticated techniques and skills, such as the following:
- If relevant, update advocacy tools and manuals to ensure relevance in changing environment. This can be done by providing follow-up training, preparing updated materials, or putting information on advocacy.ge.
- While Georgia has a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), government agencies often do not follow its precepts and NGOs have little experience in how to pursue FOIA requests, which may help their advocacy campaigns. Therefore, targeted training to increase understanding of FOIA in the context of advocacy campaigns for CPG members would be beneficial. Given IRIS' focus on this issue, this may be best pursued through coordination with their ongoing efforts.
- Additional training should be provided to supported CPGs on communications strategies, as specifically related to setting realistic expectations among citizens. Without such an emphasis, it is very possible that advocacy campaigns will get citizens rallied around a cause, but when change does not happen immediately, they will get disillusioned and disengage. This seemed to already be the case in Ozurgeti, where the community had lived without reliable sources of water for decades, but now that it had become a prominent issue, many citizens expect results immediately, despite the fact that it will require a relatively long-term

approach. While CDCA's July 2003 Communication Training may have directly addressed this issue, it may be necessary to have a follow-on session on this topic.

– Where possible, CAP should push to institute formal mechanisms for advocacy, including public hearings, public comments on draft legislation, and advisory committees to legislative bodies. The team found that most advocacy efforts in Georgia still relied primarily on personal connections, although several CPGs have made use of such mechanisms (see finding on page 9). While this seemed to yield some good results, setting up systems to ensure that those without personal connections also have access would be advisable. Given recent events in Georgia and the new government's apparent openness to more input from civil society, now would be a good time to push for such institutionalized mechanisms.

C. Development of Institutional and Financial Viability of NGOs

Civil society organizations in Georgia are still quite underdeveloped, relying largely on individual strong leaders. As a result, the development of effective, participatory structures capable of giving voice to citizen demands for better governance is a key component of this activity. In order to provide CPG members with organizational development support, Save the Children conducted organizational assessments of 2 NGOs (the lead and one member) from each CPG. Organizational assessments examined board management, staffing, volunteers, strategic planning, financial accountability and audits, regional representation, public reporting, community relations, and membership. NGOs then analyzed the results and identified three priority areas for further technical assistance. The most common areas identified for additional assistance were human resource management, strategic planning, volunteer management, financial and program transparency, and regional representation. In addition to this individualized training and technical assistance, PG and CDCA provide training more broadly on advocacy, gender, media relations, and fundraising.

In recognition of poor public awareness and confidence in NGOs, as demonstrated in CAP's NGO Survey and Public Opinion Survey, the program also facilitates the creation and adoption of an NGO Code of Ethics (CoE) for the Third Sector. This is viewed as important as the significant growth of the NGO sector over the last decade has not included the development of standards of self-regulation and accountability. The Code is being developed with involvement of several NGOs, and will acknowledge NGOs' duty to serve and be accountable to the Georgian public. Developing a Code of Ethics is one way to improve NGOs' image through creation of working principles accepted by the sector as a whole.

Other initiatives that fall under this IR include CIPDD's efforts to create a donor database and CSRDG's efforts to create an expert database. Both will provide NGOs with easy access to valuable information.

Findings

Strong/Neutral:
- ❑ The quality of training received is generally rated high by beneficiaries. Training programs seem to be structured, participatory, client-oriented and issue-based.
- ❑ Technical assistance is also provided to NGOs to increase their skills in preparing applications for funding.

- While the draft of the Code of Ethics is being developed by an elite group of Tbilisi-based NGOs, there is a plan to incorporate wider input from the NGO community and donor buy-in once a draft is in hand.

Weak:
- Throughout Georgian society, there is a focus on strong individuals rather than strong institutions. This is a particular problem right now, as many NGO leaders are leaving the sector to accept positions in the new government, leaving organizations behind without strong leaders and managers. Increased focus on organizational development can help avoid such problems in the future. Most of the CAP participants will require considerable technical assistance to become strong, viable institutions.
- Given the changing reality in the country, there should be additional follow-up consultations to ensure that new needs are being addressed.
- Training participants expressed interest in other thematic trainings not planned by CAP, including legislative work (how to work with existing legislation, legislative drafting, work with legislative bodies), presentation skills/public relations, use of courts to access information, constituency building/transparency (including report writing and proposal development), and effective use of media.
- The focus on developing a Code of Ethics was generated primarily within the ASC without a wider consultative process. While surveys were used to verify the problems the Code of Ethics is designed to address, there is no evidence of widespread demand within the NGO sector for such a code.
- The plan to implement and monitor the Code of Ethics once the language is agreed upon is somewhat undeveloped, focusing primarily on an award program.
- The majority of NGOs do not seem prepared to accept some of the transparency principles addressed in the Code of Ethics, for example publishing annual reports, opening their records to the public, and speaking out about their resources.
- Most panel discussions were organized around very general topics. The results of these discussions, which took place in Tbilisi, were not promoted sufficiently in the regions. However, the discussions are documented, allowing a larger group of NGOs to gain access to the nature of the discussions.

Recommendations
Recommendations for further strengthening this component of the program are broken down into three categories, each representing a different core activity.

- <u>Training and technical assistance for organizational strengthening</u> – Given the fact that the program is only able to provide direct training and technical assistance to a small number of NGOs, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations to spread organizational development skills in Georgia through relatively low-cost interventions.
    - Given that Save the Children took the lead in conducting the organizational assessments and developing the TAPs for organizational strengthening afterwards, the team recommends trying to indigenize these skills and experience as much as possible. One way to do this is to develop a TOT program in organizational assessments and organizational strengthening, ensuring that trainers then utilize their experience appropriately. An emphasis should be placed on local trainers and consultants to ensure that these efforts are available to regional NGOs. Once the ASC is comfortable

with the Organizational Assessment tool developed, this should also be shared widely.
- The TA packages that were developed for individual NGOs should be shared more broadly to ensure that other NGOs have access to them. This could be done on www.advocacy.ge or through the listserv, newsletters, and regional meetings.
- Add training for CPGs and other NGOs on specific topics, such as: legislative process (how to work with existing legislation, legislative drafting, working with legislative bodies), presentation skills/public relations, use of courts to access information, constituency building/transparency (including report writing and proposal development), and effective use of media (how to work with media – cooperate with IREX media program).
- Continue to ensure that training reaches deep into organizations. In other words, make sure that training is not focused just on organizational leaders, but also reached project managers and other staff. Following training with individualized consultations would further strengthen the impact of such efforts.
- As only 2 members of each coalition receive organizational development assistance, require training participants to share the knowledge they gain from this process with other CPG members. Follow-up will be necessary to ensure that this happens.
- Take advantage of expertise in the field of organizational development in other countries, including the USAID-supported Russian Resource Centers (links can be found through www.irex.ru , PRO-NGO section) and materials on the website www.ngo.org.ru, a virtual library for the NGO sector with distance learning courses.

- ❑ Code of Ethics
    - In addition to simply sharing the draft Code of Ethics with NGOs in the regions, it will be important to provide them with a solid understanding of the purpose of such standards and principles. As this Code of Ethics is based primarily on the needs of more developed NGOs, they are unlikely to have such understanding at this time.
    - Better targets and indicators of success for this program activity should be developed, for example, the number of organizations to adopt the Code by certain dates or active involvement by number of Tier 1-2 NGOs in testing the Code.
    - Once the Code of Ethics is adopted by a critical mass of NGOs, organize public campaigns to spread understanding of this practice among the public. If the broader public does not know about the Code or the standards set within it, it will do little to improve NGOs' public image in society. Media coverage, including through the use of student journalists, should be an important part of this effort.

- ❑ Panel Discussions

    - Panel discussions on more narrow issues of interest should be considered.
    - The reports from the panel discussions should be distributed as widely as possible, not only to other NGOs, but also to decision-makers, donors, and

other interested parties. However, while others may be interested in the discussion, they may not be able to digest the full-length reports currently being published. Therefore, short summaries should be prepared for this wider audience.

D. Enhanced Legal Framework and Regulatory Environment of CSOs
Without an appropriate legal framework, NGOs are limited in terms of what they are able to accomplish and their level of sustainability. Georgia scored a 3.5 on the Legal Environment section of the 2003 NGO Sustainability Index, which is directly in the middle of the scale. Problems with the current legislation include lack of tax benefits for donors, commercial tax rates on earned income. The Civil Society Institute (CSI) and ICNL take the lead on this program component, monitoring legislation and lobbying for a more appropriate legal framework and building NGO capacity and awareness regarding legal compliance.

Findings

Strong/Neutral:
- ❑ The Non-Profit Legal Monitoring Group successfully stopped implementation of several regressive measures over the past year and a half.

Weak:
- ❑ Successes to date seem to be largely based on personal connections, rather than a systematic lobbying effort, and have directly involved a relatively small number of NGOs.
- ❑ A new long-term strategy for NGO legal reform should be developed now due to the new environment. Given the make-up of the new government, they may be more receptive to NGO initiatives to change and improve legislation. However, this is not guaranteed, and new legislative developments should be carefully prioritized in order to push the most important through first.

Recommendations
- ❑ It is time to focus on implementing positive changes, rather than stopping negative ones, which CSI and ICNL seem prepared to pursue. However, while there are indications that the new government will be more receptive to positive changes in laws regulating NGO affairs, it is important not to assume that they will automatically implement all desired changes. There will be a need to keep pushing for change. A lesson can be learned in this regard from Serbia, where the NGOs that were instrumental in toppling Milosevic are still awaiting the new legislation they were promised over 3 years ago.
- ❑ Ensure that a larger portion of the NGO sector is involved in pushing for legislative change. To date, these efforts seem to have been limited to a small group, which has worked to date, but this may not always be the case. Furthermore, as future efforts will focus on implementing changes, rather than maintaining the status quo, it will be even more important to get NGOs' buy-in on and understanding of recommended changes.
- ❑ As mentioned in the advocacy section, this may be an appropriate time to push for the institution of formal advocacy mechanisms, such as public hearings, advisory groups, etc. Doing this in conjunction with other needed NGO legal reforms may be appropriate.

□ Work more closely with NDI, IRI, ABA/CEELI and IFES on legislative reform issues where interests intersect.

E. Increased Citizen Participation in Legislative Process and CSO Oversight

Several NGOs interviewed by the evaluation team acknowledged the lack of understanding within the general public about their activities. This was confirmed by the "Sociological Study of Public Attitude Towards NGOs", conducted by CAP through CSRDG in 2002, which found that only 8.7% of the population is well-informed about NGO activities. The business community tends to not trust NGOs and only 8 % would consider contributing to NGO activities, with most preferring in-kind donations over financial contributions. The segment of the population most active in their willingness to cooperate with NGOs is youth. Media's attitude towards the sector can be described as neutral.

To reverse these trends, CAP partners UNAG and CSRDG aim to turn around the public's negative perceptions and attract public support, with a focus on youth and business, in NGO activities through public education and public events, media campaigns and NGO fairs. Planned public awareness campaigns seek to increase the general public's knowledge of and support for NGOs. During interviews, UNAG and CSRDG showed clear understanding of the current situation in Georgia where shorter and more focused campaigns are needed to show NGOs' diversified, improving image, and demonstrating to the public that NGOs provide a broad range of services to different segments of society.

The overarching campaign *The Purpose We Serve* combines public information messages disseminated through media, activities and public events, with the participation of a group of volunteers, including journalism students, who write articles about various NGOs and get them published in different newspapers. (To date, 15 articles have been published.) The evaluation team met with representatives of this group and found that the students showed clear understanding of NGO activity and are eager to work with NGOs in the future. The students also confirmed that CSRDG provides them with adequate support and information.

Findings

Strong/Neutral:
□ CAP disseminates the findings of its various research projects through a variety of traditional methods, including website and dissemination of reports to key individuals and organizations. Dissemination efforts are generally not designed to promote or advocate policy changes.
□ The planned campaigns were designed based on results of public opinion surveys, providing them with a solid baseline and rationale for the activities and focus.
□ The campaigns originally planned are being redesigned based on the new situation in the country in order to increase effectiveness, demonstrating the flexibility of CAP implementers.
□ The use of the example of a literacy organization founded in Georgia 125 years ago is a good way to demonstrate Georgia's historical traditions in charity and community service.
□ CAP is making good use of volunteers (including the journalism students) to inform the population about the diversity of NGO activities.
□ Potential demand from youth to be involved in NGO activities is being appropriately capitalized upon.

*Recommendations (*due to fact that this aspect of the program is not yet fully launched, the evaluation team had limited recommendations at this stage*)*

- ❑ Provide wider training to NGOs and journalists to increase coverage of NGO activities.
- ❑ Capitalize on the historical example of charity in Georgia, and find other historical examples, if available. Promote these ideas as widely as possible through the website, newsletter, CAP's partners, and other programs (including IREX).
- ❑ Encourage business participation in NGO events organized under this program component.
- ❑ Consider renaming this IR in consultation with USAID. As currently formulated, it does not capture very effectively the activities pursued under it. Rather than focusing on citizen participation in legislative process and CSO oversight, it should state clearly that activities under this IR are focused on improving the public image of NGOs within Georgian society.

III. CONCLUSION

Overall, the team was impressed with the quality of the CAP program, and commends SC, the ASC members, and USAID/Caucasus for their work. This very ambitious program has remained largely on track, despite the very turbulent environment in which they operate. Furthermore, the program addresses issues across the CSO-development spectrum for a relatively limited amount of money and with a very small core staff. As a point of comparison, the NGO development program in Croatia, a country of a roughly similar size, operates with a $9 million, 3-year budget. SC and their partners should be commended for stretching their budget so far. In addition to the findings and recommendations listed above that relate to specific program components, the evaluation team also wanted to share the following general thoughts that relate to the program or the Georgian NGO sector as a whole.

General Findings:

- ❑ Continued efforts to build Georgian advocacy skills are warranted. Advocacy remains a new concept among Georgian CSOs, and without continued support, the continuation of advocacy efforts may be in doubt. Nevertheless, many CSOs exhibit a significant degree of independence and are increasing their technical capacity, preparing them to play an increasingly important role in providing quality analysis and advice on policy issues. By helping them to take on a greater advocacy role – informing the public and building coalitions of stakeholders around particular issues – their impact will increase and further strengthen political pluralism. Further work in this area should include both additional assistance to currently supported CSOs and an expansion to benefit additional CSOs.
- ❑ The combination of an American lead organization enforced by Georgian partners seems to be an effective management arrangement with the added benefit of increasing the Georgian partners' experience and sustainability.
- ❑ The transition to a local Chief of Party in the final year of the program needs to be more structured and carefully planned. While the team has confidence in Indira Amiranashvili's capacities, many important changes will be taking place in the program simultaneously, and a step-by-step plan should be devised to shift responsibilities gradually in order to ensure a smooth transition. It is important to note that the transition from an ex-pat to a local Chief of Party will not only effect

these two positions – changes in responsibilities will likely be needed throughout the small program staff and detailed thought will need to take place to determine how to manage the same work-load in the final year of the program with one fewer staff member. Furthermore, it is possible that this management transition will require a shift in responsibilities between SC and the ASC members.

- Working as a team of equal partners and managers is time-consuming when it is time for decisions to be made, given the number of opinions that must be heard and reconciled.
- Each member of the ASC specializes in different, specific directions with roles clearly defined from the beginning of the program. CDCA covers training, media monitoring and ethics; CSI focuses on the legal component; CSRDG is involved with promotion campaigns, surveys, and NGO strengthening; CIPDD stimulates NGO sector study and debate on critical issues, and creates a donor database; PG provides trainings and consultations; and UNAG is involved in research, NGO promotion campaigns, and website design and development. They also play an active role in monitoring, providing technical assistance and advice to CPGs.
- CAP established effective and transparent systems for the competitive award of grants. (More details in section A "Management Structure). This mechanism was transparent, serving as an important demonstration of good governance to the NGO community.
- USAID's hands-on role in project oversight is highly appreciated and found to be both substantial and beneficial.
- Some CPGs are successfully attempting to expand their coalitions. They seem to recognize the advantages of working in coalitions, citing benefits such as being able to launch activities in different regions at the same time and spreading information more widely.
- The quality of training received is generally rated high by beneficiaries. Training programs seem to be structured, participatory, client-oriented and issue-based.
- Although the program is starting to yield some impact in terms of institutional development, many CPG members are not yet viable and will require additional assistance to become sustainable.
- Policy change is more likely when key government officials are poised to accept the analysis and recommendations of CSOs; therefore, complementary efforts to build the government's acceptance of CSO input and ability to respond to advocacy efforts are encouraged.
- A new long-term strategy for NGO legal reform should be developed now due to the new environment.
- CAP is a complicated program with many different pieces that reinforce each other to varying degrees. New activities should always be designed to reinforce current initiatives.
- The ASC needs to be careful not to represent itself as "representatives" of the sector, despite the leading role that they currently play. While ASC members are influential members of the sector, they have not been elected to represent other NGOs.
- Gender and youth are meant to be cross-cutting issues addressed throughout the program. However, while there are specific activities designed to address both gender (gender training) and youth (youth campaign), these themes are not addressed comprehensively throughout other program activities.
- There is a sense among NGO representatives with whom the evaluation team met that the NGO sector should act as a monolith, representing unified opinions. While there are cases where this is desirable (for instance in terms of issues that affect the

whole sector, such as NGO legislation), NGOs should reflect the diversity of opinions that exist within society and should engage in healthy debate with one another. To the extent possible, CAP should encourage this type of pluralism within the sector.

❑ Given the exciting political events of the past several months, there is a great deal of optimism about the new government and future of the country. While some optimism is certainly warranted, it is important to keep expectations realistic. Those that are entering the government now often have a greater affinity for the issues being addressed by CSOs, but their perspectives and interests will change once they become members of the government.

❑ Collaboration between CAP and other development projects in Georgia is apparent. However, USAID/Caucasus should encourage other donors and programs to work more closely with CAP and leverage resources as much as possible to increase impact.

❑ While this program includes many different components and activities, the existence and involvement of the ASC ensures that all activities are well-coordinated and that appropriate linkages and synergies are maximized. The team had no specific recommendations on how to improve linkages.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A – Evaluation Scope of Work

USAID/Caucasus/Georgia
Mid-Term Evaluation of the Citizens Advocate! Program

Scope of Work

Activity to be evaluated

USAID/Caucasus Mission's Cooperative Agreement No. 114-A-00-02-00140-00 to Save the Children Federation to implement the Citizens Advocate! Program for Georgia. The effective dates of the Cooperative Agreement are August 12, 2003 through August 11, 2005. The total amount of the CA is 2,200,000.00

Background

Citizens Advocate! Program (CAP) comprises the Mission's first program in issue-based advocacy and lobbying. Citizens Advocate! Program was initiated in August 2002 by the US NGO Save the Children and its partners, the International Center for Not-For-Profit Law (ICNL), and a coalition of six Georgian NGOs including:

United Nations Association of Georgia (UNAG)
Center for Change and Conflict Management "Partners-Georgia"
Civic Development Center "Alternative"
Civil Society Institute
Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSRDG)
Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD)

CAP aims to strengthen civil society by pursuing three sets of results: 1) NGO coalitions pursue issue-based advocacy and lobby for citizen concerns at both the national and local levels; 2) Improve the legal and regulatory environment for the Third Sector; 3) Increase public support for NGOs.
A key feature of CAP is the active participation of the coalition of six Georgian NGOs in the design and implementation of the program. CAP is guided by the Advocacy Steering Committee (ASC), composed of Save the Children and its Georgian NGO partners. This management model is combining collective planning and individual inputs from the seven agencies.

CAP Outputs during the three years will include:

- Support of advocacy campaigns led by CSO coalitions promoting citizens' interests in the regions.
- Strengthened management and governance of CSOs undertaking advocacy around the country.
- Enhanced CSO awareness of their legal rights and obligations.
- Draft legislation to facilitate CSOs' activities and operations - introduce charity legislation as a core element of a regulatory framework that supports NGO sustainability through local funding and self-financing.
- Conduct public outreach campaigns to increase citizens' awareness of and participation in CSOs.
- Formulate an NGO Code of Ethics.
- Establish a website, with information and resources to enhance CSOs' advocacy efforts.
- Establish the Advocacy Resource Center (ARC), which will work to promote advocacy and civic activism.

Progress to date

Following an in-depth NGO country-wide survey and assessment, in June 2003, CAP awarded *Civic Participation Grants (*CPGs) of approximately $75,000 each for an 18-month period to nine coalitions,

representing a total of 37 NGOs throughout Georgia. These advocacy campaigns address school reform and education, monitor municipal budgets, inform the election process, and protect human rights.
CAP conducted **organizational assessments** of 18 CPG grantees and has identified with them their priority capacity needs, to be addressed over the life of the CPG grants.
CAP launched the **www.advocacy.ge** website**,** which serves both as a listserve for nonprofits throughout Georgia and as a resource center. The website provides analytical articles and information on advocacy efforts in Georgia, up-dates visitors on CAP activities, reports on the Civic Participation Grant advocacy campaigns, provides advocacy tools, case studies, useful links, databases to support advocacy activities and online legal consultations for NGOs.

CAP also identified the regulatory roadblocks to an active and effective civil society through **Legal Barriers Survey** providing a comprehensive picture of the actual regulatory environment of CSOs around the country.

In response to seven legislative initiatives undertaken by different State and political organizations, CAP together with twenty six local NGOs established a Non-for-Profit Law *(*NPL) Monitoring Group. The group monitors and seeks to improve the legal environment to defend Georgian civil society interests *vis-a-vis* legislative projects initiated by the government or political parties, and to lobby for further improvements of non-for-profit legislation.

Following nationwide public opinion survey on attitudes towards CSOs, CAP developed a **public outreach strategy** to increase citizens' awareness of and participation in CSOs.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation shall be to:
1. analyze the progress of the Citizens Advocate! Program (CAP) and it's specific results to date in four areas:
   - NGO coalitions pursuing issue-based advocacy and lobbying for citizen concerns at both the national and local levels;
   - Improving the legal and regulatory environment for the NGO Sector;
   - Development of Institutional and Financial Viability of NGOs;
   - Increasing public support for NGOs.

This will be done by reviewing actual versus planned progress toward achieving key expected results, identifying progress to date, delays, issues and the reasons for them;
2. assess CAP accomplishments and continuing challenges within a context of the overall civil society development in Georgia; evaluate impact of the program both on the local and national levels.
3. offer recommendations for the further implementation of the program considering possible consequences and effects of the "Velvet revolution", including forms of cooperation with the new Government.
4. offer recommendations for the transition from a USAID-funded project to the Advocacy Resource Centre (ARC), a local entity enabling the Georgian Partner NGOs to continue working together to promote advocacy and civic activism.

Specific questions for each program component

CAP Management
1. What are strengths and weaknesses of the CAP Advocacy Steering Committee's performance ?(including roles and functions, membership, decision-making and communication process).
2. How can the Management of the CAP strengthened/improved during Year 3 of the program, when the Georgian Deputy COP will assume the responsibilities of the COP.
3. Since the Advocacy Resource Center (ARC) will be established on year 2 of program implementation, what might be the relationship between CAP and the ARC, including the

division of responsibilities and level of effort provided to ARC by Save the Children and Georgian partners of CAP?

IR1:   Improve and Strengthen Issue-based Advocacy

Nature and impact of Civic Participation Grants
- What is progress to date of advocacy campaigns? Has the capacity of members of coalition to plan and implement advocacy campaigns increased as a result of training provided by CAP? To what degree have members of CPGs coalitions assimilated advocacy methodologies provided through TA? How could advocacy campaigns re-directed in light of the relationship with the new government.
- What is the nature, strengths and weaknesses of (a) Save the Children; (b) CAP Advocacy Steering Committee's role in monitoring of CPGs performance?
- What are formal/informal methods of communication and strengthening partnership relationships within coalitions and between ASC and CPGs? How could these be improved?

Advocacy Georgia Website

- What has been the impact of the www.advocacy.ge in promotion of advocacy efforts in Georgia in terms of relevance, timeliness and importance of provided information? How do the customers evaluate the structure of the web-site?

IR 2 Development of Institutional and Financial Viability of NGOs

- How well needs of customers are being met through technical assistance provided to Civic Participation Grantee NGOs? To what degree have members of CPGs coalitions assimilated skills provided through TA?
- What progress to date has been achieved in the development of Code of Ethics? Considering controversial nature of this topic to what extent can its acceptance foster self-regulation and good governance amongst Georgian CSOs?

IR3:   Enhanced Legal Framework and Regulatory Environment of CSOs

- What progress to date has been achieved in:
(a) monitoring; and (b) lobbying for improvement of not-for-profit legislation, particularly responding to legislative initiatives that affect NGO operations;
(c) drafting charity legislation;
(d) enhancing NGOs' understanding of legal requirements
- What has been the role of ICNL in this component of the program? How well did ICNL cooperate with the local partner, Civil Society Institute?

IR4:   Increased Citizen Participation in Legislative Process and CSO Oversight

- What progress to date has been achieved in the public awareness and communication campaigns? How can the PR strategy (a) foster more civic engagement; (b) contribute to better cross sectoral collaboration between NGOs, local government and private sector in light of velvet revolution?
- How effective and useful is media monitoring for the development of CAP media outreach strategy and how can it contribute to other components of the program?

General questions

- Does the CAP provide a useful model for creation of similar management model in other programs/activities?

- Thus far what is the CAPs role and impact on consolidating the Georgian civil society in general? To what extent has CAP contributed to NGO enabling environment?
- Advocacy impact – what has changed in Georgia at both the national and local level as a result of CAP?
- How can the Advocacy Resource Center become self-sustaining? What future prospective lie ahead?
- Are Georgians more engaged in civil society as a result of CAP? If so, how? If not, why not?

Team Composition

Implementation of this mid term evaluation calls for a team of two including 1 expatriate Consultant/Team Leader from USAID/ Washington and 1 Expatriate Consultant from Save the Children. The Evaluation Team will work from 26 January – 2 February 2004. Ms. Jennifer Stuart will serve as the USAID team member. The other team member will be identified by the Mission in consultation with Save the Children.

Performance Period

Consultant/Team Leader:
    3 days US preparation (document reviews)
    8 days work in-country including preparation of draft report and debriefing for the DG Office
    10 days follow-up and report finalization
    2-3 days travel to and from post

Team Member/Consultant:
    3 days US preparation (document reviews)
    8 days work in-country including preparation of draft report and debriefing for the DG Office
    2-3 days travel to and from post

Logistical support will be provided by USAID/Caucasus/Georgia DG Office.

Reporting requirements

a) The Team Leader/Consultant is responsible for providing a final briefing to the DG Office prior to her departure from Georgia. She will be in regular communication with the CTO for Citizens Advocate! Program on the progress of the evaluation throughout the evaluation period.

b) The Evaluation team will be responsible for delivery of "final" draft report with concrete and detailed recommendations no later than in two weeks after completion of the in-country work.

The report belongs to USAID, not the consultants or contractors, and any use of the material in the report shall require the prior written approval of USAID.

ANNEX B -- Bibliography

- SC's CAP technical proposal
- USAID-SC cooperative agreement
- SC's detailed implementation plans (Years 1 and 2)
- SC quarterly reports
- SC request for applications (RFA)
- Countrywide NGO Assessment (authored by SC's Georgian partners UNAG and CSRDG)
- Public Opinion Survey on Attitudes towards NGOs (authored by partner CSRDG)
- Legal Barriers Survey (authored by partner CSI, formerly known as GBLC)
- Georgia NGO Sustainable Index, 2002 and 2003 (written by SC for USAID)
- CPG summaries
- Various documents on Advocacy.ge website (http:/www.advocacy.ge)
- CAP press release
- CAP briefing paper
- USAID/Caucasus Annual Report (results/accomplishment)
- Georgian partners' annual reports, training manual, questionnaires, plans
- PG's and UNAG's annual report and brochures

ANNEX C – List of Institutions Visited and Individuals Interviewed

TBILISI -based Individuals and Groups

USAID/Caucasus, Tbilisi, Georgia

Cate Johnson	Democracy and Governance (DG) Office Director
Keti Bakradze	Civil Society Advisor

Save the Children (USA)/Georgia Field Office

Charlie Kaften	SC, Field Office Director
Patrick Crump	SC, CAP Chief of Party
Indira Amiranashvili	SC, CAP Deputy Chief of Party
Natia Deisadze	SC, CAP Project Officer

United Nations Association of Georgia (UNAG) and
Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSRDG)

Eka Datuashvili	(CSRDG), Civic Development Program Coordinator
Ramaz Aptsiauri	(UNAG), Executive Director
Nana Karseladze	(CSRDG), Youth Campaign Coordinator
Maka Kobzonidze	Student, Technical University
Sopho Dzuadze	Student, Ivane Dzavakhishvili State University

Center for Change and Conflict Management "Partners-Georgia", (PG)

Irene Tsintsadze	(CDCA), Director
Sopiko Shubladze	(PG), Director
Milena Mitagvaria	(PG), Trainer

Civic Development Center "Alternative", (CDCA)

Irene Tsintsadze	(CDCA), Director
Ninuna Sanadiradze	(CDCA), Program Coordinator
Dato Losaberidze	(CIPDD), Board Member and members of Ethics Code Working Group
Tamuna Kaldani	(Ethics Code Working Group)
Lela Khomeriki	(Ethics Code Working Group)

Civil Society Institute (CSI)

Vazha Salamadze	(CSI), Director
Maia Meskhi	(CSI), Program Coordinator
Kakha Damenia	(Not-for-Profit Legal Monitoring Group)

Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development, (CIPDD)

Dato Losaberidze	(CIPDD), Board Member
Zviad Devdariani	(Panelist)

NGO Sector Experts

David Usupashvili	IRIS-Georgia, Rule of Law Program
	Senior Legal and Policy Advisor
Michael Chachkunashvili	Open Society Georgia Foundation
	Chairman of the Executive Board
Levan Berdzenishvili	National Parliamentary Library of Georgia
	Director General

International Institute for Educational Policy, Planning and Management (IIEPPM)

Aluda Goglidze	(IIEPPM), Program Director

International Center for Civic Culture (ICCC)

Kote Kandelaki	(ICCC), Director

Other City-based Individuals and Groups:

OZURGETI SITE VISIT

Citizen Meeting at Ozurgeti Young Scientists Club and Members of coalition (Civic Participation Grantee)

Gocha Shanidze	Director, Yong Scientists Club
Tengiz Berishvili	Technical Expert
Gia Menabde	Budget Research Center
Tamaz Trapaidze	Georgia Democratic Development Association
Marina Topuria	Young Teachers Association
Dato Mdinaradze	Association "Child is the future"
Vacil Khomeriki	Association "Child is the future"

Ozurgeti Young Teachers Association

Leri Ghlonti	Street Committee
Amiran Vashakmadze	Street Committee
Guram Lomadze	Street Committee
Maiko Mikadze	Street Committee
Ana Menabde	Teacher
Mzia mekhuzla	Teacher
Lia Kiladze	Teacher
Natia Menabde	Teacher
Tamar Glonti	Citizen
Mikheil Topuria	Citizen
Nino Oragvelidze	Doctor
Guram Mjavia	Student
Tatia Mgeladze	Student
Tamuna Urushadze	Student
Salome Khintibadze	Student
Sopo Kalandadze	Student

Ozurgeti Governor Office

Vakhtang Goliadze	Governor of Guria
Tamaz Salukvadze	Chairman of Ozurgeti District Council
Levan Urushadze	Chairmen of Ozurgeti City Council

KUTAISI SITE VISIT

Georgian Young Economist's Association (GYEA) and Members of Coalition (Civic Participation Grantee)

Tengiz Shergelashvili	Director, GYEA
Besik Bregadze	Expert, GYEA
Levan Gogelashvili	GYEA, Kutaisi Branch
Kakha Gvantseladze	Kutaisi Branch Manager, GYEA
Zurab Khurtsidze	Executive Director, Association "Sachino"
Khatuna Khurtsidze	Association "Sachino"
Besik Gulordava	Center for Democratic Innovations

Education working group

Zurab Khurtsidze	Association "Sachino"
Tengiz Shergelashvili	GYEA
Khatuna Khurtsidze	Association "Sachino"
Medea Mukhasharia	Teacher, the 7th school
Lia Rokhvadze	Teacher, the 7th school
Zviad Gorgodze	Art College
Eliso Jibladze	Humanitarian College
Irina Tkeshelashvili	IOM (Kutaisi branch)
Nino Gabunia	Association "Sachino"
Manana Managadze	"Mother and Children's Defense League"

ANNEX D – Evaluation Team Members

Jennifer Stuart has served as the NGO Specialist for USAID/Washington's Bureau for Europe and Eurasia for the past four years, where she is responsible for analyzing USAID's efforts across the region to develop local NGO sectors. In this position, she has conducted assessments of the NGO environment, designed programs, served on technical evaluation committees, and drafted democracy strategies in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Bulgaria, Armenia and Azerbaijan. She has also served as the editor of the NGO Sustainability Index for the past three years. This experience has provided her with a solid regional perspective of the problems facing local NGOs and the success of USAID programs designed to address them. Prior to joining USAID, she worked for the Eurasia Foundation and American Councils (ACTR/ACCELS) on various programs in the region.

Elena Kordzaya is an independent evaluator from Russia with more then 10 years of extended working experience on different NGO projects in both Georgia and Russia. Ms. Kordzaya has participated in several training programs on monitoring and evaluation and program and finance management, and has taken part in several program evaluations in Russia. Since 1992, she has been involved in NGO development activities, both managing projects and providing training and consulting services in institutional development to NGOs. For almost ten years she has worked with NGOs in Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, consulting dozens of NGOs and grassroots organizations of many different kinds. She has led workshops for the Russian Resource Centers (Novosibirsk, Krasnodar and Samara), "Partner", IREX's Institutional Partnership Program, the International Republican Institute, Open Society Institute, UN Development Program and others. Ms. Kordazya has been a former participant of different conferences and workshops in the US, Egypt, Albania, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Hungary and in MSI's Evaluation Training Program offered in Moscow in 1997. From 2000-2003, she served as Co-Director for the USAID-sponsored PRO-NGO (NGO Support Program), an NGO development effort administered by IREX. Ms. Kordzaya is currently an independent evaluator and consultant, based in Moscow, Russia.