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#### Document Framework

This document contains 4 main parts:

Part I Executive Summary

Part II The final evaluation framework that provides the development context and brief description of the project intervention, evaluation scope and objectives, and the evaluation approach and methodology.

Part III Provides the main findings and conclusions that includes the OECD DAC evaluation criteria assessment; responsiveness to project goal, project management and implementation, and SDGs; the background, major results and conclusion for each outcome; and lessons learned.

Part IV An attempt to identify the main recommendations with a focus on next steps for a future cycle of reform.

# Executive Summary

UNDP in partnership with the government of the United Kingdom, through its Good Governance Fund, initiated the project *Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia* in July 2016 (hereinafter “PAR project”) to help advance the government’s public administration reform agenda and implement key parts of that agenda. The PAR project was designed and implemented in the context of the Government of Georgia’s (GoG’s) major public administration reform effort initiated in 2015 with the development of the Roadmap of Public Administration Reform 2016-2020. The roadmap had the objective of establishing a transparent, predictable responsible, and efficient public administration, which would meet society’s demands and correspond to European standards by 2020. The roadmap was developed by the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG). It included six policy areas: policy development and cooperation, civil service reform and human resource management, accountability, service delivery, public finance management, and local government and decentralization. The roadmap was preceded by work with the support of the European Union (EU) and OECD/SIGMA. The PAR project is in direct response to the roadmap to help implement its components.

The planned reform was prepared in the context of the Association Agreement (AA) including the Deep and Comprehensive Freed Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with the EU that were signed in 2014 and came into force in 2016. The strengthening of the government’s public administration and its coordination capabilities were key elements of reforms resulting from the AA and subsequently supported by various EU instruments.

The Civil Service Concept Note adopted by Government Decree no. 627 on November 19th 2014 sets out the government objective to develop a unified, impartial, professional and politically neutral civil service. And the Law on Civil Service of Georgia, drafted in 2015, was approved in July 2017 with 10 by-laws to facilitate implementation. PAR Action Plans helped implement these documents with the last approved for 2019-20.

The PAR project goal and targeted outcome is: *to enhance the capability of the Government of Georgia to implement its national development agenda through a more effective, professionally trained, unified and independent public administration that delivers public services with greater accountability and responsiveness to citizen’s needs.[[1]](#footnote-2)* The project has had a budget of $6.1 million provided by the government of the United Kingdom.[[2]](#footnote-3) The project is administered by UNDP and in partnership with the GoG.

The project has 3 main outcomes:

***Outcome 1 Policy Development and Coordination:*** GoG ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation.

*Main Counterparts:* Administration of Government (AoG) and its Department of Policy Planning and Coordination and its two units – Policy Planning Unit and Public Administration Reform Unit, PAR Council, line ministries and agencies – mainly policy planning units

***Outcome 2 Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management:*** Performance of civil service is more professional and effective.

*Main Counterpart:* Civil Service Bureau (CSB), line ministries and agencies - mainly human resource management units

***Outcome 3 Public Service Delivery:*** The government delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens.

*Main Counterparts:* Digital Governance Agency (DGA)[[3]](#footnote-4), Public Service Development Agency (PSDA)

The project was scheduled to end in December 2020. An extension was agreed to allow for the final project evaluation, end tasks delayed given the COVID-19 pandemic, and allow for immediate follow-up activities in all three outcome areas that emerged from past interventions.

The final evaluation was conducted from 1 January to 19 March 2021. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the efficacy of the project design and structure, relevance of the project outcomes and outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the assistance, and the sustainability of interventions. The evaluation is to also include an analysis of how PAR project interventions address human rights and gender equality principles.

The following is a brief summary of applying the OECD DAC evaluation factors:

**Relevance**

The project is extremely relevant to GoG priorities and needs. The GoG had prioritized PAR in the past but placed more of a priority in 2014-16 when the project was being defined and eventually initiated in 2016. An emphasis was on having reforms in all three outcome areas of the project with an initial emphasis on the policy planning and coordination, civil service reform and human resource development, and public service delivery legal/regulatory framework that was worked on as a result of the PAR Roadmap that identified these areas. The project was directly responsive to the Roadmap and had government and stakeholder buy-in at the very beginning as evidenced by initial review and agreement on project document intervention areas, with some initial adjustments made. The project remains relevant as the GoG is preparing another PAR roadmap that the project has helped to develop.

**Effectiveness and Results**

The project outcomes and most outputs were achieved. Some outputs require attention for full completion. However, the measurement of achievement is ongoing and will continue to be ongoing since the subject areas addressed will take time to embed and progress as cycles of activity occur over the medium term. For instance, the policy planning handbook is in place and is now being piloted with 3 national strategies applying the handbook’s methodology during the design stage. 15 policy documents were scheduled for approval that had applied the new policy standards and to date 8 were approved. The e-monitoring and evaluation system that will be the policy planning backbone remains in the development phase and is scheduled for completion the third quarter 2021. The COVID-19 impact had slowed both activities. Similarly, with certain elements of civil service reform, such as applying performance appraisal, progress has been made and methods should improve. The progress should be maintained if the performance appraisal requirement continues and there is a stronger link with human resource development. Both these areas were addressed through a more organized and targeted education and training approach. For service delivery, national standards have been developed and are being applied, though the standards were not approved as of this time. The challenge is the depth and breadth of applying these processes, systems, standards, and approaches government-wide so there is a whole-of-government approach and results. This will require further interventions and further cycles of activities as what has been developed over the last 4 years is applied.

**Efficiency**

Project expenditure appears to have aligned with project activity in each of the output areas. There are some variations in the early years at project start-up with more emphasis or faster start on policy planning than public service delivery. However, the activity and expenditure evens out over time so that project was operating more efficiently in all outcome areas. Project management and staffing was appropriate for the size of the project once it evolved into a stand-alone project in 2017 rather than being a part of the UNDP Governance Reform Fund. Stakeholder involvement did impact efficiency at times given government changes or changes in management and personnel at some of the implementing entities. However, the project team made up for delays or absences by moving forward with activities so interventions did not stop.

**Impact**

The project had a significant impact on PAR implementation and its activities will continue to positively impact PAR as long as the government adheres to PAR in the form envisioned in the 2016-20 Roadmap. It is reported that the 2021-24 Roadmap will address the same priority areas. Further impact will depend on the implementation of the processes, systems, and capacities developed by the project and their application government-wide. The gains made to date will most likely remain given that law or policy, human resource development, and process implementation support them. Stakeholders report the project directly contributed to the advances in each of the three outcome areas. Examples of impact for each outcome include: 1) participatory policymaking with the implementation of the policy planning handbook, there is already an impact on improved plans and strategies that follow a coherent process and framework, includes monitoring evaluation, and includes input and feedback of stakeholders including CSOs; 2) civil service human resource development, a framework and some standards (such as appraisal and professional development) are in place and being applied to further expand on a professional civil service that should help policy making and implementation as well as a more confident civil service; and 3) service delivery impacts include the improved number and quality of use of public services either through the internet or through face-to-face delivery with interest and capacity to make further improvements based on standards.

**Sustainability**

Sustainability of PAR is evident. The PAR Roadmap 2016-20 has ended and is being followed up with a new Roadmap for the next 4-5 years. The Civil Service Law is implemented along with its by-laws. The Unified Public Service Design and Delivery (UPSDD) standards are drafted, though not yet approved, with the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and standards being applied at least on a pilot basis. CSO participation has been generated with avenues to provide input to PAR and policy planning as well as conduct necessary research. To keep this all going further attention is needed consisting of political will and acceptance of reform, civil servant buy-in which appears to be happening, and civil society engagement which is also happening. Development partner support will also need to be continued to ensure standards are in compliance with EU and international standards. There is common interest and commitment to achieve these standards by stakeholders and those involved in the reforms.

**Coordination**

The project has been apt at coordination on several fronts: with government stakeholders, development partners, CSOs, other UNDP projects, and UN agencies. The project’s management and staff have coordinated effectively and have a positive relationship with the UNDP country office and with UK government representatives.

**Gender Equality and Inclusion**

Gender and inclusion have been a day-to-day commitment for the project since initiation. The project follows an ingrained human rights based approach that is not only advocated but put into practice at the policy formulation level, human resource capacity building level, the provision of public services, and the involvement of CSOs and their ability to either address or formulate positions or provide research on gender and inclusion issues. The human rights based approach is now embedded in the policy formulation process. The policy planning handbook requires the adoption of a human rights based approach when formulating goals and objectives in national, sector and institutional policy documents. The documents are to incorporate SDGs, issues relating to gender, minorities and vulnerable groups. For the new PAR Roadmap under development, UN Women is part of the development team and by applying the policy planning handbook and system, a more human rights-based approach will be applied. Human resource capacity development sponsored by the project had strong female participation. Of the 25 main training events, 18 had participants gender disaggregated. At these 18 events, a total of about 2,907 individuals were trained with about 1,854 women trained (63.8% of those trained). The public service delivery outcome area has helped to improve awareness and use of public services of all citizens. The e-services and work done to improve service delivery in the Public Service Halls and Patrol Department Unified Service Center have helped to improve access countrywide for all groups to include women, minorities, and those with disabilities. The research and civil society grant schemes brought attention to gender and other issues to include careers in the civil service and gender equality, challenges in provision of services to women victims of domestic violence during COVID-19, amongst several other research initiatives addressing gender issues, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

**COVID-19 Impact**

While not an evaluation criterion, the impact of COVID-19 on the project, and PAR in general, should be noted since the pandemic has impacted project performance for about one year of the project’s lifespan. The project had to change its approach of one that was very much based on personal face-to-face interactions with stakeholders in terms of meetings and discussions, training, and the provision of the advisory services. The project adjusted its approach so that regulations were followed and safety paramount. The interactions with stakeholders, contractors and others moved on-line via teleconference or videoconference meetings. Training was modified to occur on-line with survey tools built in to evaluate the effectiveness of training and forum meetings. Several of the research and CSO grant scheme initiatives were in direct response to the pandemic and its repercussions. Most impacted was the public service delivery outcome with the pandemic instigating more attention to service delivery. The delivery of public services during the pandemic was part of the response included in the CAF assessments and application of standards for the Public Service Halls and the Patrol Department Unified Service Center. Both entities reported that the advisory services and resulting service changes did help improve the delivery of services during the pandemic. More public services were placed on my.gov.ge and the project was instrumental to help this movement, significantly over achieving the target (133 on-line services added with project support). The project also supported a promotional video prepared with DGA to promote my.gov.ge during the pandemic.

There are a variety of lessons learned, the three main ones are:

1. *Building of Momentum and Consolidation:* There is momentum for PAR. The project has been catalytic in building that momentum by helping to identify discrete PAR reform targets and then addressing those targets in an organized, detailed and cooperative manner. Some have said that senior political support has waivered over the years given the macro political situation but even so, public servants have kept it going and the main impetus, adopting European country standards and the commitments made by government, keep the reform alive. PAR will continue. The challenge is to make it government-wide and have the political will and leadership to advance ownership and accountability to allow an independent and merit-based professional civil service to evolve that uses evidenced-based policy making.
2. *Planning and Implementation with Flexibility:* The project was adeptly flexible to facilitate each of the outcome areas and applied its resources as needed. Sometimes, such as waiting for a document to be approved like the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation handbook and related process and UPSDD, the project adjusted so it could still address the need and put things in place so that when approval was given, stakeholders could progress since the building blocks were already set. The flexibility allowed is a testament to close cooperation with the project partners – UNDP and the UK government – to allow such flexibility. The flexibility did not throw the project off course as shown by the results to date, budget execution and feedback from the parties involved. The resourcefulness shown by all parties - project team, development partners and stakeholders is a key lesson for PAR in Georgia.
3. *Change Management Takes Time and Should Always be Present:* A change management approach was established at project start. The focus on change management helped to draw attention to priority needs. As time went on, the project went from advocating for change to actually making it happen with the various interventions. However, PAR-related reform is not complete. Change will need to be constant as PAR is further planned and implemented.

PAR in Georgia is real and is making progress. The goal remains the adoption of EU standards and practices in line with past commitments as well as future needs including a more participatory approach with civil society input and some more formal checks and balances. The following is “unfinished business” to bring to close outputs or activities that are currently underway but will not end by project closure in March 2021. The reasons for the delay are mainly because of the adjustments made in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic and several changes in government that impacted certain approvals and had an impact on the continuity of counterparts. The activities are reportedly being included in the next project phase.

**Policy Development and Coordination**

1. *Drafting of National Strategies Applying Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Standards:* Three strategic documents with accompanying action plans are being prepared with project support to include: 1) PAR Roadmap 2021-24; 2) e-Governance Strategy; and 3) Maritime Transport Strategy. The strategies are being prepared by applying the methodologies and processes of the new policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process documented in the accompanying handbook and being applied by the AoG. The PAR Roadmap is slated for completion in March 2021 and requires PAR Council approval.
2. *Unified Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation e-platform:* The e-platform will be the backbone of the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process. It will provide an electronic system to help standardize inputs and outputs that will standardize national, sector and institution strategies. Completion is expected in the third quarter, 2021.
3. *On-Line Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Course:* The project has trained policy planning managers and staff throughout the government. The plans for the next phase of the project is to create an on-line course that is part of the e-learning platform.
4. *PAR Communication and Action Plan:* The plan was finalized in October 2020 but not approved. Approval is expected at the next PAR Council meeting. Implementation is required.

***Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management***

1. *Linkage of Performance Appraisals and Professional Development Plans:* Work continues regarding performance appraisals and professional development plan preparation in pilot ministries. These results will be evaluated and recommendations drafted will be shared with the CSB with the aim to replicate this experience in other ministries and agencies.
2. *Electronic Human Resources Management System (eHRMS) Support:* The project supported adding 4 modules to the e-HRMS: performance appraisal, professional development, self-service modules for civil servants, and smart analytical module. In line with the previous recommendation, the use of the e-HRMS modules should be monitored to ensure they are being used as designed and contributing to at least better store data and report on performance appraisal and professional development information.
3. *Unified e-Learning Platform:* The e-platform concept was due to be completed in February. The technical part of the platform is scheduled to be finalized in April 2021. A next step is to link the e-HRMS and e-learning system
4. *Civil Servants’ Forum Meeting Support:* The Civil Servants’ Forum and Human Resource Managers’ Forum meetings have proven effective as a way to advance civil service reform in a participatory manner. There should be a transition period and agreement at the start of the next project phase so that the CSB steadily takes on more responsibility and tasks so that project support is phased out within an agreed timeframe.
5. *Advancing Dispute Resolution:* Advances on dispute resolution have been made with the investment in a multi-year effort. The project is currently implementing a plan consisting of formulating detailed mediation guidelines, cooperating with the Association of Mediators and also capacity building of human resource personnel in conflict management techniques. If successful and accepted, formalizing the approach and methodology will be necessary.

***Public Service Delivery***

1. *UPSDD Full Implementation:* The UPSDD is designed and its components implemented in two pilot entities that provide services Georgia-wide. The pilots are reportedly successful. However, the standards are not yet approved.
2. *Monitoring of CSO Input and Feedback and Comparative Perception Survey Study:* Avenues were built and capacities developed through various project interventions to allow for CSO input and feedback. During the next phase of the project, such input and feedback should be monitored to measure if CSOs interests are being considered. Also, the project has supported 3 public and civil servant perception surveys. The survey results should be information inputs to the AoG, CSB, PSDA, DGA, PAR development partners, and the project team to help advance PAR. There could be a comparative assessment of the surveys’ findings to show how perceptions have changed over the years and what areas need further attention. If data is not comparable between the surveys, any future surveys should have a survey framework that will provide for comparative data assessment.

The following are a set of recommendations to help move the PAR effort forward. Any future interventions need to be fully aligned with the PAR Roadmap now under development.

1. *Leadership and Ownership of the of PAR Process:* The project, development partners as well as actions by the GoG itself show that PAR leadership and ownership are with the GoG. While the support and advancement may not have been as consistent as initially envisioned, despite a changing environment PAR continues to advance. Development partner support will remain crucial to help advance the reforms. The PAR Roadmap, currently under development, will help to set the direction for further interventions. The project was well placed as a catalytic actor that helped to advance change in a constructive, collaborative and results-oriented manner. While external support (leadership, personnel, finance resources) must be provided to those entities responsible, such support should be carefully gauged and planned out so that there is a clear transition from any future project support to the GoG. Such transition should account for leadership, personnel and financial resources to take on the roles and responsibilities developed.
2. *Developing Linkages Within and Between PAR Components:* The project has developed different systems and approaches within each of the outcome areas. Toward project end, these components began to be linked. Examples are the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process and methodology; performance appraisal and human resource development planning; and public service assessment and standard setting to upgrade public services. For the next PAR phase, such cooperation and collaboration should be sought at the beginning of intervention planning rather than towards the end. Such collaboration will provide more GoG ownership and help to implement at a more rapid pace.
3. *Medium Term Depth and Breadth of PAR:* Applying PAR government-wide takes time and cycles of activity. The legal/regulatory framework is mostly in place. At this time, various reform areas have been addressed with components in place or at least piloted. The challenge now is to keep on conforming to the legal/regulatory framework and applying the requirements by using these methodologies, systems and processes developed. This will take time and attention of the political leadership as well as all levels of the civil service. There will also be trial and error. Public feedback should be a key ingredient and some advancement has been made to allow it to happen as well as shows how feedback can actually support policy making and service delivery. Two issues remain outstanding.

First, while there have been advances on a professional and merit-based civil service, the question of “independence” still lingers. Changes in government over the project’s timeframe and the public and civil servant perception of independence keeps it as a front burner issue. Attention is needed so that civil servant independence continues to be pursued.

Second, the status of LEPLs is an issue. Though not an output area for the project, the project has had to work with LEPLs as stakeholders as well as participants in project activities. While PAR is being undertaken, LEPLs seem to be treated differently and there are similarities and dissimilarities between LEPLs themselves. If the GoG is truly interested in PAR, such rules, regulations, etc., should be applied equally and across government. Currently, LEPLs operate in a different manner than line ministries and agencies yet also provide public services and help to administer the state. The current approach creates distortions for all of PAR. The LEPL situation needs to be addressed so there is more conformity with the public administration framework, laws, and policies.

1. *Human Rights-Based PAR - Addressing Gender, Various Community Needs and Civil Society Input:* The project has made significant gains to help streamline and implement a human rights-based PAR. Though it is in the early stage to tell the impact, some of the tools have been developed as well as avenues opened to allow for civil society input and feedback. For the next round of the PAR Roadmap, it is reported that this focus will continue and will be designed into the Roadmap. Also a human rights-based approach, including addressing SDGs, should be part of national sector and institution strategies as it is required according to the policy planning handbook. Such inclusion should be monitored to ensure the prioritization continues. While advances have been made, the human rights emphasis needs to continue. Implementation is always challenging and attention can be refocused elsewhere. For the next project phase, indicators should be identified at the beginning along with collection modalities so impacts can be better measured. There should be constant indicator monitoring to make sure appropriate feedback is being provided by civil society.
2. *Decentralization and Local Government*: Decentralization and local governance development are priority areas as indicated by the GoG’s decentralization strategy and various local government strengthening efforts, including those supported by UNDP and other development partners. It appears that the project touched upon local governance to a certain extent. It is not currently foreseen that the next phase of the project will be able to address applying what has been developed through the project at the local level. Such activities could be integrated into projects that are currently active at the local level, if additional funding is added to such a project. Or, additional funding could be added to bring the next phase of the PAR project’s activities to the local level. Such a consideration should depend on what other development partners are doing in this space to avoid duplication.
3. *GoG External Assistance Coordination:* As previously mentioned, development partner coordination is happening by the development partners amongst themselves and with government stakeholders as required. However, given that the PAR is intended to be government-wide and given the depth that is needed across government, there seems to be the need for more government-led development partner coordination. Such coordination could help PAR to move at a more rapid pace, concentrate resources on priorities, and address issue that are sensitive or difficult. Given a further stage of PAR about to begin, and in line with leadership, ownership, transparency and accountability, such government-led coordination appears appropriate. An emphasis should be on government management and execution. Also, it may give impetus for the PAR Council to be more active.

Also, the governance and PAR space has many players working throughout government to include, the parliament, policy planning and management, civil service reform, public service delivery, decentralization, local governance, public finance, anti-corruption, etc. The GoG and development partners may benefit to have an inventory of all such interventions. It is reported that USAID is preparing a list of PAR-related projects. Such an inventory should be thorough and show what areas are being addressed, timelines and counterparts/stakeholders. Such an effort will help the GoG and all development partners to be on the same page and that activities are aligned with the PAR Roadmap. It will also show what government agencies are doing since some entities are involved in several interventions at once. Such an inventory is essential for government-development partner coordination. UNDP is positioned to assist in facilitating this government-led coordination given its experience with the governance reform agenda and its objective stance.

1. *Exist Strategy, Exit Strategy, Exit Strategy:* The next phase of the project should have an exit strategy for each output designed in at the start. The respective strategies should be discussed and agreed to with each of the stakeholders and a “handover” timeline prepared. Included in the strategy should be the “elements of sustainability.” These elements should identify what is needed for the interventions to be sustainable.

# Final Evaluation Framework, Development Context and Intervention Description

## Development Context and Description of Intervention

Georgia has made progress over the last decade in terms of political, economic and social development. As of 2019, Georgia ranks 61st on the Human Development Index with a rate of 0.812 in 2019 compared to 0.769 in 2015 and 0.710 in 2010.[[4]](#footnote-5) It has held peaceful elections with accompanying transfers of power, improved trade and economic relations with Europe and other countries, and strengthened the social support framework. Governance reform to include public administration reform, decentralization of governance and economic development, public finance reform and country-wide oriented development have been key components of Georgia’s development agenda as formerly illustrated in various government strategies and action plans as well as reform of the legal and regulatory framework to be more in line with European Union (EU) standards and practices.[[5]](#footnote-6)

UNDP in partnership with the government of the United Kingdom, through its Good Governance Fund, initiated the project *Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia* in July 2016 (hereinafter “PAR project”) to help advance the government’s public administration reform agenda and implement key parts of that agenda. The intervention was designed based on the experience of past UNDP activities under its Governance Reform Fund (GRF) initiatives, the government’s interests and strategies to undertake major public administration reform, and other UNDP and development partner governance reform project interventions.

The PAR project goal and targeted outcome is: *to enhance the capability of the Government of Georgia to implement its national development agenda through a more effective, professionally trained, unified and independent public administration that delivers public services with greater accountability and responsiveness to citizen’s needs.[[6]](#footnote-7)* The project has had a budget of $6.1 million provided by the government of the United Kingdom.[[7]](#footnote-8) The project is administered by UNDP and in partnership with the government of Georgia (GoG). A mid-term evaluation for the period 2016 to December 2018 was conducted.

The PAR project is an effort to contribute to the overall UN Partnership for Sustainable Development 2016-2020 outcome and UNDP 2016-20 Country Programme strategic plan outcome: by 2020, expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels. The project is also directly responsive to the country programme’s output 1.1: by 2020, government has stronger capacities to formulate, implement and monitor policies in a participatory manner for improved service delivery, with equal access for all.[[8]](#footnote-9) And, the project has contributed to UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-21 output 1.1.1: capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and other international agreements in development plans and budget, and to analyze progress towards the SDGS, using innovative and data-driven solutions.

Through the government’s nationalization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Goal 16 is applicable to the project: promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.[[9]](#footnote-10)

The PAR project was designed and implemented in the context of a major public administration reform effort initiated in 2015 with the development of the Roadmap of Public Administration Reform 2020. The roadmap had the objective of establishing a transparent, predictable responsible, and efficient public administration that would meet society’s demands and correspond to European standards by 2020. The roadmap was developed by the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG). It included six policy areas: policy development and cooperation, civil service reform and human resource management, accountability, service delivery, public finance management, and local government and decentralization. The roadmap was preceded by work with the support of the EU and OECD/SIGMA. The PAR project is in direct response to the roadmap to help implement several of its components.

The Civil Service Concept Note adopted by Government Decree no. 627 on November 19th 2014 sets out the government objective to develop a unified, impartial, professional and politically neutral civil service. And the Law on Civil Service of Georgia, drafted in 2015, was approved and implemented in July 2017 with 10 by-laws to facilitate implementation. PAR Action Plans helped implement these documents with the last approved for 2019-20.

The changes are being made in the context of the Association Agreement (AA) including the Deep and Comprehensive Freed Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with the EU that were signed in 2014 and came into force in 2016. The strengthening of the government’s public administration and its coordination capabilities were key elements of reforms resulting from the AA and subsequently supported by various EU instruments.

The reforms were also being implemented in a changing political and economic context. Politically, while there have been peaceful transfers of power from 2012, there have been various elections since that time as the governance transitioned to more of a parliamentary system of governance that culminated in the October 2020 elections. Economically, the country confronted an economic crisis in 2014-16 that led to currency depreciation and socioeconomic fallout. The COVID-19 pandemic added to this environment. The pandemic has had a significant impact on Georgia beginning in March 2019 and a direct impact on PAR. The pandemic has challenged government to respond to the pandemic and at the same time helped to prove the case for PAR and showed how the PAR undertaken to date has helped to more effectively respond to the pandemic. The PAR project itself has been in the midst of the response as well as attempting to continue to administer and implement the project in a more challenging environment as well as bring the project to a close.

PAR in this context was challenging and gave rise to different political and public directions for and attitudes toward the reform agenda. These challenges included government size reductions and different philosophies about the size of government, centralization versus decentralization of authority and services, organizational and unit leadership changes, public participation, and the financing of public services as well as overall reform and development.

The size of the public service is considerable and its scope of services in terms of policy development and implementation and service provision are essential given the current political and economic structure.[[10]](#footnote-11) Public input and perceptions of the public service and its service provision have adjusted over the years. And, through the PAR project, feedback has been provided from both civil servants as well as the public to measure the perception, attitudes and performance. While some progress seems to have been made, such as in reducing corruption and 74% of citizens surveyed believe that “civil servants are oriented at providing quality service to citizens,” there is much on the agenda to be addressed.[[11]](#footnote-12) [[12]](#footnote-13)

The current context of the public administration has evolved from an ever-changing governance landscape over past decades. The public administration context can be split into four phases.

The first phase was the highly centralized bureaucratic structure established during the time of the Soviet Union. The highly centralized system was established in Georgia itself with extraordinary external power and control with central planning and decision-making from Moscow. As the system failed, corruption became more of the norm to access public services, serve in government, or be a recipient of public funds, goods and services.

The second phase was the transition period as of 1991 as a new government of centralized control managed by Soviet dissidents that created in-country power centers while at the same time allowing for the initial formation of a more market-driven economy with inconsistent regulation. This period was unstable for a coordinated and well-managed public administration to form. As mentioned in the 2016 Political Economy Analysis, “In the turbulent years replete with a coup, civil war, and two local conflicts, the modern civil service has failed to consolidate.”[[13]](#footnote-14) Corruption persisted with market economy principles being applied to accessing government services, employment, finances and influence.

The third phase began in November 2003 with the Rose Revolution with the intent to oust former leaders that appeared to administer the state with more of a Soviet mindset and a public distraught by corruption and failed, weak or non existent political and economic development. The orientation of the new government was “small” government and economic liberalization more in line with Western standards. Various reforms took place within the public administration with more of a “competition” approach to services, developing responsive government services, and attempts to address corruption. This period is seen as uneven since there was reportedly lack of social welfare progress, political decision-making remained centralized and, again, there was no clear direction for a competent and independent non-political civil service.

The fourth phase is the current phase with the reforms stated above and a committed direction to adopt European public administration standards. As can be seen with the laws and decrees put in place, this has been a slow process also characterized by changes in government and some delays in having the appropriate legal and regulatory framework in place and sometimes limited or lack of attention to implementation. But, given overall government direction, a committed civil service, more public participation and feedback than in the past, and the participation of development partners, while the road has been arduous, there are signs of progress. The project document states that, “The Theory of Change takes as its logical departure point a simple historic fact: that Georgia has never had a modern, unified, politically independent, professional and career-based civil service which differentiates itself from all new members of the European Union.” As one interviewer stated, “What Georgia is going through is not really public administration reform. Georgia is really establishing a public administration and civil service based on European and international standards for the first time.” In practice, reform started, in various manners and approaches, with more serious efforts dating back to 2004. However, with the EU accession agreement and the PAR Roadmap, a more whole-of-government and comprehensive approach is now being undertaken.

A more decentralized public administration and a more independent civil service is taking shape. However, it appears that more of a top down decision-making and management profile exists. Political decision-making and control still persists but, with the help of the PAR project and other development interventions, the driving force of EU accession, more public participation, and the application of the laws, policies and plans put in place, a more networked and professional public administration is emerging.

The project has 3 main outcomes that respond to the previously mentioned goal:

***Outcome 1 Policy Development and Coordination:*** Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation.

*Main Counterparts:* AoG and its Department of Policy Planning and Coordination and its two units – Policy Planning Unit and Public Administration Reform Unit; PAR Council; planning and policy units of ministries and agencies

***Outcome 2 Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management:*** Performance of civil service is more professional and effective.

*Main Counterpart:* Civil Service Bureau (CSB) and line ministries and agencies mainly the personnel or human resource management units

***Outcome 3 Public Service Delivery:*** The government delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens.

*Main Counterparts:* Digital Governance Agency (DGA)[[14]](#footnote-15), Public Service Development Agency (PSDA)

The individual ministries and other government agencies supplement the main counterparts, including LEPL’s, with whom the PAR project have provided training and other support services.[[15]](#footnote-16) The units within these entities are mainly the policy and planning and human resource management or personnel units.

Table 1 provides a basic breakdown of outcomes and outputs and associated indicators. The breakdown is provided given that the project document’s logical framework is the road map for project activity. Progress of the project and its interventions will be measured according to this framework. The indicators will be reviewed to provide the basis of the evaluation to determine if the outcomes and outputs were achieved.

**Table 1: PAR Project Logical Framework Summary**

| Outcomes and Indicators | Outputs and Indicators |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome 1 Policy Development and Coordination:* Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation.  *Outcome Indicators*   1. Share of government strategies drafted in line with new policy standards 2. Degree of institutionalized coordination between government institutions 3. Rate of satisfaction of CSO participation in policy process 4. Share of civil servants supporting ongoing PAR through the development of PAR communication strategy and action plan 5. Number of PAR Council meetings reviewing the new PAR Strategy and Action Plan for 2021-2024 | * 1. Policy planning unit staff from line ministries trained in line with new policy standards      1. Share of Policy Planning Unit staff from central and Adjara Autonomous Republic (AR) trained on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation standards      2. Share of female and male policy planning unit staff demonstrating increased knowledge of the unified standards   2. Government strategic documents drafted through coaching of individual ministries in line with new policy standards      1. Number of government strategic documents drafted via coaching      2. Quality of government strategic documents drafted via coaching   3. Unified electronic system for policy planning, monitoring and evaluation is operational and meetings its objectives      1. Number of government strategic documents produced using new system      2. Number of men and women from the respective ministries and LEPLs trained   4. New training module on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation incorporates inclusive public participation elements      1. Rate of female and male participants reporting usage of inclusive public participation elements   5. AoG has tools to improve the communication on PAR both internally and externally      1. PAR communication strategy and action plan drafted   6. AoG is able to launch and steer the implementation of the PAR beyond 2020      1. New PAR strategy and action plan for 2021-2024 is compliant with new policy guidelines and is based on PAR Roadmap 2020 review |
| *Outcome 2 Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management:* Performance of civil service is more professional and effective.  *Outcome Indicators*   1. Share of female and male civil servants whose individual performance plans are in line with organizational strategic goals/objectives 2. Share of female and male civil servants satisfied with individual performance plans 3. Qualify of drafted individual performance plans 4. Share of female and male civil servants who support project-relevant changes brought by civil service reform. | * 1. Trained managers develop individual performance and professional development plans jointly with civil servants      1. Share of female and male managers trained in elaboration of professional development plans      2. Share of female and male civil servants that have professional development plans   2. Accreditation system of civil servants’ training programs is operational      1. Number of accredited training programs      2. Number of female and male civil servants from all line ministries trained through accredited programs   3. Civil servants access learning opportunities online through unified platform      1. Share of female and male civil servants using the unified e-learning platform   4. Enhanced knowledge of female and male civil servants on civil service reform      1. Number of female and male civil servants participating in Civil Servants’ Forum meetings      2. Share of female and male civil servants who report satisfaction with participation in forum meetings      3. Number of trained managers in management and civil service reform-related issues   5. CSB has instruments to effectively manage civil service      1. Number of Human Resources (HR) Forum meetings held on key CSR issues      2. Electronic Human Resources Management System (HRMS) generates key statistics on civil service      3. Number of female and male civil servants trained in dispute management   6. Civil Society Organization (CSO) initiatives supported through small grants scheme provide required research and expertise in designing inclusive policy, improving civil service and offer practical solutions to government      1. Number of CSO initiatives providing expertise to the government inclusive policy making process and civil service reform |
| *Outcome 3 Public Service Delivery:* The government delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens.  *Outcome Indicators*   1. Number of key service delivery agencies initiating implementation of disability inclusive unified service delivery standards 2. Usage rate of the unified government services portal (my.gov.ge) increases | 3.1 Public service delivery officials ready to use Unified Service Delivery Standards  3.1.1 Number of disability inclusive (where applicable) Unified Public Service Design and Delivery (UPSDD) methodological packages developed  3.1.2 Number of female and male civil servants trained under each of UPSDD packages  3.1.3 Number of agencies implementing new quality assurance standards in line with UPSDD  3.2 More services and data are accessible in digital format on unified government portals and the uptake of services are increased  3.2.1 Number of new services accessible on my.gov.ge  3.2.2 Number of citizens covered by public relations and information outreach |

Georgia’s development partners share the GoG’s prioritization and interest of PAR. The main partners are the EU, U.S.AID, UNDP, UK Government, Sweden’s SIDA, and Germany’s GIZ. A review of the development landscape helps to put the PAR project in context of other development partner activities. The following is a description of the key projects, not all PAR development partner projects.

The EU’s partnership is to facilitate the Association Agreement commitments and work with the GoG to keep PAR as a priority. OECD/SIGMA had helped with the formulation of the PAR Roadmap 2016-20 and has provided assessment and advisory services on policy planning as well as input into the formulation of the new PAR Roadmap. The EU provided 3.6 million euro to support PAR in 2019-20 to strengthen the institutional capacity of the main PAR stakeholders as well as ministries and agencies.[[16]](#footnote-17) The EU also supported a two-year 1.2 million euro twinning project between the CSB and the Republic of Lithuania.[[17]](#footnote-18) The EU has also supported a large-scale CSO initiative to build alternative monitoring mechanisms to support PAR and build capacity of CSOs to contribute to the oversight and implementation of PAR.

USAID supports the 5-year Good Governance Initiative (GGI) that was extended to April 2022. The project addresses all PAR Roadmap components. An emphasis of the project is on accountability and an open government partnership. Other areas addressed include local government and decentralization reform, civil service and public service delivery reform, financial management improvements, and work with the Parliament.

SIDA provides support to UNDP’s GRF. The PAR project was formerly part of the GRF before evolving to a stand-alone project. The GRF supports government agency institutional strengthening. There have been collaborative efforts between the PAR project and the GRF to include civil service reform and adapting services to the people with disabilities and special needs.

GIZ focuses on local governance and decentralization and emphasizes service delivery improvements, public participation at the local level, and local economic development. GIZ also continues to work on public finance reform at the central and local levels.

UNDP has a variety of projects within its democratic governance program. In addition to the GRF, the projects include: consolidating parliamentary democracy in Georgia, protecting the rights of persons with disabilities in Georgia, mediation and arbitration, fostering decentralization and good governance at the local level, fostering regional and local development in Georgia, UN Joint Programme for gender equality in Georgia, and assisting Georgia’s government and local communities in mitigating the COVID-19 impact.

The Evaluator would like to thank the project team for their collaboration and coordination of the assignment. The assignment was implemented in a short time frame near project end. The project team’s efforts to provide the necessary documentation, coordinate meetings, and provide insights helped the assignment proceed smoothly. Their effort is especially commendable given that they were also ending project activities while planning for the next project phase. And, all this was done during the COVID-19 pandemic so extra efforts were needed given the collection of information from various sources, and the scheduling of and participation in numerous videoconferences in two far apart time zones with meetings taking place in the Georgian evening. The Evaluator would also like to thank the UNDP Country Office for their support and insights and the Government of the United Kingdom for their support and insights. The AoG, CSB, PSDA and DGA, and other national government entities and CSOs were helpful to gain an understanding of the project’s context, collect feedback on the project’s performance, and receive perspectives on the PAR components.

## Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The project was scheduled to end in December 2020 and an extension was agreed to allow for this final project evaluation, end tasks delayed given the COVID-19 pandemic, and allow for the immediate follow-up activities in all three outcome areas that emerged as a result of past interventions. The final evaluation is timely to determine if project outcomes and outputs were achieved according to the project document and follow-on annual plans. As indicated in the previous section, the project was implemented in a changing environment. The final evaluation is an opportunity to measure results, summarize the lessons learned, and contribute to future programming, policymaking and overall organizational learning by outlining recommendations for further PAR. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation is provided as Annex A.

The final evaluation was conducted from 1 January to 19 March 2021. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the efficacy of the project design and structure, relevance of the project outcomes and outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the assistance, and the sustainability of interventions. The evaluation is to also include an analysis of how PAR project interventions address human rights and gender equality principles.[[18]](#footnote-19)

Also as stated in the TOR, the specific objectives of the evaluation are to:[[19]](#footnote-20)

* Evaluate the achievements against the project’s objectives and expected outcomes;
* Identify strengths and weaknesses in design and implementation;
* Assess the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the project in terms of achieved outputs and results and its contribution to Country Program Document outcome;
* Identify lessons learned and good practices; and
* Provide recommendations for future phase of the project.

## Evaluation Timeline

The evaluation was to take place from January 1 to March 19, 2021 with the following time schedule:

* 1 January Contract start date
* 27January Inception Report submitted
* 8 January, ongoing Document Review
* 21 January – 19 Feb Discussions and interviews with project management and staff,

project donor representatives, counterparts (AoG, CSB, DGA, PSDA, others), CSOs, other development partners as appropriate

* 5 March Draft Report submitted
* 12 March Consolidated UNDP and donor comments to the draft report

received

* 19 March Final Report and PowerPoint Summary Presentation submitted

and assignment end

**Table 2: Graphic Work Plan**

| Deliverables | Timeline | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| January | | | | February | | | | March | |
| I | II | III | IV | I | II | III | IV | I | II |
| Draft Inception Report  Responsibility: Evaluator with inputs provided by project personnel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finalize Inception Report  Responsibility: Evaluator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desk Review  Responsibility: Evaluator, project personnel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation of data collection instruments  Responsibility: Evaluator with discussions and feedback with project personnel to schedule meetings, obtain documents, gather data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection - Field Work  Responsibility: Evaluator interactions with interviewees and project personnel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis  Responsibility: Evaluator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft an evaluation report  Responsibility: Evaluator with feedback provided by project personnel, UNDP and UK Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final evaluation report (March 19)  Responsibility: Evaluator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 March |

## Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation approach and methodology was based on a triangulation approach to include: 1) a review of relevant documents and the collection of data regarding PAR in Georgia, project activities and resulting impacts; 2) interviews of the direct and indirect stakeholders and project partners; and 3) a performance review analysis of the information gathered, particularly the Results and Resource Framework (RRF) and other performance-related data. All findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are a result of at least two if not three or more sources so as to verify the information provided and provide a sound basis for any related future PAR interventions.

As indicated in the evaluation TOR, the evaluation was focused on the following, according to the criteria established by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC):

* + 1. *Relevance* (approach, objectives, modalities of implementation, etc.) and to include to what extent the project is responding to the national context.
    2. *Effectiveness and Results* of the approach used to produce results and to what extent the project is on track to achieving the project outputs and outcomes.
    3. *Efficiency* of project and project management, including the delivery of inputs in terms of quality, added value, quantity and timeliness, and the monitoring system, including how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) were converted to results.
    4. *Sustainability* of the project to measure to what extent the benefits of the activities will have after project completion and if the capacity will be maintained or expanded.
    5. *Impact* on PAR reform, overall, and for each outcome.
    6. *Coordination* with development partners, UNDP and UN agencies, and other development partners, CSOs, NGOs and academic institutions.
    7. *Gender and inclusion* in regard to the extent the project has contributed to gender equality and the empowerment of women and the extent the project promoted positive change in gender equality, empowerment of women and social inclusion.

An analysis of each of the evaluation criteria is included in the following section to show how the project has responded to each criterion. The TOR contained a list of questions to respond to each criterion. The questions related to each criterion were responded to based on the document review, interviews, data review and the resulting analysis of these elements. The analysis directly contributed to the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations in the proceeding parts of the report after Section III.A. It should be noted that not all TOR questions for each criterion are answered directly in Section III.A but provide a summary for each criterion. Each question was considered for each criterion and, where possible, answers were amalgamated or priority information, issues and/or conclusions presented.

The findings and conclusions section is based on evaluability analysis.[[20]](#footnote-21) The aim is to provide information on outputs and indicators compared to baseline data mainly through the RRF. There was also a review of the project activities and outputs as identified in the other attachments to this report (Annexes D to M, described below). There was the identification of issues confronted and how they were addressed. The analysis also looks at how the project’s methodology was applied and if any issues or best practices were evident. The information analysis leads to the identification of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

The target audiences for the evaluation are:

* Main partners to deliver the project services: UNDP, Government of the United Kingdom
* Direct stakeholder: AoG, CSB, DGA, PSDA; other development partners
* Indirect stakeholders: End-users such as government ministry planning and human resource management offices, LEPLs and other government service delivery organizations, CSOs active in PAR, academic institutions, and private consulting firms engaged in PAR

All findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are those of the independent evaluator.

The documents reviewed include, but were not limited to, the following documents. A complete list of documents reviewed is provided as Annex B.

* Project document to include attachments (RRF tables, indicator performance tables, budget, etc.)
* Project 6-month and annual reports including budget performance, work plans, situation analysis documents, risk analysis, etc.
* Medium term evaluation report
* Survey data especially data from the baseline 2016 and 2019-20 civil servant and public perception surveys[[21]](#footnote-22)
* Planned and actual budgets
* Project outputs such as plans, strategies, laws, decrees, orders, training programs, etc. that resulted from project activity
* Other documents as necessary and relevant

The stakeholder interviews were organized to discuss the performance of the outcomes and outputs, performance and relationships with the project team, the structure of the project, and possible future areas that need attention. The interviewees were selected to include direct and indirect stakeholders. All main stakeholders and development partners were interviewed. Also, a cross section of “users”, trainers and consultants were also interviewed. Besides interviewing project management and staff and the donor entities, a cross section of individuals were selected to represent each outcome area. The selection of those interviewed was suggested by project management and staff, UNDP, the evaluator or suggested by stakeholders during the interview process. The objective was to obtain a variety of viewpoints from a variety of angles. The interviews were also helpful to add information or verify information that was obtained during the document review phase. There was also open discussion of lessons learned and/or conclusions and next PAR steps relevant to the three outcome areas. This discussion took place to ensure that whatever was concluded, observed or recommended was practical and in line with the current and medium term context for any further interventions. A complete list of those interviewed is provided as Annex C.

In summary, the interviews included:

* Project management and staff,
* Development Partner representatives to include UNDP, UK Government, EU Delegation to Georgia and USAID
* Direct and Indirect Stakeholders:
  + AoG to include Policy Planning and Coordination Department, Public Administration Unit, Policy Planning Unit,
  + CSB,
  + PSDA,
  + DGA,
  + Public Service Hall and Patrol Police Unified Service Center, and
  + CSOs, consultants and academia

The interviewees included: 1) project management, implementation and oversight; 2) implementation as a counterpart, stakeholder or provider of services involved in one or more of the outcome areas; and 3) an end-user or individual or entity that were impacted by the project. There was an attempt to get a cross section for each of the three outcome areas.

Given the project’s complexity, a set of tables is provided as attachments (Annexes D-N) to present project information in an organized analytical framework. The tables also provide more quantitative and some qualitative data on which to provide background and inputs to provide a base for conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. The tables are also a summary of all project activity. This information was especially important to help measure the progress of the project to date according to what was originally planned in the project document. The project team completed the tables to provide the most up-to-date and accurate information in an efficient and timely manner. They worked with project stakeholders to collect the information so the information can be presented in an organized and presentable manner. The collected information can be used for purposes other than this evaluation by the project team, development partners and the government stakeholders.

The tables are:

Annex D: List of Project Personnel and Main Contractors

Annex E: Progress Toward Project Goal, Outcomes, Outputs and Associated Indicators

Annex F: Main PAR Laws, Policies, Decrees, By-Laws and Strategies Prepared

Annex G: Project Developed QEC Training

Annex H: Key Training Events

Annex I: Emerging Needs – PAR-Sponsored Sub Projects

Annex J: Project-Sponsored Conferences and Public Events

Annex K: PAR-Sponsored Policy Research Studies, Civil Society Grants, Other Research, Guides, Publications and Videos

Annex L: Project-Supported e-Services

Annex M: Budget Performance by Outcome, by Year, and Totals

Annex N: Theory of Change

Attempts were made to analyze gender and inclusion in terms of how gender was integrated in the project, the activities that had taken place to address gender and inclusion, and any impacts on gender and inclusion issues. This analysis included reviewing gender data of training, number and types of research to address gender issues in the civil service, any gender and vulnerable group screening mechanisms in policy and strategic document preparation and/or review, and improved access to e-services and such services targeted to vulnerable groups.

Value for money was also addressed by reviewing efficiency, effectiveness, results and impact based on the criteria review noted above. The analysis included reviewing budget expenditure, by component, compared to actual progress on outputs and the achievement of results.

The final phase of information analysis and report writing was conducted during and following the interviews. The analysis included:

* Intended outcomes, outputs and output targets per the project documents (baseline and actual result) including the RRF.
* Progress on each outcome’s outputs and indicators identifying indicative output result and issues (if any), by outcome.
* Budget performance, by outcome, by year and overall with delivery rates.

By reviewing the documents, interview information, indicators (targets and actuals) and activity performance, findings and conclusions were identified by component and for the overall project. A set of lessons learned is also provided to improve upon any future PAR efforts. A set of recommendations was formulated to: 1) contribute to the effective completion of the existing project; and 2) provide guidance for the planning of any future PAR interventions that may be related to the project.

The evaluation did have limitations. As previously mentioned, the COVID-19 travel restrictions prevented an in-country visit. However, the limitation was mitigated by the conduct of videoconferences. All necessary information was obtained from the interviews. The project team was proactive and responsive in coordinating the meetings.

A second limitation was that many activities were delayed given the COVID-19 slowdown during the project’s last year. It appears that time was made up with the extension. But many of the outcomes were to be completed in the February/March period that left time for only more “spot” like observations to determine where such activities stood at the time of the evaluation. The evaluation is based on information received to date. The project’s management and staff were cooperative in providing information as it was being produced, some unique for the evaluation, as well a project products that were planned before project end.

A third limitation was the availability of some data. The project would have benefited from having a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework at project start, especially given its size and wide scope. It is understandable that such a framework was not established at the very beginning since some of the outputs were adjusted just after project initiation and the project context had changed from when the project document was formulated. Even the Theory of Change was adjusted in the first year. However, the data limitation was not severe or negatively impactful regarding project performance and this evaluation. The information collected and presented by the project team, the mid term evaluation, various output evaluations, and the civil service and public surveys do combine to provide a good base for project performance as well as PAR performance. It would have been helpful or could be helpful since the last civil service/public survey is now being prepared, if the survey data was more comparable from survey to survey, especially after the last survey (reportedly to be completed in March), comparable data would make a contribution to review PAR reform in terms of what has/has not developed over the last 5 years and what gaps or weaknesses need further attention.

A fourth limitation is that the assessment of efficiency relied on comparing activities and performance with financing and other resources. It also relied on comparing actual results to baselines, when known, and targets. There are limited other efficiency review options given the type and scope of project activities to other similar projects and activities. The ability of project management and staff to execute project activities was reviewed.

# Findings and Conclusions

## Overview and Criteria Assessment

The section includes a project performance summary based on a set of evaluation factors and associated questions; an assessment of responsiveness to the project goal, project management, project implementation and SDGs; and the background, major results, and conclusions of each of the three outcome areas. The section ends with a set of lessons learned. This section prepares the groundwork for the recommendations in Section IV

The evaluation factors are criteria to report on and measure project performance. They are based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. Each factor has an associated set of questions as identified in the TOR. The questions are responded to below to the extent possible. Where possible, descriptions are summarized and the main issues or conclusions are indicated. Please note that give the breadth of the project’s activities, the assessment presented below is a summary of each factor with sufficient detail to support findings. More detailed performance information is provided in the following sections, overall and by outcome area.

**Table 3: Project Achievement Measurement Summary**

| Evaluation Factors | Result |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance | The project is extremely relevant to GoG priorities and needs. The GoG had prioritized PAR in the past but placed more of a priority in 2014-16 when the project was being defined and eventually implemented in 2016. An emphasis was on having reforms in all three outcome areas of the project with an initial emphasis on the policy planning and coordination, civil service reform and human resource development, and public service delivery legal/regulatory framework that was worked on as a result of the PAR Roadmap 2016-20 that identified these areas. The project was directly responsive to the Roadmap and had government and stakeholder buy-in at the very beginning as evidenced by initial review and agreement on project document intervention areas, with some initial adjustments made. While political will waivered at times given various election-induced changes and some personnel changes, the project adjusted accordingly, maintained close contact with key stakeholders and continued to advance. Even when there were delays in the approval of some documents (policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process handbook; civil service reform by-laws, Unified Public Service Design and Delivery Standard (UPSDD), as examples), the project continued to work with stakeholders to advance project activities.  Within each outcome area, stakeholder needs were continually assessed and project interventions designed accordingly with input. As necessary, civil society input was sought and through the research and “emerging needs” mechanism, was broadened so as to bring such participation and feedback into the policy and program development, civil service reform implementation, and service delivery processes.  The key stakeholders (AoG, CSB, PSDA, DGA) as well as various ministries used the project as needed and found a responsive partner in stakeholder initiated activities as well as the implementation of project activities.  The project directly responded to the needs at the appropriate time. This is evidenced by contributions to establishing the legal/regulatory framework for the various outcome areas as well as their implementation.[[22]](#footnote-23) An organized effort was implemented to develop human resources for implementation and structures to provide for human resource training and development (course accreditation process, topic-specific training on various project-related PAR subjects, research).[[23]](#footnote-24) Also, the project contributed to the public awareness of the PAR activities by conducting 2 national surveys to measure public and civil servant perceptions of the various elements of PAR (2016 and 2020). A third survey is scheduled for completion by March 2021. Other public awareness raising efforts are provided in Annex J and K. |
| Effectiveness and Results | The project outcomes and most outputs were achieved. Some outputs require attention for full completion. However, the measurement of achievement is ongoing and will continue to be ongoing since the subject areas addressed will take time to embed and progress as cycles of activity occur over the medium term. For instance, the policy planning handbook is in place and is now being piloted with 3 national strategies applying the handbook’s methodology during the design stage. 15 policy documents were scheduled for approval that had applied the new policy standards and to date 8 were approved. The e-monitoring and evaluation system that will be the policy planning backbone remains in the design phase and is scheduled for implementation in the third quarter 2021. The COVID-19 impact had slowed both activities. Similarly, with certain elements of civil service reform, such as applying performance appraisal, progress has been made and methods should improve as long as the requirement continues and there is a stronger link with human resource development that was also strengthened through a more organized and targeted education and training approach. For service delivery, national standards have been developed and are being applied, though the standards were not approved as of this time. The challenge is the depth and breadth of applying these processes, systems, standards, and approaches government-wide so there is a whole-of-government approach and results. This will require further interventions and further cycles of activities as what has been developed over the last 4 years is applied.  The PAR project partnership strategy was tested during the COVID-19 pandemic. While certain elements of the project slowed, the project adjusted to respond accordingly in cooperation with stakeholders. The project has emphasized a participatory and cooperative work relationship throughout its timespan. During COVID, for example, the policy planning reforms continued and the policy handbook was approved and implemented as well as work on the accompanying e-system. Public service delivery demand and interest increased, raising its prioritization within the GoG and with the project. More government services were placed on-line through my.gov.ge, many with project support.[[24]](#footnote-25)  While the project has accomplished most of its outputs, the main contributors to its positive performance are its flexibility and ability to work closely with stakeholders in partnership; the relationships that were built with stakeholders, civil society, and other development partners; and the ability to measure results occasionally with reporting and monitoring and evaluation instruments. Through the project reporting, major constraints and risks were clearly identified with realistic approaches to resolve or respond to such risks. With those risks out of the control of the project, the ‘flexibility’ factor kicked in so progress continued to be made.  While the basis for PAR are established, adjustments will likely need to be made as time goes on. Future interventions will have to consider how to continue the reform process and implementation in an efficient manner. For instance, about 300 people from ministry and agency policy planning units were trained on the policy planning handbook. Such training will need to be continued as people change in the line ministries over time and as the planning handbook is applied and there are more users. The e-monitoring and evaluation system will help as will policy planning staff training and the current designing of an on-line training course. For civil service training, the accredited training programs designed with project support (5 training centers with 11 courses accredited) will meet at least medium term training needs for certain subject areas. New areas will need to be identified as training needs assessments progress to facilitate the application of the civil service by-laws and professional development training needs become more evident.  Stakeholder capabilities have been built to the extent possible within each of the outcome areas. The issue is that management and staff change, which has been experienced throughout the project’s timespan, in the key stakeholders, and ministries and agencies. While the continued training and implementation will help, there will also need to be the political will and support to allow the reforms to become routine in government with the interest to apply change management for continuous improvement. |
| Efficiency | Project expenditure appears to have aligned with project activity in each of the output areas. There are some variations in the early years at project start-up with more emphasis or faster start on policy planning than public service delivery. The activity and expenditure evens out over time so the project was operating more efficiently in all outcome areas. That said, the expenditure for policy planning and coordination outcome was about 13% over planned expenditure and service delivery 21% under planned expenditure as of December 2020. The policy planning and coordination outcome was a smaller size component of the project with 14% of expenditure with service delivery at 22%. The civil service reform component was only 2% over planned expenditure. Allocations between policy planning and service delivery could have been adjusted over the years. However, given plans and expectations in the two outcome areas such reprogramming may have been inappropriate and there was no budget shortfall. Some activities did not occur according to time plan based on required approval or stakeholder readiness. For instance, the UPSDD has not yet been approved though the standards are being applied in at least two entities with project support. Strategic decisions were made to allocate funding where activity was needed or present and the proper stakeholder support was evident. When there was lack of support, mainly caused by lack of political will (such as delays in approving the policy planning handbook) activities were adjusted accordingly. The civil service component seemed to be implemented methodically with budget and resources aligned with the project activity and the support of the CSB.  The project management structure was appropriate for the size of the project and its scope of work. The project structure was adjusted at the inception phase when it was split from the GRF. The change seems to have been a benefit given the scope and breadth of the project. There was no staff turnover and human resources were allocated to areas where needed that included adding a full time monitoring and evaluation specialist and administration/finance associate. It appears that there was no staff turnover. There was use of local and international consultants and contractual-service companies; use of grants through the research and civil society grant schemes (25 total), funding of “emerging needs’ subprojects subjects (7 total), and the support of conferences and trainings events. Management of such contracting-out posed no management issues. There were no negative findings. UNDP procurement processes were applied. Performance was measured and evaluated. Those contractors interviewed reported a positive relationship with the project in terms of execution, support and payment.  UNDP monitoring and evaluation systems were applied. The project conducted a detailed mid-term evaluation. There were also project-conducted evaluations of the CSO and research grants schemes (two evaluations with a third to be completed in March 2021). Project reporting was detailed with reports biannually and annually for each year. The reports indicated activities, described the context of the activities and PAR in general, next steps, monitoring and evaluation steps taken, public and outreach events, risk matrix, budget status, and a performance table per the RRF. The project also produced detailed implementation context analysis based on UNDP standards in 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.[[25]](#footnote-26) The results of the evaluations were followed up as illustrated in the reporting and appeared to help in refining activities. Ongoing discussions with stakeholders also helped to either keep activities on track or agree to adjustments. |
| Impact | The project significantly impacted PAR implementation and its activities will continue to positively impact PAR if the government adheres to PAR as envisioned in the 2016-20 Roadmap. It is reported that the 2021-24 Roadmap will address the same priority areas. The gains made to date will most likely remain given that law or policy, human resource development, and process implementation support them. The project has provided input into the Roadmap being prepared and has helped its development. The delay in its finalization could be attributed to three factors: 1) the impact of the GoG’s responding to COVID-19; 2) the AoG applying the policy planning handbook process to the Roadmap; and 3) given a change in the Prime Minister, the Head of AoG and deputy positions were vacant until 10 March 2021. The appointment delay also delayed the convening of a PAR Council meeting.  The project was catalytic for PAR given its timeliness and direct tie to the PAR Roadmap. Relationships with stakeholders helped to refine and adjust activities along the way, as needed. Also, there was coordination in what is a “crowded” space with various development partners active in PAR. All this was happening in an overall political environment that raised questions from time-to-time about commitment and prioritization but which also showed constant movement to advance the PAR Roadmap. The impact, while real and positive, may not be as deep and broad as needed since not all systems, approaches and processes developed with project support are being applied government-wide. And, government ministries and agencies cannot access some of the modalities (such as the civil service training programs) because of lack of financing or other access issues. PAR is a wide subject and for the activities to “stick” will require constant attention and application over the medium term. The project has implemented what was set out and sometimes exceeded expectations (certain training, support to e-government services, etc.).  For the impact on each outcome area, please see the descriptions in the subsections below (III.C and D).  CSO’s engagement in PAR has been advanced by the project. The engagement has been by the small grants scheme and involvement in project activity, such as being brought into the policy planning process especially for national strategic and sector studies, and improving service delivery. For the small grant scheme, a total of 25 research and civil society grants were awarded. The grants helped to build capacity to make the organizations, be they academic institutions, national or local community CSOs, to be involved in PAR. 16 of the grant projects were evaluated with 8 to be evaluated by mid-March 2021. The grant scheme was adjusted in 2020 to be more responsive to subject areas within the project outcome areas that were more relevant to the COVID-19 pandemic situation. This included digital learning, provision of services to women victims of domestic violence during the pandemic, compliance with public participation in the policy planning process, support to develop and deploy risk communication strategic guidelines for public health emergencies, and provision of professional home care services to elderly and vulnerable persons and a home care on-line learning platform. The adjustment shows the flexibility of the project to respond to needs and at the same time draw attention to key issue areas. As shown by the evaluation, most (not all) of the research that was done was evidence-based. However, it is difficult to show if the research had a significant impact on public policy. There is evidence of drawing attention to issues that need to be addressed by senior government, civil servants and the public. In various cases, the research efforts bridged a gap between government and civil society participants at a national level and, in a few instances, at a local level. |
| Sustainability | Sustainability of PAR is evident. The PAR Roadmap 2016-20 is being followed up with a new Roadmap for the next 4-5 years.[[26]](#footnote-27) The Civil Service Law is implemented along with its by-laws. The UPSDD are drafted, not yet approved, with the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and standards being applied at least on a pilot basis. CSO participation has been generated with avenues to provide input to PAR and policy planning as well as conduct necessary research. To keep this all going further attention is needed consisting of political will and acceptance of reform, civil servant buy-in which appears to be happening, and civil society engagement which is also happening. Development partner support will need to continue to ensure standards are compliant with EU and international standards. There is common interest and commitment to achieve these standards by stakeholders and those involved in the reforms. There have not been deviations though some of the activities have developed slowly. The project has helped to mitigate some of the risks by appropriately identifying problem areas and addressing issues using a combination of tools to include building positive relationships with stakeholders, using UNDP and UK government senior officials to help push progress or draw attention to issues when needed, and coordination with other development partners so that common goals and objectives are achieved. It has been a challenging environment in the past but with the development of the legal/regulatory framework, the building of capacities, more active and prepared CSOs (with avenues for input), continued development partner support, and a government plan in preparation to continue reform, sustainability is more apparent.  Some key strategies developed with the support or input of the project continues to be used. The following are examples. As mentioned, the policy planning handbook is being used for 3 national strategies (supported by the project) and is required to be used for all other national, sector and institutional strategies. The e-monitoring and evaluation system will help to broaden and solidify its use. The unified e-learning platform is planned for completion in April 2021. The platform will help in the delivery of the civil service training and make it more widely available. The Civil Servants’ Forum, with CSB backing, has been a useful meeting place for civil servants and is expected to continue to advance civil service reform and address issues. Performance appraisal, which the project has helped to advance, is being applied. It is not yet a perfect system but has shown signs of improvement given a very low expectation base. And, pilots are now being undertaken to link appraisals with human resource development plans (in 3 ministries). The e-Human Resources Management System (e-HRMS) is part of this infrastructure and will eventually be linked to the e-learning platform. There is a question of affordability of training by some ministries and agencies and, thus, access but the e-learning platform may help to address the affordability and access questions. Service delivery will be enhanced by approval of the UPSDD and the application beyond the two current pilot entities. The standards are being applied to entities that see the benefit of using such standards and seem to have been applied in a committed and enthusiastic manner. E-government services have been expanded with project support as well as providing support for critical issue areas to include cyber security. The challenge is broadening the use of these interventions so they are done without donor support. There are signs this is happening but not thorough enough.  Capacity has been transferred to stakeholders. The transfer has occurred by training for the most part. In some cases, training of trainers has taken place, such as for the policy planning-related training and public service delivery to include training packages in service design, delivery, quality assurance and public service costing. E-learning systems are being developed to facilitate training but such use and quality of training need to be observed, especially at the beginning of their implementation.  There is an issue of keeping management and staff at certain entities, such as AoG, PSDA and DGA. One of the solutions is to adopt processes, procedures, manuals and standards so if new people enter they have something to follow. Since some of the instruments are mandated or according to law, it makes sustainability more possible but implementation will continue to be a main factor, especially the quality of implementation.  Any future interventions should have a clear exit strategy. Within the current project’s design, the exit strategy was not specifically identified and such a strategy could make it clear to stakeholders where donor support ends and it is up to stakeholders to do on their own. There is evidence that some of this is happening but not sufficient evidence that the reforms are fully accepted and whole-of-government. This observation is not unique to Georgia since it requires cycles of activity over time. |
| Coordination | The project has been apt at coordination on several fronts: with government stakeholders, development partners, CSOs, other UNDP projects, and UN agencies. The project’s management and staff have coordinated effectively and have a positive relationship with the UNDP country office and with UK government representatives.  From all parties interviewed, the project management and staff received positive comments for responsiveness, resourcefulness, support, follow-up and reliability. Government stakeholders see the project as a reliable support tool to accomplish their respective responsibilities. Other development partners indicated the interest to work together when necessary or coordinate as appropriate. This is being done in a more informal manner based on either past working relationships of those active in the reform process or the building of new relationships. Collaboration also seems to occur when issues are confronted or attention is needed. The project fits into a multi-faceted governance program being executed by UNDP in Georgia as well as a major project of the UK government in Georgia. CSOs, to include NGOs and academic institutions and others, have been key players as participants as well as stakeholders. The two faceted approach - opening avenues for CSO input and participation into the various PAR elements and involvement of CSOs in the small grant scheme - has created more than just interest but a more active role in PAR reform as well as capacities to do so.  Coordination was also done within the project itself to help develop or strengthen working relationships between different stakeholders. PAR is a wide-ranging reform effort and requires the coordination and collaboration of the various entities involved. It is not a totally hierarchical effort and various GoG entities have responsibility. This has led to formal and informal cooperative working relationships between AoG, CSB, DGA and PSDA. Such coordination and collaboration is absolutely necessary and the project has helped to facilitate it.  There is the possibility for donor coordination to improve in this space that is more led by government. There are various donors involved (EU, UNDP, USAID, GIZ, etc.) and there is coordination amongst the donors that benefits collaboration and cooperation and for each to focus on specific areas. However, the coordination is amongst the donors themselves. Each has their inroads with the GoG. More government-led donor coordination may benefit PAR progress in the future and the specific stakeholder counterparts. UNDP has the comparative advantage to help make this happen given its objective stance and worldwide experience, including within the region. |
| Gender Equality and Inclusion | Gender and inclusion have been a day-to-day commitment for the project since initiation. The project follows an ingrained human rights based approach that is not only advocated but put into practice at the policy formulation level, civil servant human resource capacity building level, the provision of public services, and the involvement of CSOs and their ability to either address or formulate positions or provide research on gender and inclusion issues.  The human rights based approach is now embedded in the policy formulation process. The policy planning handbook requires the adoption of a human rights based approach when formulating goals and objectives in national, sector and institutional policy documents. The documents are to incorporate issues relating to gender, minorities and vulnerable groups. For the new PAR Roadmap under development, UN Women is part of the development team and by applying the policy planning handbook and system, a more human rights-based approach will be applied. Such an approach makes addressing such issues systematic and allows input from the professionals at the civil service level as well as the public. As well, it give more discrete avenues for development partner assistance or partnerships on these issues.  The civil servant human resource capacity development sponsored by the project had strong female participation. Of the 25 main training events, 18 had gender disaggregated participant data. At these 18 events, a total of about 2,907 individuals were trained with about 1,854 women trained (63.8% of those trained). Women made up 72% of those interviewed for this evaluation. Women were trainers, conference speakers and consultants. Project management and staff are all female except for one part-time male advisor. The positions of those females involved in the project (trainers, trainees, counterparts, consultants, etc.) vary to include senior executives and managers, a range of technical specialists, and service delivery personnel.  The public service delivery outcome area has helped to improve awareness and use of public services of all citizens. The e-services and work done to improve service delivery in the Public Service Halls and Patrol Department Unified Service Center have helped to improve access countrywide for all groups to include women, minorities, and those with disabilities. As an example, personnel in these two entities were trained in sign language. Standing Operating Procedures were developed to help serve the needs of those with disabilities. Several e-services were developed to make such public services are more easily available to a variety of vulnerable groups. Also, targeted service delivery improvement measures for persons with disabilities and persons with psychosocial needs were addressed through the legal framework.  Regarding research done by CSOs, various subject areas were addressed to include: careers in civil service and gender equality, the study on state services supporting inclusive education, the challenges in provision of services to women victims of domestic violence by the Ministry of Internal Affairs during COVID-19, assessing public participation in the policy-making process, support expansion of the home care services throughout Georgia targeting the most at-risk people affected by COVID-19, development and deployment of national risk communication strategy for public health emergencies in Georgia, provision of public services and effectiveness of ethnic minority (Azerbaijani) engagement in Georgia, day care standards for people with disabilities, and improving state services supporting the employment of persons with disabilities in Georgia. Also, a project initiative mapped managerial female civil servant career paths to observe experiences, challenges, issues and opportunities.  The above listing of research and civil society projects show that the project has addressed different groups in a manner to identify and address certain issues under the project’s umbrella. It appears that more of the relevant research and civil society projects were done on these topics was later in the project (2020). The first two evaluations of the grant schemes states that gender was reflected, for the most part, in terms of gender-related indicators and criteria yet not sufficiently mainstreamed in all research efforts. Gender factors were part of the criteria for the selection of the grants. Though, most of the projects did not have a gender or vulnerable group emphasis. This seems to have been addressed during the last cycle of research and CSO projects.  Gender and social inclusion could have been better ingrained in the project through the project document to have more of a focus. As the project developed, these factors did come more into focus and were intertwined in all activities as summarized in the above paragraphs. Also gender-disaggregated data could have been better planned from project initiation. As mentioned, not all training had gender-disaggregated data. And, more gender specific research could have been taken, especially in the areas of civil service professional development.  The project has definitely contributed to promoting positive changes in gender equality and women empowerment, as illustrated above. There were no negative effects observed. There were positive effects in terms of engaging on women’s issues, emphasizing a merit-based civil service, equal access to professional development and objective-based performance appraisal, bringing attention to and helping to come up with an appropriated mechanism for dispute resolution, and improving access to public services. |
| COVID-19 Impact | The impact of COVID-19 on the project, and PAR in general, should be noted since the pandemic has impacted project performance for more than a year. The project had to change its approach of one that was very much based on personal face-to-face interactions with stakeholders in terms of meetings and discussions, training, and the provision of the advisory services. The project adjusted its approach so that regulations were followed and safety paramount. The interactions with stakeholders, contractors and others moved on-line via teleconference or videoconference meetings. Training was modified to occur on-line. Several of the research and CSO grant scheme initiatives were in direct response to the pandemic and its repercussions. Most impacted was public service delivery with the pandemic instigating more attention to service delivery. The delivery of public services during a pandemic was part of the response included in the CAF assessments and application of standards for the Public Service Halls and the Patrol Department Unified Service Center. Both entities reported that the advisory services and resulting service changes did help improve the delivery of services during the pandemic. There was an effort to place more public services on-line through my.gov.ge and the project was instrumental in helping this movement so much so that its target was significantly over achieved. The project also supported a promotional video prepared with DGA to promote the use of my.gov.ge during the pandemic.  The project’s pandemic response was timely and detailed so that 1) project activities continued; and 2) the pandemic actually brought attention to the need for PAR reform. Both were addressed by adopting more responsive advisory, training and public service delivery modalities. While some project activity or outcomes slowed because of the transition, efforts were made, with consultations with the project sponsors and stakeholders, to keep things moving. The pandemic is also probably the chief factor to grant a 3-month project extension to the end of March 2021. |

## Responsiveness to Project Goal, Project Management and Implementation

#### 1. Assessment of Achieving Project Goal

The project’s goal is intertwined with the GoG’s overall development goal, EU accession commitments and the UN and UNDP framework as described in Section II.A. However, the project goal has somewhat evolved from the project document. For instance the project goal in the project document is stated as:

“To enhance the capability of the Government of Georgia to implement its national development agenda through a more effective, professionally trained, unified and independent public administration that delivers public service with greater accountability and responsiveness to citizens’ needs.”[[27]](#footnote-28)

The RRF has an impact statement:

“Citizens expectations for voice, accountability and better public service are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.”

The above goal and impact statements have common elements. The impact statement is at a higher level and thus a bit broader and long-term in nature. The different phraseology did not add to mission creep or a misallocation of resources, or result in misunderstandings by implementers and stakeholders. The definition of the outcomes and outputs were clearly stated so that a focus was developed to concentrate in the 3 outcomes and the associated outputs and activities. The GoG mandate was also clear since the PAR Roadmap and civil service reform law provided the overall umbrella to help the project identify and make progress.

The project began on July 26, 2016 after signing project document. The project was designed to help raise awareness at the political level for further autonomy and professionalism of Georgia’s civil service. At the policy level, with other development partners’ support, the project was to advance PAR and continue it as a priority at the cabinet level. At the operational level, the objective was to improve policymaking and implementation, overall civil service reform and improvement of service delivery.

Formal Cabinet of Ministers project approval was delayed due to the 2016 parliamentary elections. When the project was initiated, the first task undertaken was a review of the RRF and associated work programs with the key stakeholders. Some adjustments were required since the project document was prepared about one year before implementation. The meetings and adjustments were a positive outcome for the project since it helped to tailor needs and synchronize activities with stakeholder interests and helped to gain participation and ownership at an early stage. One of the initial tasks of the project, the conduct of a survey of public and civil servant PAR perceptions in 2016-17 helped to establish baseline data for the project.[[28]](#footnote-29)

The PAR Council and associated working groups were reactivated in 2017. However, a worsening economic outlook in 2016-2017 resulted in austerity measures and a 10% cut in administrative expenses and civil service personnel cuts. The number of ministries was reduced to 14 from 18. Project activity and performance was intertwined with establishment and implementation of the legal/regulatory framework. The civil service law came into force on 1 July 2017 though several of the by-laws came into effect later on. The Law on Salary Scales in the Civil Services was approved on 22 December 2017. A draft law was proposed to reform LEPLs. To date, no actions have been taken regarding LEPLs.

Through these occurrences and changes in personnel or vacancies in AoG, the project had adopted a more flexible approach to be able to adjust to the legal/regulatory environment, capacity constraints, and different levels of attention to or prioritization of PAR.

In 2018, the project was able to continue working with CSB to implement the elements of the civil service law under the project’s framework. According to project reporting, the CSB developed a more advisory role rather than hands on management role. CSB was coordinating reform and providing guidance to ministries and agencies to interpret the regulations. The project was seen as a key development partner, amongst others, to help implement the civil service reform agenda. At the same time, the project was able to make progress with AoG to strengthen the policy planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting. There were political changes with a cabinet reshuffle and presidential elections in November 2018. The head of AoG moved to a ministerial position on/about April 2018. A new head was appointed in July and initiated a restructuring. In June 2018 the number of ministries were reduced from 14 to 11. The 2017 reduction was still not completed. The new Cabinet and leadership expressed interest in the PAR agenda. Given this situation the PAR project continued work despite the leadership disruptions. By this time all elements of the project were established in all three outcome areas. Relationships were built with the various stakeholders and work plans remained intact. While senior government attention had wavered with the various changes, commitment at the civil servant level was sufficient. And, the situation further identified the need for and the project’s commitment to CSO input to PAR that the project was also developing through the reform of the policy planning process and small grants scheme. The project was also conducting a series of Emerging Needs sub projects to address particular PAR needs, such as institutional reform of two ministries in Ajara. As needed, senior development partner officials, such as EU, UK and UNDP representatives, were brought in to bring attention to PAR and specific issues.

In 2019, there was some consolidation of project gains from the 2016-18 period with change being undertaken at the main stakeholder entities and a whole-of-government approach applied to the extent possible. However, destabilizing political occurrences in 2019 raised concerns with protests, the Prime Minister’s resignation and parliamentary elections scheduled for 2020. The results of the project’s mid-term public opinion survey showed concerns of the impartiality of Georgia’s civil service with 56% of respondents thinking public agencies make decisions based on political orders, up from 34% in 2016.[[29]](#footnote-30) Other findings indicated more of a loss of trust of government compared to 2016 survey findings: the percent of the public who believe the civil service employs professional fells to 58% from 74%; and public trust in civil servants fell from 67% from 71%. For civil servants, more civil servants said they are proud of their work (80% versus 78% in 2016); fewer civil servants felt the civil service is free from political influence (42% versus 56%); and fewer civil servants said the civil service employs professionals (41% versus 50%). The deterioration of the public and civil servants’ opinions of the public administration and public services was clear. But, at the same time, 67% of the citizens said they value Georgia’s civil service.

The survey, along with the project’s mid term evaluation, helped the project to adjust focus and activities. There was progress on outputs and by the end of 2019 the project seemed to be on course for completion in 2020 especially if necessary approval were provided for key documents such as the policy planning handbook and the UPSDD.[[30]](#footnote-31)

For FY20, the project was to come to a close with plans for full implementation of policymaking guidelines, more uniformity of policy development and implementation with a whole of government approach and an electronic system for policymaking, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; increased development of human resources through educational and training opportunities, personnel appraisals and an educational e-platform; and the improved quality control and unified standards for e-services and public service provision. As well, the small grants programs and sub projects were being implemented in a cyclical manner including periodic evaluations of the grant schemes. Plus, a review of the PAR 2020 Roadmap was planned and actually conducted to help design the next PAR Roadmap. However, the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent unprecedented measures for ensuring public health and safety significantly impacted the implementation throughout most of 2020. And, parliamentary elections that occurred in October-November 2020 also had an impact. For instance, the positions of AoG Head and deputies were not filled until March 2021.

The COVID-19 pandemic changed the focus of government activity given the necessity of a response. The pandemic strained government services and highlighted the need for whole-of-government coordination. The crisis situation also showed the need for PAR and the importance of public service delivery, especially accessing services on-line and adjusting in-person public services. Even though the PAR and the project itself were not complete, the advances made to date did contribute to an improved response.

The civil society support aspects of the project were adjusted to emergency support to enhance collaboration between the government and public, such as the capacity building of the Georgian Red Cross Society to provide direct assistance in remote areas to vulnerable people and to expand their services. The project also provided support to work on the immediate need to scale-up government’s capacity, such as the sub project launched to collaborate with the UN Association of Georgia to help the National Center for Disease Control and Public Health of Georgia to build its crisis communication capacity in the short term and develop a longer term strategy through a consultative process.

The above brief historical description attempts to take a macro look at the situational context in which the project was implemented and how the project goal was being met. There were various destabilizing factors, mainly in the political context as changes in government and senior leadership occurred. Also, economic difficulties early on in the project did have an impact as the economic situation impacted government finances and thus the provision of public service and cuts in government expenditure and the reduction of the number of ministries and personnel. As indicated in the mid-term public and civil service survey, the impact on perceptions was noticeable which reflects a deterioration of the situation. The survey shows the continued uphill battle that PAR confronts though there are commitments to PAR reform. That commitment seemed to have become less of a political priority as the project was implemented. But, though maybe not a main priority, the commitments made were adhered to and reform did happen though probably at a slower pace than originally intended. The GoG’s continued interest in and commitments to the EU AA roadmap is the driving force to keep its commitment as part of the development agenda. The government programme for 2021-2024 that was approved by the current Prime Minister continues to emphasize PAR implementation for the next cycle.

The project was able to respond and remain catalytic to implement planned activities. The key elements were: 1) a flexible approach; 2) the building of effective working relationships with stakeholders, other development partners, and civil society organizations; 3) the targeting of resources and expertise (domestic and international); and 4) a project structure, work planning ability, and work ethic that made the project team a trusted partner. All of these factors have allowed the project to achieve the goal of advancing PAR, in general, and the specific outcome areas, in particular.

#### 2. Project Design and Coherence of the Project to the Logical Framework

The project was designed in the 2015 time period when the interest in PAR appeared to have been at its height amongst senior political leadership. This was around the same time as making the EU commitments. As indicated above, there was a time lag between project design and implementation given political changes. However, the necessary commitments were present.

The project was designed to be linked to and respond to the overall UN Partnership for Sustainable Development outcome and UNDP 2016-20 Country Programme strategic plan outcome: by 2020, expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels. The project is also directly responsive to the country programme’s output 1.1: by 2020, government has stronger capacities to formulate, implement and monitor policies in a participatory manner for improved service delivery, with equal access for all.

The project directly responded to the Programme outcome when that outcome is parsed. The project did address building systems and opportunities for citizens’ voice in public policy, furthered the rule of law in the realm of public administration, directly addressed public administration reform in each of the output areas, and improved accountability by helping to develop a more professional and independent public service and build mechanisms for public input and service access. Regarding the Programme output, the three project output areas directly addressed improving the policy making process including by using more participatory approaches then before the project’s start; and improving service delivery to increase usage, quality and general awareness as well as providing more equal access. As mentioned in other parts of this report, it is not a question of these areas being address, it is more a question of depth and a whole-of-government approach with indications the reforms will be further implemented during the next PAR Roadmap’s timeframe.

What did benefit the project were the slight adjustments that were made at project initiation with stakeholders. At project beginning, project management and staff met with AOG, CSB, PSDA and DGA. With each partner, the project team reviewed the corresponding outcome area together. Adjustments were made as necessary. All adjustments were reviewed with UNDP and UK management so that the appropriate results and RRF changes could be made. It is a benefit that both entities had a knowledgeable grasp of the situation and worked with the project team to allow for a positive way forward. This relationship has continued throughout the project lifespan to the benefit of the project’s results.

The conduct of the mid-term public and civil servant perception survey and the mid-term evaluation also provided feedback to help provide corrections. As well, the two evaluations for the small grant schemes provided feedback. It appears that the feedback was applied to the extent possible given resources available and time remaining. Some of this was thrown off track by the response to COVID-19 but, again, adjustments had to be made given a totally different operational environment.

There were no major deviations from the project’s logical framework. The outcome areas and outputs remained intact, after the adjustments were made initially, and pursued throughout the time of the project. The 3-month extension granted was mainly a result of the pandemic and not based on poor performance. Any development project, especially a PAR-related reform, is sensitive to absorptive capacity. And, this project had confronted absorptive capacity issues as stakeholders became more prepared to work on implementation as the project developed.

The project’s Theory of Change (Annex N) was revised from the original schematic drawn up during project formulation and as depicted in the project document. The final Theory of Change is more detailed and better aligned with the impact statement and UNDP strategic planning outcome with corresponding alignment with the three outcome areas and the related assumptions, outputs and their respective output-related activities. The Theory of Change and RRF directly correspond with one another. This clarification and modification appears to be a result of the consultations with government stakeholders and the project donors. The adjusted strategy was fully in place in 2017. The Theory of Change and RRF remain extremely relevant. Both are aligned with the government’s development programme and PAR Roadmap.

The project was designed as a medium-tem intervention for a development subject that takes a medium to long-term development commitment. This commitment does not require external assistance throughout its evolution but does so at least in the beginning to the medium term. While PAR can be advanced in a 4-year time period, it cannot be fully implemented in that timeframe. Such reform takes repeated cycles of activity together with public input to constantly evolve a more professional service that has adequate training and is applied whole of government. The project has contributed to and advanced functional elements but more work is necessary to help the reforms “stick” and advance. The collaborative partnership modality with government agencies started to show signs of success in 2018 as the entities continued to move forward with reforms and the PAR agenda despite leadership and political shifts. As well, donor coordination and dialogue contributed to marshaling resources and attention to key areas.

The project’s identification of key issues and risks were well considered and illustrated in the semi-annual and annual reports. The risks were clearly identified with a measurement of probability and impact with each risk having a mitigation action. The risks were confronted from time-to-time and the team was capable of addressing them as needed. While stakeholders also new of these risks, their ability to respond was more constrained since sometimes other support or agreement was necessary.

The involvement of CSO’s was helpful to project progress. While the project was to help foster CSO involvement in PAR, the project’s development and use of such entities have opened new doors for CSO involvement in the subject area. As well, the surveys including public and civil society opinion are bringing more evidence-based information that provides feedback and can help planning and decision making.

SDG Goal 16 is most applicable to the project: promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The GoG established a “Democratic Governance” thematic working group to address and monitor the related SDGs. The AOG’s Policy Planning Unit of the Policy Planning and Coordination Department is the coordinator for the SDG working group. The department and unit are main stakeholders of the PAR project. The project’s components directly correspond to the goal’s components to include “inclusive societies for sustainable development” and “build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.” The activities and results of the policy development and coordination, civil service reform and human resource management, and public service delivery outputs have all responded to address some of the major shortcomings and gaps that existed in each of these areas. The policy development and coordination output is the most relevant since it provides for SDGs to be part of national, sector and institutional strategies. There are 95 nationalized SDG targets. As more of these targets and approaches to achieving them are built into the strategies, the better the civil service can deliver on them. Thus, the relationship to the civil service reform and human resource management efforts to help design approaches to achieve the targets. As of January 2020, there were 7 national or sector strategies that, together, covered all 95 targets.[[31]](#footnote-32) The efforts by the project show how a public administration effort can have an impact, and will continue to do so, for all SDGs. As indicated in the policy planning handbook, each goal and impact provided in a policy document must be linked to a SDG.[[32]](#footnote-33)

The project also contributed to other SDGs but in a more indirect way. SDG 5 Gender Equality was addressed by improving access to public services via the internet and at the Public Service Halls, providing and making more accessible professionalized training of female civil servants, and helping develop a more objective performance evaluation process and a more formalized dispute resolution process. Goal 10 Reduced Inequalities will be better addressed with an improved policy planning and coordination process and capabilities as well as the public service delivery access and availability improvements. And, SDG 17 Partnerships for the Goals was addressed given the advancements made in using technology to help deliver public services through my.gov.ge and upgrading technological capabilities such as in cyber security and web site standardization.

#### 3. Project Management and Implementation

Project management was adjusted during the project’s inception phase. As designed and implemented, the project was part of UNDP’s GRF. A project coordinator managed the intervention during the inception phase. The project was split out of the GRF and a full-time project manager was in place as of September 2017. The monitoring and evaluation specialist was also initially shared with the GRF (50:50). In 2019 PAR hired a full-time monitoring and evaluation specialist. The same change was made with the administration/finance associate. Other than those changes, there were no major hiring or firing, some movement of personnel within the project, and more emphasis on monitoring and evaluation as the project matured. The changes resulting from the split with the GRF allowed the team to fully concentrate on the project’s efforts in a more streamlined manner. The adjustments were appropriate given the scope and breadth of the three project outcome areas. The personnel, as indicated by stakeholders and other counterparts, have a positive reputation not only for the delivery of project services but as collaborative and cooperative partners. The team is positioned and seen as a key group to facilitate PAR.

The team also contracted a variety of contractors (individuals and companies, domestic and international) that were engaged to provide training, systems design (procedural and e-platforms), research, surveys, technical advice, etc. Stakeholders reported no negative feedback and a review of project reports did not indicate any major issues. UNDP procurement guidelines were used for contracting services. Decision making was made in a participatory manner with the involved stakeholders. The small grants scheme had an established selection process and the different cycles of the scheme were evaluated in three evaluations with the last one slated for completion in March 2021.

Annex D provides a list of project personnel and the main company and individual contractors. Annex K identifies research contractors.

The monitoring and evaluation aspects of the project developed. The approach was inclusive and participatory from the project’s beginning. At that time, the RRF, annual work plan and risk register were refined with project stakeholders. The development can be seen in the quality of the semi annual and annual project reports. The RRF and risk register were kept up-to-date. Beginning in 2017, the project team began working with key stakeholders to develop their own monitoring and evaluation plans. This helped the stakeholders to take ownership of the PAR initiatives and take responsibility for results. And, work was done with CSOs to develop their own results frameworks and risk registers that were submitted as part of the CSO grant scheme. In addition to project-sponsored surveys of civil service and public PAR perceptions, the project team conducted civil servant focus groups on their knowledge and perceptions of the performance appraisal system in their respective ministries (162 civil servants in 9 government agencies). In 2018, they used “user journey mapping” to collect first hand information from civil servants on different topics including their perceptions and attitudes toward civil service reform and various elements of the reform. The effort to adapt advisory services, training workshops and forums during the COVID-19 pandemic was a key challenge for the project. The activities were brought on-line with an emphasis on quality. Surveys and direct observation tools were used to help improve the delivery of project services. Satisfaction surveys were conducted at the end of each training and forum. The monitoring and evaluation framework became an important tool to adapt the project’s plan in response to changing needs and the various stakeholders involved. The result was two-fold: producing adequate monitoring and evaluation information as shown throughout this report and the data collection in the annexes, and helping to develop stakeholder monitoring and evaluation capacities.

The project team’s collaboration and cooperation was a key element to help facilitate PAR progress, in general, and project progress, in particular. The project hosted or participated in donor coordination meetings. The participants included the major PAR development partners: Delegation of the European Union in Georgia, UK Embassy in Georgia, Swedish Embassy in Georgia and SIDA, USAID along with the USAID-sponsored GGI, GIZ, NATO Professional Development Program, and Swiss Cooperation Office in Georgia.

The project team and stakeholders benefitted from a project kick-off workshop and meetings with key stakeholders. The meetings allowed the review of project outputs during inception phase that was helpful to refine outputs especially given a changing environment since the project document was about a year old and there were changes in government. The meetings also helped to formulate the 2017 work plan and budget.

Implementation continued at a steady pace with the team adjusting attention and resources between the three outcome areas as the respective outputs were developed and/or implemented and as stakeholders had their own time, interest and capacities to implement. The project was helpful in instigating or supporting activity, as needed, and in full cooperation with the stakeholders.

The civil society and research grant schemes and the sub-projects proved helpful to develop capacities for and attention to PAR topics and issues. It appears that each cycle of such initiatives became “smarter” and more targeted. The activities in 2020 into 2021 helped to respond to relevant issues and activities resulting from the COVID-19 situation. Again, it appears that the project’s flexibility, allowed by the project sponsors and exercised by the project team, enabled the project team to pivot to address these needs. Also, the pandemic response brought focus to public service delivery. The attention to this outcome area actually was a benefit since it applied much of what the project was trying to accomplish to develop and apply service delivery standards and improve public services.

Communications efforts were documented in the project reporting. There was an active effort that appears to have helped raise the awareness of PAR in Georgia. Some of the communications were done with the UK government and some with UNDP. The communications outlets included radio, television, print, Internet and the various opinion surveys. A list of project-sponsored conferences and public events is provided as Annex J. A list of guides, publications and videos is provided as part of Annex K.

A review of project expenditure shows that expenditure has followed project implementation and the execution of activities. As of 30 December 2020, about 95% of project funds were expended. The project was extended for a 3-month period and with that extension, the project budget was increased by about $307,188 (GBP 236,000) to bring the total budget to $6,085,840. Annex M provides a complete project budget status as of 31 December 2020.

**Table 4: Project Financial Expenditure Status as of 31 December 2020**

Note: $s and %s figures rounded

|  | **Total Planned** | **Total Expended** | **Execution Rate** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |
| Outcome 1: Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation | $703,200 | 797,911 | 113% |
| Outcome 2: Civil Service performance is more professional and effective | $2,096,766 | $2,141,760 | 102% |
| Outcome 3: GoG delivers high quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens | $1,634,755 | $1,288,291 | 79% |
| Management & Administration Total | $1,258,073 | $1,101,435 | 88% |
| *Total Net* | $5,692,794 | $5,329,397 | 94% |
| Facilities and Administration (8%) | $455,424 | $426,352 | 94% |
| **Grand Total** | **$6,085,840** | **$5,755,749** | 95% |

Source: Project Office. Full financial table is provided as Annex H.

For outcome 1, policy development and coordination, total expenditure was above target at about 113% of the planned budget expended. Contractual services exceeded planned expenditure by about 67%. The international consultant line item budget was also exceeded by about 19%. Events, conferences and travel were about 10% under budget. On a year-to-year basis, expenditure followed implementation with a slow start that can be attributed to changes in government and at AoG. However, the pace of activity and expenditure and corresponding activity picked up in 2018 to 2020. Expenditure in 2016 was over budget attributable to initial international consultant costs. This outcome area was the smallest, in terms of budget and expenditure, making up 11% of the project budget and 14% of the expenditure.

For outcome 2, civil service delivery, expenditure was about on target with 102% of the planned budget expended. The largest expenditure category was grants at about $912,364. The reason for the size of this category is that the CSO and research grants scheme was funded through this component. That budget was exceeded by about 35%. Local consultant costs were about 22% under budget. Other budget categories were near budgeted amounts. On a year-to-year basis, the 2016 budget was significantly underspent most likely due to the need to plan the start up of the small grant schemes in the following years. Other year expenditure was at or near budgeted amounts. This outcome area is the largest of the project with about 34% of the planned expenditure and 37% of total expenditure.

For outcome 3, public service delivery, expenditure was below target with only 79% of the planned budget expended. This is somewhat a surprising finding since public service delivery outputs have been implemented in a timely manner with most outputs accomplished. All categories are under budget. What may be attributable to the low execution rate is that the UPSDD was not approved and thus held back full implementation of the standards though those standards were applied to two large entities to achieve the project target. Also, more efficiency may have been gained by delivering services to this outcome area especially where such efficiencies could multiply such as placing services on my.gov.ge. This outcome area is the second largest of the project with about 27% of the budget and 22% of the total expenditure.

Given the budget performance, there is still work ongoing with the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation e-system (outcome area 1) and e-learning platform (outcome area 2). Funds could be reallocated from outcome area 3 to outcome areas 1 and 2 to fund these initiatives. While the e-system and platform are more aimed at civil service delivery, they will ultimately impact public service delivery.

Total project management and administration costs are under budget with about 88% of the planned budget expended. Staff costs are in line with that execution rate while monitoring and evaluation is below the planned budget by about 41%. The monitoring and evaluation expended amount will most likely increase before project end given the ongoing evaluation of the small grant scheme and this final project evaluation.

#### 4. Conclusion

The project’s goal, outcome areas, outputs and activities are fully aligned with the GoG’s PAR Roadmap, efforts and interests. The project’s structure, management, implementation, and financing are aligned as well with what the project set out to accomplish. Despite the challenges confronted, execution continued. PAR is a diverse reform area and any such effort must be applied whole-of-government and have significant depth to reach throughout the civil service with civil society knowledgeable of the changes and participatory in the process. With the time and resources the project had available to it and with cooperative stakeholders and development partners, all who confronted the same implementation challenges, the PAR seem to have taken hold and is advancing.

The outcome areas of the project are broad and wide ranging. Each outcome area could be a project itself. The approach taken is more sophisticated with different areas of training, advisory services, system building (process and e-system), grant schemes and sub-projects. What has been done can be said to have had an impact on PAR and has been done in an efficient manner with tangible results. The breakdown of each of the outcome areas will be further described to better illustrate project performance and individual outcome area conclusions.

## Outcome 1: Policy Development and Coordination

#### 1. Background and Major Results

Outcome 1 is aimed at ensuring the GoG enhances participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions for PAR implementation. The main work is with the AoG to improve policy planning, management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Within the AoG, the main work is with the Department of Policy Planning and Coordination and its two units – Policy Planning Unit and Public Administration Reform Unit. The PAR Council, for which the AoG serves as the secretariat, has been a main project stakeholder and a main body for overall PAR. Work was correspondingly done with the ministry and agency planning and policy units. Coordination was evident with the civil service reform and public service delivery outcomes.

Table 5 provides the main results and status. The information is abstracted from the RRF as provided as Annex E.

**Table 5 Outcome 1: Policy Development and Cooperation Main Results**

| Result | Target | Status, Issues or Next Steps |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook approved | 1 process | Government Decree 629, December 2019 approved handbook and process |
| 2. 8 of 15 policy documents approved by GoG | 3 | The documents were approved using the handbook processes. Progress was delayed by impact of COVID-19 in 2020 |
| 3. 3 major national strategies and accompanying action plans (of 15) are being reviewed using handbook process: PAR Strategy 2021-2024, e-Governance Strategy 2021-25, Maritime Transport Strategy 2021-25 | 3 | Target to be reached in 2021. Policy Planning Unit working with ministries/agencies on other national, sector and institutional strategies |
| 4. Unified Monitoring and Evaluation e-platform under development and the first phase is expected to be completed in March 2021 | 1 platform | The e-platform is critical for applying and standardizing the planning process and to have a consistent monitoring and evaluation framework. Project facilitated a working agreement with AoG and DGA to complete the platform. Phase 1 is the design and building of the platform architecture and formalizing the policy planning and monitoring components. The system will be applied government-wide. Phase 2 is scheduled for completion in August 2021. Training (20 civil servants targeted) on the e-platform is to be completed by March 2021 if the first phase is completed by that time. |
| 5. 79% of civil servants’ support PAR through the development of a PAR Communication Strategy and Action Plan | 92% | The percentage is from the 2019 mid-term public and civil servant perception survey. Survey results will be updated by March 2021. The Communication strategy was prepared in October 2020 but not yet approved. Scheduled for approval at the next PAR Council meeting (March 2021). |
| 6. 94% of policy planning units trained on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation from all line ministries | 90% | The last phase of the training was delivered on-line. Agreement with AoG to have the next phase of training on the unified e-learning platform (see outcome area 2, below). As part of policy unit staff training plans, new personnel must receive training upon entry and personnel have to attend training every 3 years. Training was inclusive of officials from Ajara. |
| 7. 87% of civil servants demonstrate increased knowledge of unified policy planning process | 80% | Expectation is that the added knowledge will contribute to higher quality policy documents. |
| 8. 75% demonstrate understanding of inclusive public participation elements | 60% | Training and the policy handbook include raising awareness and providing avenues for public inputs. And, a CSO conducted a study that prepared an index to measure compliance of public input to the policy process. |
| 9. PAR Strategy and Action Plan (2021-2024) under development | 1 plan | AoG is leading the formulation of the new strategy that was delayed given the COVID-19 situation and GoG response, and government changes. The project has provided support, as has UN Women. Assistance has been provided for workshops, focus groups and consultant provision. The strategy will be linked to the Government Program 2021-2024 that includes PAR. |

Initially in 2016, the project team had consultations with the AoG since it is the primary counterpart for the project and for the outcome. There was initially some refinement of the outputs. It was determined that the CSB as the primary beneficiary for the change management plan for civil service reform would coordinate that outcome area. It was decided the internal and external communication strategy would concentrate on civil service reform. It was also decided that ministry planning capacities would be assessed to develop an appropriate model of performance monitoring and reporting with the following years to install mechanisms and methodologies. And, AoG wanted support to introduce new policy planning practices at the line ministries.

In 2017, there was a reevaluation of PAR modalities in AoG and changes in the Policy, Planning and Innovation Unit. The AoG completed an assessment and mapping of strategic processes for PAR guidance including recommendations for improvement. The PAR working groups were used to conduct the assessment and mapping.[[33]](#footnote-34) The project conducted an evaluation of ongoing planning and coordination processes including performance tracking and monitoring. The evaluation resulted in recommendations and the beginning of peer advice to ministry and agency policy units. The PAR Council was initially an active stakeholder and had an understanding of project objectives.

The public policy process assessments that were done identified weaknesses to include: 1) weak strategic planning management in ministries; 2) weak linkages between policy development and the budget process; 3) weak linkages between different policy documents; and 4) uneven level of knowledge and experience in policy planning and coordination mechanisms across various ministries.

The project contracted an international consultant to scope out existing policy monitoring and performance tracking mechanisms of public agencies and identify needs to develop a government-wide performance tracking and monitoring system. The PAR Roadmap and Policy Planning Reform Strategy 2015-2017 were used as the basis for developing the system. Based on consultant findings a workshop was held in November 2017 for policy planning unit personnel to gain consensus to move forward.

In 2018, the project worked with AoG to assess policymaking practices in line ministries and in developing policy-making guidelines. Training was conducted of key personnel in ministries and LEPLs. Work was mainly done with the Policy Analysis, Strategic Planning and Coordination Department. In April 2018, with a new head of AoG, an internal assessment and restructuring of AoG took place. Also, OECD/SIGMA published its Baseline Measurement Report of Policy Planning and Coordination in May 2018.[[34]](#footnote-35) The report assessed the policy development and coordination areas. The report identified shortfalls that went along with the project’s prior assessment. The OECD/SIGMA assessment found weaknesses in PAR coordination and the policy development process, weak research-based evidence for policymaking, and shortcoming in the institutional setup of the coordinating bodies and processes. In response to the various assessments, the project formulated a plan to strengthen policy planning, performance tracking, monitoring, and evaluation practices throughout the civil service.

The project implemented the Training and Consultation Support Initiative to increase the capacity of the ministries’ policy units in public policy analysis, strengthen the link between policy planning and budgeting, improve the linkage between policy planning and implementation, and build a monitoring and evaluation mechanism. An assessment of all 14 ministries was conducted. Training in public policy analysis started in October 2018 followed by advisory services and coaching. A training module in policy analysis was developed. Work was also done to update the policy planning handbook. The project worked with the AoG to develop policy process standard operating procedures that would be part of the new handbook. For the performance tracking and monitoring system, an assessment was conducted of existing processes and procedures. Meetings and/or workshops were then held with 15 public agencies. One of the results of the meetings and workshops was a standardized glossary of terms that would become part of the new policy planning handbook.

PAR Council coordination meetings were held regularly in 2018. The Council adopted the PAR Roadmap Action plan for 2019-20. The Council was kept appraised of project and other development partners’ PAR activities.

In 2019, the AoG, with project support mentioned above, finalized the “Rule on Development Monitoring and Evaluation of Policy Documents” and “Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook” using a whole-of-government approach. The documents were approved by the government decree in December 2019. The AoG worked with the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure on the Mid-Term Strategy for Municipal Development so it used the new handbook. With project support, work also began on preparing the unified policy planning, monitoring and evaluation e-system. A business analysis was prepared for that e-system.

Up to the end of 2019, the project trained 283 civil servants in policy analysis, planning, monitoring and evaluation. The training included 50 people from Ajara. The training curriculum was updated to follow the handbook. Coaching was provided to 6 ministries on policy-related issues. Ten policy planning unit people were trained as trainers.

At AoG, staffing in Policy Planning and Coordination Department doubled since 2016 to 16.

The PAR Council only met once in 2019 and it was reported that the working groups were not very active. The PAR Communication Strategy was drafted by the project but was not approved. The Strategy’s target groups are civil servants, CSOs and the general public.

The 2019 public and civil service perception survey was conducted. The outcome was not positive for PAR since many of the questions had more negative responses compared to 2016, as reported above. There were some advances for PAR reform but public knowledge was at a low level. For instance, public awareness of PAR was measured at 39% in 2019 compared to 19% in 2016. Despite the work done to date, the survey revealed much more was needed.

In 2020-21, one of the key achievements was the recognition of the prime minister and AoG head of the prioritization of PAR on the government’s agenda and the PAR project as one of the examples driving change. The COVID-19 pandemic raised the awareness at the senior levels of government to prioritize PAR.

The work on the unified policy planning, monitoring and evaluation e-system was ongoing and the concept was finalized.

Training continued with up to 300 civil servants trained in policy planning, monitoring and evaluation. In an agreement between the AoG and the CSB, the training module became part of all policy unit staff training plans. The training is not mandatory as of this time but all new unit entrants have to take the course and personnel must take the course every 3years.

With the UNDP Parliamentary Support project and AoG, training was provided to Parliament to improve its policymaking and oversight functions using the new policy planning framework. The aim was to extend the use of the policy planning handbook to Parliament so the same guidelines are followed.

The project worked with the UNDP project fostering decentralization and good governance at the local level project to create a coherent approach in local and central government policy making. A “Policy Handbook on Municipal Development Documents” was developed in conformity with the national policy planning handbook.

Up to 35 strategic policy documents were pending adoption. However, adoption was slowed by the COVID-19 pandemic or changed due to changing priorities due to the pandemic. All national, sector and institutional strategies were to be drafted using the new policy planning handbook. The project supported 4 national strategy documents: E-Governance Strategy of the DGA, PAR Strategy and Action Plan 2021-2024; Maritime Transport Strategy; and Public Service Design and Delivery Policy document. As of this time, the first two are in planning phase and the last two are finalized.

The PAR Council did hold a meeting in 2019 and CSOs were included. Topics included a review of PAR Roadmap 2016-2020, development of the 2021-2024 PAR Roadmap and Action Plan, and the role of civil society in PAR. The project had provided support to AoG for the 2020 Roadmap review to be an input in the design of the new PAR strategy document. And, it has been providing support to the new Roadmap’s formulation.

The PAR Communication Strategy was presented but not approved.

#### 2. Conclusions

The policy development and coordination outcome area was effective in improving processes, human resources and actual applications to the reformed policy planning, management, monitoring and evaluation framework.

The project team took a step-by-step participatory approach working mainly with the AoG and the policy and planning units of the ministries and agencies. A whole-of-government approach was taken from the beginning. And, the project was aligned at the very beginning with government interests and priorities.

Training, expertise and advocacy were applied as needed to help keep the changes ongoing. At times the involvement of AoG units or that of senior government seemed to have waivered mainly because of a changing political climate, changes of leadership and human resources at AoG, and then the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, given these hurdles, the project was able to adjust in line with the outcome area stakeholders to advance project activity.

The preparation, approval and implementation of the policy planning handbook is a major achievement. The active implementation by AoG and the training and use of the processes by ministries and agencies are already showing benefits. A more recent OECD SIGMA assessment found a more adequate policy development and coordination process.[[35]](#footnote-36) There will most likely be refinements needed and training will need to be continuous- the mandating of the training would be an achievement. While the development of the accompanying unified e-system platform was delayed and won’t be in place until 2021, the effort is well underway and will help to instill a formalized process that is ongoing within government. Making the policy–related training an e-course available on-line will help training provision though this should be monitored to make sure the training has the intended effect. Also, as applied in the civil service outcome, networking of policy planning managers and staff should be at least initially facilitated to help ingrain the handbook’s processes, apply the training, and share information and experiences. Such networks benefit system application.

The activities and results contribute directly to strengthening more evidence-based policy-making. The methodology itself is not a panacea to say all policy will be evidence-based but it is a major step in the right direction. As well, the system and methodology has built in civil society mechanisms. This is at the planning stage as well as at the implementation stage. It is reported that some ministries and agencies have had difficulty seeking civil society input into plans. The difficulty of obtaining civil society input should not be seen as a negative. It should be seen as an area that may need further development since both sets of participants (government entity and civil society representatives) have to determine their role, relationships and input/output avenues of communication. Also, civil society input or feedback is allowed in the monitoring and evaluation framework. With a human rights-based approach ingrained in the policy planning handbook methodology, more societal needs will be better reflected in strategies.

The success of the outcome area will depend on how the systems and processes are applied. It will take cycles of activity and practice. AoG and the PAR Council should monitor implementation at least yearly to stay ahead of any problems or issues that may develop. Also, the lack of approval of the PAR Communications Strategy could be hindering the civil service and public’s perception of PAR as shown in the 2019 mid-term perception survey. Attention is needed to the approval and implementation of the strategy.

## Outcome 2: Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management

#### 1. Background and Major Results

Outcome 2 is aimed at the performance of the civil service and supporting efforts to make it more professional and effective. The main work is with the CSB. Extensive work is also with the line ministries and agencies. Within the ministries and agencies, the work has been done with the personnel or human resource management departments. The work focused on further developing civil service education and training as well as conducting training, applying the civil service reform law, and aiding the implementation of several of its by-laws. The Civil Servants’ Forum was coordinated with project support to advance civil service reform in general, and several of the project’s outputs, in particular. Coordination was evident with the policy development and public service delivery outcomes.

Table 6 provides the main results and status. The information is abstracted from the RRF as provided as Annex E.

**Table 6 Outcome 2: Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management Main Results**

| Result | Target | Status, Issues or Next Steps |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Performance plans are in line with organizational goals/objectives | 80% | Work is ongoing with the three target ministries.[[36]](#footnote-37) Progress was delayed due to COVID-19. Male/Female data will be available in March 2021. |
| 2. Share of civil servants satisfied with individual performance plans | 70% | Related to #1, Male/Female data to be available in March 2021. |
| 3. Performance plans meet quality standards | 90% | Related to #1. Data to be available in March 2021. |
| 4. 76% of civil servants support project-relevant civil servant reform changes | 70% | 96% appear aware of key civil service reform issues; 76% think changes are definitely (more or less) positive. |
| 5. Training underway in 3 ministries of managers trained in elaboration of professional development plans | 90% | Training underway in 3 target ministries identified above. Not yet measured. |
| 6. Civil servants have professional development plans | 70% | Results to be measured as the process of preparing the plans are completed. Expected March 2021. |
| 7. 11 training programs accredited | 10 | The project is evaluating existing legislation to determine if accreditation procedures can be improved. More training program to be accredited. |
| 8. 1,510 civil servants receive accredited course training | 100 | Trained through accredited professional development programs. Data not sex disaggregated. |
| 9. Civil servants use unified e-learning platform | 15% using platform | Technical side of the e-learning platform will be finalized in April. Work on integration with the e-HR MS is ongoing and both systems to be integrated by April 2021. |
| 10. 1,388 civil servants participate in Civil Servants’ Forum meetings | 700 | CSB arranged 21 thematic Civil Servants’ Forums. Most were done on-line so gender information was not collected but will in future. Forums to continue. |
| 11. 93% of civil servants report satisfaction with Civil Servants’ Forum meetings | 80% | 93% of participants reported meetings were at least “useful” based on a CSB 2020 study |
| 12. 330 managers trained in management and civil service reform-related issues | 300 | CSB took ownership of training and plans to continue training |
| 13. 6 Human Resource Forums held on key civil service reform issues | 7 | Next meeting was planned for April 2021 |
| 14. E-human resource management platform (e-HRMS) enhanced | e-HRMS  operational | The project supported adding 4 modules to the platform (performance appraisal, professional development, self-service modules, and smart analytical module). The platform is operational as of October 2020. |
| 15. 86 civil servants trained in dispute settlement | 100 | Research and various meeting/discussions took place to develop an appropriate dispute settlement approach. A March 2021 decision to pilot mediation includes developing guidelines on mediation, training of mediators on civil service-related workplace disputes, and equipping human resource units with relevant knowledge. At a later stage, mediation-related topics will be integrated into the training program for managers. |
| 16. 24 CSOs provide evidence-based inputs for future policy decisions | 10 | The project, through the small grants scheme funded a variety of research and other grants to advance different topics related to PAR. The project conducted two evaluations of the grants and a third is scheduled for completion by March 2021. |

In 2016, work began with the CSB, first with a review of the civil service reform and human resource management outcome and its related outputs and activities. As noted above, the change management plan for civil service reform was switched from outcome 1 to outcome 2. The activity was refined to result in a change management plan implemented through “expert and methodological support and change readiness feedback incorporated in the monitoring and evaluation loop.”[[37]](#footnote-38) A change readiness assessment was to be conducted and a change management plan prepared by a contractor. The implementation was to be reviewed periodically and training and advisory services were to be provided.

During this time, the CSB was revising the draft performance appraisal regulation that was being drafted in accordance with the civil service law. And, the entry level certification program for aspiring civil servants was completed.

The approach to civil service training was adjusted resulting in a change to the approach in the project document. CSB was originally responsible for the development of the unified civil service training system. In February 2017, the International Education Center of Georgia (IEC) was tasked to support the CSB in the development and implementation of the unified civil service training system. However, later with changes in the AoG, a different approach was selected by the CSB and a semi-decentralized model was introduced.

For dispute resolution, the project conducted research on different dispute resolution models, including presenting international, regional and the Georgian experience. No conclusion or official decision was made and the project’s efforts continued on the subject.

In 2017, the Change Management Plan was completed with the cooperation of the AoG and CSB. An overall plan was prepared with individual plans for 9 ministries. The number was reduced to 8 when the number of ministries was changed.[[38]](#footnote-39) An associated Communication Strategy and Action Plan was prepared. Training was conducted and ministry leadership was engaged to help implement the plans. The PAR Council reviewed the plans in 2018.

The CSB prioritized the development and implementation of the civil service performance appraisals in accordance with the civil service law and respective by-law. The CSB set minimum standards and procedures and the line ministries were tasked with determining the specific performance appraisal formats and procedures. In 2017-2018, performance appraisal systems were supported in 6 partner ministries.[[39]](#footnote-40) A comprehensive analysis of the respective institutional context and needs was also conducted. Training was provided to build the capacity of key ministry staff. In 2018-2020, the project cooperated with the existing partners to enhance their performance appraisal models and also supported new partner agencies (such as AoG).

The project contributed to the draft Decree on Professional Development of Civil Servants. The decree included standards to identify and plan professional development opportunities for civil servants. The draft also established the requirement for a mandatory basic program and additional professional development programs. Changes were made to the education approach due to the determination to have decentralization training delivery.

The alternative dispute resolution mechanism remained under discussion. Research was planned for 2018 to be conducted by local and international specialists on suitable alternative dispute resolution models.

In 2018, the project supported change management team continued working with line ministries. The Human Resources Managers’ Forum, also project supported, was established and becoming a change management instrument for the CSB. Awareness of the Change Management Plan continued with the implementation of the plan’s communications strategy.

Support was provided to the selected performance appraisal models in 6 new ministries that had developed compliant performance appraisal systems. A Handbook of Performance Appraisal System in the Civil Service was prepared along with a guide on self-evaluation techniques and a video on the goals and major stages of the performance appraisal process.

The civil service by-law “On Assessment of Professional Capacities, Professional Development Standards and Rules for Professional Development of the Career Civil Servants” was approved in May 2018. It was determined that the National Centre of Educational Quality Enhancement (QEC), operating as an LEPL under the Ministry of Education and Science, would be the accreditation body for civil service training programs. The CSB role would be to implement the decree, develop training needs assessment tools, and participate in the accreditation process. The change in the accreditation process and delivery of training did cause some adjustments in the project. However, the project was involved in the transition process. With the CSB, the project created a training needs assessment system and the associated Handbook on Professional Needs Assessment. The assessment was followed up with training. The accreditation experts’ hiring/firing procedures, scope, and compensation rules were developed.

On alternative dispute resolution, the UK-based Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution was selected to help in the design and use of a resolution mechanism. Also an assessment of current alternative dispute resolution practices in Georgia was conducted. Meetings and discussions were held using the documents to help advance the issue.

In 2019, the Human Resources Managers’ Forum was becoming more established as a network of civil servants to assist in implementing change management and transforming the organizational culture. A Forum meeting was held on performance appraisal, motivation and professional development. In the Ministry of Economy, 50 managers were trained on performance appraisal. Work was also done with the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection on performance appraisal with 60 managers trained, coaching of the human resources unit conducted, and 4 staff awareness meetings conducted. And, 6 video tutorials on performance appraisal were prepared.

The decree on accreditation was adopted with the Statute of the Accreditation Council and associated by-laws. The project worked with the QEC to develop the curriculum outlines and handbooks for two courses: Effective Communication and Effective Service Delivery. Also, the project worked on an agreement between the CSB and DEA (now DGA) to develop a unified e-learning platform where info on professional development program e-courses and knowledge resources would be available. The first two meetings of Accreditation Council took place and 9 mandatory programs for civil servants were accredited.

Up to 2019, 1,325 civil servants were trained on the civil service law and associated by-laws.

On the alternative dispute resolution mechanism, following on the research conducted by local and international consultants, no model was selected. The project moved forward by addressing “managing difficult conversations” in the workplace. The project sponsored coaching sessions, training and preparation of a manager’s Guide for Difficult Conversations. 15 human resource managers and CSB officials were trained on the subject.

The PAR perception survey of civil servants and the public was conducted in 2019. The survey allowed some comparisons with a similar survey conducted in 2016. As indicated in other places of this report, the results were mixed in regard to civil servant and public opinion regarding PAR and civil service reform. With project support, a further survey is being conducted and results should be known in March 2021.

For 2020-2021, with the impact of COVID-19, support to the outcome had to be adjusted. The activities are very training and person-to-person oriented so the modalities had to change. For instance, training and Human Resource Managers’ Forum meetings had to transition to on-line provision. Advisory services had to transition on-line as well.

Performance evaluation capacities were further developed to bring the total number to 9 ministries. Combining performance appraisal and professional development began to be applied in 4 ministries and the AoG.[[40]](#footnote-41) The aim is to support improving performance appraisals and aligning them to strategic goals of the institution and improve the linkage to professional development. A Study of Perceptions of Civil Servants regarding the Performance Appraisal System was finalized by Ilia State University. Findings showed the need for improved use and better understanding of performance appraisals.

A total of 11 mandatory training courses were accredited by early 2021 and implemented by QEC. The project supported the development of standard syllabus for two programs “Effective Communication” and “Service Delivery”. Please see Annex G for a list of the project-supported courses. About 1,510 civil servants participated in the mandatory training programs in 2019-2021.

A handbook on Management and Leadership in Civil Service was developed by CSB and 330 senior civil servants were trained on the use of the handbook.

An international expert started work on the development of the concept for a unified e-learning platform for civil servants. Based on the recommendations, the local expert in cooperation with the CSB and an information technology team prepared the platform’s design. Technical work was initiated in January 2021 and will be completed in April. Also, in 2020 a business process description of 4 new modules of the e-HRMS was completed. The modules included performance appraisal module; professional development module; integration mechanism with similar HR electronic tools in public agencies; and reporting and analytical tools. Work on the e-HRMS was completed in October 2020. The remaining task is to link the fully functioning e-HRMS with the on-line learning platform.

A total of 6 Civil Service Forum meetings were organized, engaging more than 300 civil servants in 2020. Discussions were also held on introducing civil service coaching and mentoring practices and pilot ministries selected.

CSB, human resource units, and internal oversight unit representatives reviewed alternative dispute resolution models. CSB, with project support, is currently implementing a plan consisting of formulating detailed guidelines on mediation, cooperating with the Association of Mediators, and building capacities of HRs in conflict management techniques. A group of human resource personnel and other civil servants will be trained on the guidelines and techniques. A Memorandum of Understanding with the Association of Mediators of Georgia will be signed to allow civil servants to engage in external mediation.

**Emerging Needs Projects**

For the life of the project, there was a set of “Emerging Needs” subprojects. These subprojects were funded by the project to address specific topics or issue that were related to one of the project’s outcomes. There were 7 of these subprojects. There were also 6 subprojects that were not considered emerging needs but were directly responsive to project outcomes. The subject, description, partner and result or next steps are summarized in Annex I.

There were a total of 5 subprojects under civil service reform and human resource development. These included support to issue topics or issue areas under that component to include anticorruption, communications about the civil service law, and the e-HRMS. There were also 2 subprojects with Ajara: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport and Ministry of Finance and Economy. These subprojects reviewed the organizational structure, policy planning, and human resource practices of the ministries and worked with them to make the appropriate changes.

**CSO and Research Grants**

As part of the effort to build the capacity for and input into PAR, the project’s small grant scheme had several cycles of grant awards. The initiatives also contributed to providing research, support, feedback and direction to the all three outcome areas. These grant initiatives are identified in Annex K. Two evaluations were conducted of the previous cycles in 2019 and 2020.[[41]](#footnote-42) An evaluation of the last group of initiatives should be completed in March 2021.

#### 2. Conclusions

The results have shown the ability of the project to tangibly promote the concepts of professionalization and political independence of the civil service that helped to advance performance appraisals, furthered a system for civil service education and training, and helped to establish the groundwork and a possible approach to dispute resolution.

The legal/regulatory framework consisting of the civil service law and its by-laws is in place. The project has directly helped in advancing this framework by having discrete interventions in several of the areas. The CSB has proven to be a reliable partner and has taken on the role of civil service reform coordinator and has an interest to monitor implementation.

A whole-of-government approach was undertaken and there is some success. The work on performance appraisals and improving the quality of the appraisals is being brought government-wide.[[42]](#footnote-43) Civil service training is a more formal process with an agreed structure to include Identifying and implementing mandatory training with an accreditation process. The project has been catalytic in these areas. However, work remains to be done in these two areas. For the performance appraisals, work is now being done to connect appraisals with human resource development plans. For civil servant training, further work on the curriculum and facilitating access to all civil servants will continue to need attention. Reportedly some ministries and agencies don’t have access to the training since they don’t have their own training centers or do not have financing to attend the courses. The development of the e-HRMS and e-training platform will help to address these needs. What is developing is full circle of human resource development to create a more merit-based competent professional civil service. The project contributed to this development yet more work needs to be done and it appears there is some capacity for the CSB and line ministries to take on more of the implementation themselves. But, this does not eliminate the need for further development partner support.

Efforts at alternative dispute resolution made some progress but not as much as originally envisioned. The project tried various avenues to help advance the issue. There is some consolidation of views at this time and with CSB and ministries’ human resource departments to work more on elements of dispute resolution such as mediation and how to manage difficult situations. Addressing this issue will mature with or without development partner assistance. As some interviewees said, there must be found a “Georgian way.”

The independence of the civil service remains a priority and also remains an issue. The civil service law and by-laws help to further this independence. But, the leadership structures in place and the institutional make-up between political leadership and civil servants remains problematic. The constant changes in government make for a more destabilizing work environment. While there were no direct outputs tied to ‘independence’ or changes in leadership structures, there was research done in regard to having a Senior Civil Servant or Executive Secretary in ministries and agencies. While this may not be the answer, the political leadership/civil servant dichotomy seems to need attention to further civil service reform and a professional merit-based civil service that is more independent from political control.

The outcome of the 2019 PAR civil servant and public perception survey showed mixed results. The feedback provided by the survey gave government direct information on how the reform effort is perceived and understood by the two groups of stakeholders. The survey results also provided input to the project team and other development partners to better target resources as well as to communicate in a more effective manner. The results of the 2021 survey should show further insights if any progress was made. The changes in government over recent years could cloud the perceptions. As well, the impact of COVID-19 may further drive responses rather than the reforms themselves.

The emerging needs subprojects were valuable tools for the project to react to needs that were not specifically identified in the project document. They raised the awareness of PAR, provided direct technical assistance to address some priorities, and provided support to civil service reform and public service delivery. The modality allowed the project to concentrate on its core outputs and activities while having another avenue of service delivery to address priority needs. The modality seemed appropriate given the length of the project as well as its wide breadth.

The small grants scheme of CSO and research grants did facilitate CSO input and provided added research and support for PAR. The evaluations of these initiatives conducted to date and the one planned by March 2021 provide detailed evaluation information. That information is not repeated in this evaluation.

Gender was a key element of this outcome. As mentioned in the evaluation criteria description above, women made up most of those who received training. Unfortunately, not all of the training and some of the outputs indicated in the results table, above, provided gender-disaggregated data. This should be a priority to collect such information for future interventions. There was also a research study to include: a career in civil service and gender equality. The first two evaluations of the grant schemes stated that gender was reflected, for the most part, in terms of gender-related indicators and criteria yet not sufficiently mainstreamed in all research efforts. Gender factors were part of the criteria for the selection of the grants. Though, most of the projects did not have a gender or vulnerable group emphasis. This has been addressed in the last phase of the grants and will be reported on in the upcoming evaluation.

There is evidence that there is momentum for civil service reform and improved human resource management. With a CSB that has clear direction and the support provided to date, that momentum must be supported so there is a more deep and wide whole-of-government approach. The civil service reform is now happening on a day-to-day basis. The COVID-19 pandemic may have benefited the realization of the needs for a professional public service rather than hindered its development- more pubic services went on-line or adjustments made to continue services, civil service training continued to the extent possible, and ways of working remotely conformed to the need to keep government functioning. Development partner support is still needed but most likely in a more targeted manner so that the GoG takes on more of the change and ownership. As well, political will is needed especially in regard to allowing professionalization and merit-based career development as well as allowing independence and a direct stake in evidence-based policy making. Civil servants must be given “room” to implement reforms, learn from them, and work with political leadership to affect change.

## Outcome 3: Public Service Delivery

#### 1. Background and Major Results

Outcome 3 is aimed at developing the government’s ability to deliver improved quality public services – in person and digitally so they are more accessible and inclusive to citizens. The main work is with the PSDA and the DGA (formerly DEA) as well as organizations that have sought to improve service delivery through the various project interventions. The work focused on developing common public service standards, applying those standards, and improving the number and usage of e-services including those on my.gov.ge.

Table 7 provides the main results and status. The information is abstracted from the RRF as provided as Annex E.

**Table 7 Outcome 3: Public Service Delivery Main Results**

| Result | Target | Status, Issues or Next Steps |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. 2 key service delivery agencies initiated implementation of UPSDD and quality assurance elements and comply to standards | 2 | The Public Service Hall and Patrol Department Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs have completed the CAF and implemented service delivery improvements. |
| 2. Usage rate of my.gov.ge increases to 423,555 as of December 2020 | 360,000 | Baseline was 45,000. While the project contributed to adding services on the site and its promotion, most of the increase could probably be attributed to the impact of COVID-19 and the inability to provide in-person services. |
| 3. 5 methodological packages developed and ready to use as part of UPSDD | 5 | The UPSDDS are developed. The project provided 5 ‘packages: costing, people with disabilities, inclusive public service design and delivery, CAF, and customer satisfaction. Awaiting official government approval. |
| 4. 187 civil servants trained to apply UPSDD packages | 150 | 139 female and 48 male civil servants from 10 public agencies trained on the 5 packages. The Ministry of Justice’s Training Center has taken over the training and is part of its training curriculum. |

In the 2016-2017, work on public service delivery standards began with PSDA. An international and local consultant prepares a policy document to apply to different public services across all GoG ministries to include equal accessibility to services, a citizen-centric design, transparency, fair pricing and reliable monitoring. Also during this period, local consultants integrate 10 local municipality services on my.gov.ge. Work was conducted to prepare videos and provide design services to market e-government best practices and solutions. Expertise was exchanged with other countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Africa and South Caucasus.

The Georgian Public Service Delivery Baseline Assessment Report reviewed public service design, delivery, pricing, and quality assurance. It identified existing gaps and best practices. The report was presented to the PAR Council’s Service Delivery Working Group. The working group provided feedback. To follow-up on the report, PSDA continued to work on common guidelines. The project also supported the preparation of the Case Study Report on Public Service Delivery Monitoring and New Service Development Processes in Service Delivery Agencies in Georgia to contribute to the unified public service delivery standards.

Work on my.gov.ge consisted of helping to advance the knowledge, expertise and management of e-governance by enhancing the use of the web site through the integration of new services; creating replicable methodological packages that included technical documentation and best practices; contributing to the establishment of the e-governance Competency Centre; and building the public sector personnel capacity for e-services and cyber security. E-learning systems were developed for these areas.

The DEA (now DGA) launched activities to gain citizen feedback to develop on-line services and to increase usage. Use of my.gov.ge increased substantially from less than 5,000 in 2012 to more than 120,000 by 2017 with the largest gain reportedly in 2017. More services were on-line and public accessibility improved. According to project reporting the project supported 8 public services that were added in 2017 and 44 were converted to digital format. DEA established information corners in the 13 Public Service Halls and provided training to personnel at 50 community centers on the usage of my.gov.ge services.

In 2018, further work was done on the public service design and delivery document. It reached a final drafting stage in February but was not approved. The PAR Council’s Service Delivery Working Group worked on how to implement the policy. Several entities began aligning services to the document including the Public Service Hall – an LEPL that is the largest public service provider in the country. At the same time, the project contracted a legal specialist to study the existing legislation to identify any gaps for implementation and if any amendments were needed. A study on pricing public services was also initiated.

The e-Governance Competency Centre was formally established to provide a knowledge database for GoG ministries and agencies. The Centre’s web site was prepared. Other countries were looking at Georgia’s e-governance efforts and the Centre was responding to requests for information.

At this time, it became noticeable that critical human resource capacity was being lost in the key stakeholder entities while core procedures were not yet institutionalized. This issue was a chronic impediment for this outcome. The project worked with the Ministry of Justice to analyze ways to stem the outflow of qualified technical and managerial personnel.

The Case Study Report on Public Service Delivery Monitoring and New Service Development Processes in Service Delivery Agencies in Georgia was completed. The study looked at public service quality monitoring practices and the business process to create new public services.

E-governance toolkits were created so that standards and processes could be replicated government-wide. Cyber security training was provided in regard to the design and development of e-services and information systems. An e-learning system was developed to provide e-government and cyber security training given the demand and the need for updating training to respond to changing e-government and cyber security environments.

The DGA implemented or launched activities to integrate citizen feedback to develop online services and increase their usage. As of November 2018, 105,000 citizens used the my.gov.ge platform. According to a DGA study conducted at the end of 2018, 68.8% of those surveyed visited public institution web sites during the last 12 moths compared to 42% in 2016. The project helped to add or convert 66 e-services onto the on-line platform by 2018, exceeding the target of 50.

The DGA also developed a package of legislative amendments to create a legal obligation of public agencies to make their services available in electronic format with expectations that the package would be adopted in 2019.

In 2019, all major components of the public service design and delivery policy document were reflected in PAR Action Plan 2019-20. The CAF was implemented in the Public Services Hall and the Unified Service Center of the Patrol Police Department of the Ministry of Interior. CAF training of trainers was provided to representatives of public service delivery agencies from Ministry of Justice’s training centre and two public service delivery agencies (11 participants). CSO input and participation in service delivery developed to the point that CSO representatives attended and actively participated in the February 2020 PAR Council Meeting.

At the Public Service Hall, 800 front-line officers were trained across the country on service delivery including serving persons with disabilities.[[43]](#footnote-44) Training was also on COVID-19 safety and prevention methods. Assistance was provided to analyze over 4,500 services and determine procedural and legal challenges persons with disabilities and psychosocial needs confront while receiving public services. A guidebook was prepared on detection and reaction to possible citizen rights violations and services for persons with psychosocial needs who use Public Service Halls.

At the Patrol Police Unified Service Center the CAF was applied. The focus was on the effective delivery of human-centered public services with increased accessibility of these services to persons with disabilities. The initiative included development of standard operating procedures, applying a quality control system, customer service training, stress management, team building, and service assessment. Sign language training was also included to communicate with hearing-impaired customers.

An agreement was reached with PSDA to support the implementation of the UPSDD. The project developed four of the packages: service design, service delivery, quality control and service costing. Training was also provided to support standard implementation.

DGA presented the Competency Centre services at an e-governance seminar in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. The e-book “e-Georgia: Decades of Successful Transition” describing reforms and success of Georgia in the field of e-government was published.

There was increased use of e-governance platforms. 34 new public services were integrated into my.gov.ge. In total 468 services were on the my.gov.ge web site with 94 added with project support. The increased demand for usage was sparked by the COVID-19 restrictions. The project facilitated the movement to e-services in the 2020-21 period.

In 2020, a letter of agreement was signed with DGA to support implementation of the e-governance related activities that were to be coordinated by that agency. The DGA would prepare an updated second National e-Government Strategy of Georgia in line with the UPSDD and the policy planning handbook.

The analysis of the legal framework for service design and delivery was finalized. Recommendations and amendments were suggested to the General Administrative Code and the Law on Electronic Documents and Electronic Trust Services. The proposed changes were presented to the Ministry of Justice for approval and to be submitted to Parliament.

Given the emergency situation, DGA with the National Public Registry Agency and PSDA finalized 36 new electronic services that were transferred to my.gove.ge. The new services were for passports, e-cards and marriage, birth, death and adoption secondary certificates; to change names and surnames; and to register land and businesses. Use of my.gov.ge reportedly increased by 25% from March to June 2020. 70 new public services were integrated into my.gov.ge, bringing total services to 699 of which 133 were a result of the project. DGA created and disseminated a video encouraging citizens to use my.gov.ge.

#### 2. Conclusions

The outcome area has progressed steadily over the years to achieve the establishment and application of the UPSDD including to the benefit of the provision of public services to persons with disabilities and the expansion of the use of e-government services. There are some unique characteristics of both that will impact their application and will either benefit or hurt future sustainability.

For the UPSDD, while the standards are set and are being applied to two key agencies, Public Service Halls and Patrol Department Unified Service Center, the related policy has not received government approval. The PSDA is positioned to oversee the standards. The Ministry of Justice has taken over the training programs within their training centre. While the integration will help to ensure sustainability, the lack of official adoption will hinder the application of the standards government-wide.

The two entities that adopted and applied the standards report noticeable differences in their public service provision. They also report that the support provided by the project to assist the interventions were critical to conducting the CAF and implementing change, especially given the pandemic and the interest to improve services to persons with disabilities. The pilot efforts provide evidence that the standards can be applied to large organizations with a positive degree of success.

For the expansion of e-governance services, there were notable changes with the number of services placed on e-governance platforms increased along with public usage of the platforms. The growth on both fronts occurred before COVID-19 but understandably skyrocketed since March 2020. The project was catalytic in terms of not only supporting the addition of new services, but standardizing methodologies and tools, providing training, and helping in the promotion for public use.

A factor that may hinder sustainability is the attraction and keeping of technical personnel. Currently, there is reported to be a lack of qualified technical professionals and managers. There is competition with the private sector for such personnel. The project has discussed this issue with the Ministry of Justice counterparts. Losing critical capacity while core procedures are not yet institutionalized is an issue to be addressed. There is no simple solution but it warrants senior government attention.

CSOs appeared to play a role in service delivery. As mentioned above, CSOs were included in some of the work of the PAR Council Public Service Working Group and participated in a PAR Council meeting. Such participation is necessary and will hopefully continue. It is an essential element to help make services responsive to public needs. The same applies to the UPSDD. Public input, customer satisfaction, addressing needs of persons with disabilities must continue. Approving the policy is required so the standards can be applied government-wide.

## Lesson Learned

The following is a set of lessons learned based on evaluation criteria review, project management and implementation, and the activities and results of the 3 outcome areas.

1. *Building of Momentum and Consolidation:* There is momentum for PAR. And, the project has been catalytic in building that momentum by helping to identify discrete PAR reform targets and then addressing those targets in an organized, detailed and cooperative manner. Some have said that senior political support has waivered over the years given the macro political situation but even so, public servants have kept it going and the main impetus, adopting European standards and the commitments made by government, keep the reform alive.

As the year-to-year progress shows, activities became more consolidated to delivering on the key outputs. In the early years, much depended on having the appropriate legal/regulatory framework, collaborative working arrangements with stakeholders and other development partners, ability to target resources efficiently and effectively, and a project “road map” to address the areas the project was designed to address. These building blocks helped to make progress along the way and contributed to the more major results that were experienced at project end. And, the progress and consolidation continued even given the response to and impact of COVID-19 that changed the way the project could deliver. That said, there is still some “unfinished business,” described in the next section, which remains to be addressed.

1. *Planning and Implementation with Flexibility:* PAR is a long-term process. It consists of developing attitudes for an independent, merit-based professional and capable civil servant (and developing that civil servant), establishing the legal/regulatory framework, establishing processes, training, standardization, certifications, e-systems, etc. that are applied to help deliver services and provide capabilities that are designed to be responsive to government and citizens’ needs. A whole-of-government approach takes all of government.

The project was adeptly flexible to facilitate each of the outcome areas and applied its resources as needed. Sometimes, such as waiting for a document to be approved like the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation handbook and its related process and USPDD, the project adjusted so it can still address the need and put things in place so that when approval was (or will be) given, stakeholders can progress since the building blocks were already set. The flexibility allowed is also a testament to close cooperation with the project partners – UNDP and the UK government – to allow such flexibility. The flexibility did not throw the project off course as shown by the results to date, budget execution, and feedback from the parties involved. The resourcefulness shown by all parties - project team, donors and stakeholders is a key lesson for PAR in Georgia.

1. *Change Management Takes Time and Should Always be Present:* A change management approach was established at project start. The focus on change management helped to draw attention to priority needs. As time went on, the project went from advocating for change to actually making it happen with the various interventions. However, that not is to say PAR-related reform is complete. Change will need to be constant as governance structures adjust – as they did with the number of ministries reduced during the project as an example, and demands change – such as with the response to a crisis and emergency situation of COVID-19 and its vast impact. Given the project’s interventions, the government is better equipped to plan for, adopt and measure change. The government now has at its disposal a policy planning monitoring and evaluation process with civil society input; an organized civil service training approach and responsive curriculum; a link between performance appraisal and capacity building; and improved service delivery also with civil society input and where one-on-one and e-services have and can continue to improve. The challenge is to bring these changes forward so they are applied government-wide and change is allowed systematically. The feedback allowed through strengthened monitoring and evaluation, provision of more standardized training of the civil servant workforce, and civil society input will help to advance future change.
2. *Identifying and Overcoming Project Risks:* The project reporting clearly identified risks to the project and had realistic responses. It appears that this risk identification and analysis helped to feed the flexibility identified above while also helping to keep the project on track.
3. *Not Getting Ahead of Stakeholders:* Sometimes with development assistance projects, a project gets ahead of its stakeholders or begins advancing project components that may be in a project document but may not be a priority or are stalled for a time. This was not the case with the project. The team was able to adequately review and measure the situation with stakeholder support and cooperation. Such an effort took more time and effort, as shown by individual output progress, but paid off in terms of having collaborative partnerships and eventually making progress.
4. *Mid Term Evaluation and Survey Feedback:* The design and application of the civil servant and public perception surveys were helpful to provide feedback on PAR in general and the project’s outcome areas, in particular. The benchmark survey of 2016 and the mid-term survey in 2019 provided this feedback. While the final survey is not yet completed, it is highly encouraged, if not planned already, to show differences of the surveys results from the different time periods. It should be noted that each of the surveys were taken in a different socioeconomic and political environments – for instance the political changes in 2016-2019 probably impacted those survey results just as the response and impact of COVID-19 will impact the March 2021 survey results. A comparative study will help to see what direction PAR is heading and help to identify areas that require attention.

The mid term evaluation helped to check progress of the project in the 2016 to 2018 time period and also helped to see how the project was placed in the overall PAR framework. The feedback provided helped the project to make adjustments, indicated work to be done, and identified the need for a medium-term approach.

The above feedback instruments show the application of checks and balances. Such instruments will continue to be needed, such as further civil servant and public surveys, not only to keep a project on track, but keep PAR on track.

1. *Leadership Required for PAR to Advance:* With changes in government early on in the project, the lack of PAR prioritization did impact the overall PAR effort. As mentioned above, the project’s flexibility allowed it to keep providing support. However, the challenges show that senior leadership is required. The reductions in government and lack of PAR emphasis reportedly made civil servants more risk averse. Political ownership was sought. And, public awareness of changes was not always evident as exemplified in the 2019 perception survey results. The more political will and commitment, the more PAR progress can be made and the faster the transition to EU administrative standards. Leadership and its buy-in is essential and, if not present, should be sought with other development partners using senior level officials.
2. *Continued Need for Structural Changes?* The number of ministries was reduced twice during the project’s timespan resulting in some uncertainty in government programming as well as civil servant confidence. The civil service law and its by-laws created change and provided the necessary framework for civil service reform and professional civil service. However, certain issues have not been addressed.

First, the status of LEPLs remains an issue. There was a proposed law to reform LEPLs but no developments to date. Their status is unclear. As seen in the project implementation, LEPLs are unique entities and there appears to be differences between them and how they relate to the traditional public administration. The experience of the PSDA and DGA are a case-in-point. Questions arise: are LEPL employees’ civil servants? Further work is needed to define LEPL’s, standardize them as part of the pubic administration and civil service, or spin them off to the private sector. As of now they appear to work in a gray area – not part of public administration, not a public-private partnership and not a private entity.

Second, while civil service reform has been applied, there are still questions of independence. This finding was evident in the 2019 perception survey. The project as well as other development partner interventions, looked at the possibility of having a senior civil servant at ministries and agencies. Currently leadership is composed of ministers and deputy ministers and other political appointees. While the senior civil servant position may be an option, the goal should be to find a mechanism or structure that allows independence in the Georgian context. Further attention to this issue is needed with a whole-of-government approach including advocacy and raising awareness at the senior government level.

1. *Evidence-Based Decision Making Matters:* Government decisions have to be made with the support of evidence. This is not to say they have not been. But, some of the tools, processes and capacities created by the project directly contribute to making evidence-based decision making much more possible and prevalent. These include the policy planning monitoring and evaluation process (and eventual e-system), training of AoG and ministry and agency planning personnel on the processes, standardized and more broadly available required civil service training, linking of performance appraisal and human resource development, adopting public service delivery standards, etc. And, all have more avenues for civil society input.
2. *Donor Coordination Works and Involving Senior Officials Helps:* There are various interventions and development partners involved in PAR. From an outside perspective, one can say that the space is “crowded” which may negatively impact progress. That is not the case. There is coordination amongst the various development partners. There is no apparent competition. Each work on discrete areas and work on areas together or coordinate where interests or activities coincide. Each seems to have their “avenues” within government to help make their respective efforts progress. If there is a criticism, it is that the coordination is mainly donor driven with donors coordinating amongst themselves. There is a case for the government to take more active leadership in donor coordination. UNDP is well placed to help make this happen given its objective stance.

The project has used senior UNDP and UK government officials to weigh in on critical issues from time-to-time. This has included the UK Ambassador to Georgia and the UNDP Resident Representative. The use of such resources was and could continue to be highly effective to help advance PAR. It also shows the serious commitment development partners have to the reform.

1. *Stakeholder Management and Personnel Continuity:* In several of the entities there were management and personnel changes throughout the life of the project. The AoG had several changes in management plus it was reorganized once after a new director was appointed. There were also changes at PSDA and DGA that are LEPLs. The CSB was reportedly the most stable stakeholder. The changes in stakeholder management and personnel are not unique to this project. Other projects confront the same challenge. What is appropriate is to recognize that such occurrences will happen and to be able to respond proactively rather than sit back and wait until positions are filled. The project was able to cope with these changes. The project team worked with line management and staff to continue activities.
2. *Lag Between Designing Policies and Processes and Approval:* There was some initial lag and there continues to be lag between the preparation of policies, processes and standards and formal adoption. This was evident with the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation policy (and resulting handbook), and continues to be applicable with the UPSDD. The project actively monitored these approval processes for these examples as well as for other interventions. In all cases, the project forged ahead to address the issues. For instance with the policy planning process, training continued at the AoG and in ministry policy planning units. For the UPSDD, the standards were applied in two large entities. What lack of formal approval does hinder or even stop is the application government-wide. The approval and application of the civil service law and eventual by-laws has helped to advance civil service reform government-wide though even these processes are not complete.
3. *The COVID-19 Pandemic – A Blessing or a Curse?* In an attempt to create at least one silver lining from a global pandemic, an observer can see that the pandemic tested governments in a variety of ways all over the world. No benefits will ever outweigh the death, destruction and havoc caused by such a crisis. In Georgia, as it relates to PAR, the pandemic raised awareness on several fronts and actually increased advances as well. The pandemic showed the importance of planning and evidence based policy making with the need for monitoring and evaluation as feedback. For civil service reform, it showed the importance of having an administrative structure and professional and competent personnel to continue their duties even if done remotely. And, it showed the need to continue public services in an effective manner to meet public needs. The direct result is the increased availability and use of e-government services that the project helped to improve over the years. And, the work with the Public Service Halls and Patrol Department Unified Service Center – two of the largest public service providers- was instrumental to serve the public even during times of the pandemic including addressing the needs of vulnerable groups to include persons with disabilities and psychosocial needs. This latter intervention was timely to help Georgia better respond to the pandemic. At the end of the day, the situation may positively contribute to raising the awareness of PAR at the senior level so it remains a priority.
4. *E-Systems Are Not A Panacea:* The project has or is developing a number of e-systems to include the policy planning monitoring and evaluation system; the e-HRMS and e-training system with both eventually being linked; those systems or processes involved with the UPSDD; and all the work to transfer specific public services to my.gov.ge. Training was also provided for cyber security. Such activity is not one-off. Data and e-systems must be constantly updated and maintained. Exit strategies need to be developed for the systems so they do not stop once project assistance ends. The Ministry of Justice has picked up the UPSDD training. Such transfers have to happen if not already done so. Subjects like cyber security need to be continually addressed as demands and training changes given the evolution of such technical areas.
5. *Central and Local Government PAR:* The project concentrated on addressing central government PAR. There were some linkages to local government PAR efforts including through the small grants scheme and sub projects, and tailoring the policy planning handbook to local governments. Collaboration did happen with other UNDP and development partner projects aimed at the local level. Given the GoG’s emphasis on governance decentralization, attention should be given to further applying the central level reforms to the local government level as applicable.
6. *CSO and Research Small Grants Scheme and Emerging Needs Sub Projects Supplemented and Advanced PAR:* The small grant scheme accomplished two goals. First, it brought attention or helped to provide research or solutions to a variety of PAR reform issues or areas that warranted attention. The scheme also developed the capacities of national and local CSOs, to include NGOs and academia, so they are more prepared players to help address PAR.

The Emerging Needs sub projects helped to address areas that either provided examples or allowed the project to apply PAR in specific situations. It is not known at this time if such interventions had a “multiplier” effect but they at least met needs, developed approaches, set examples and built capacity.

1. *Gender and Inclusion Addressed in an Integrated Manner:* Gender and inclusion were elements of project design. Gender and inclusion were factors considered when implementing the outcomes and outputs and their respective work activities. The effect, as shown above, has been significant. Gender and inclusion are part of the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process given that these and other human rights considerations must be addressed in national, sector and institutional strategies. Plus, seeking CSO input on these and other issues are also part of the process. The civil service reform and human resource development outcome featured issues that addressed women in the public workforce and the number of female participants far exceeded male. And, the public service delivery efforts, while looking to advance services to all citizens, had a focus on improving services on those with disabilities and psychosocial needs as well as providing services to all groups throughout Georgia. Efforts will need to continue in all three outcome areas. It would be a positive to collect more gender-disaggregated data from project beginning for all intervention areas.
2. *Networking Advances Process Application, Address Issues and Builds Ownership and Capacity:* The project has supported or participated in several PAR meetings or conferences that helped civil servants to network. The most considerable examples are the Civil Service Forums and Human Resource Manager Forums. It appears that these forums are now being supported more by the CSB. There should be a transition so that CSB conducts or supports such forums on an appropriate timeline. It has also been mentioned that more networking can occur for the policy planning units within the ministries and agencies. AoG can be the main coordinator or at least support such a forum. Participants rather than donors or external consultants should own such networking efforts. They should be allowed to share experience and address issue areas that they confront. The end result is to help apply the systems and approaches developed, further tailor them to their needs, and help build ownership and capacity.

# Key Recommendations and Next Steps for a Future Cycle of Reform

## PAR is for Real and Making Progress

PAR in Georgia is real and is making process. Most of the key building blocks are in place. These building blocks have been put in place not only by the project but also by the GoG itself and by the support of other development partners. The goal remains the adoption of EU standards and practices in line with past commitments as well as future needs including a more participatory approach with civil society input and some more formal checks and balances.

The project has contributed to the progress in the three outcome areas. As well, sustainability is evident within each of the outcome areas. However, risks remain. The chief risk is the prioritization of PAR at the senior level of government. While the priority is evident in the national and annual strategies and plans, as well as the current formulation of a new PAR Roadmap to follow through on the previous one, constant support is needed. The risk is not that the reform effort will stop but it can slow or stagnate if the political will is not present. As shown in each of the outcome areas, there is interest and capability to implement the reforms by civil servants but at times there was frustration when things seemed to move sideways because of government changes or lacked attention such as by delaying approvals of key documents or processes.

Ownership of PAR is also not a question. The reforms are advancing and the project has been allowed to be a catalyst to help support reform implementation in the three key outcome areas that directly link to the reform roadmap. While all the needs in the three outcome areas are not met, the progress made to date has allowed more ownership of a policy planning monitoring and evaluation process that is being applied government-wide with at least some capacity built to help implementation. Civil service reform will continue with progress made on civil servant hiring, standard performance appraisal and human resource development ongoing. And, public service delivery has drawn significant attention to improve delivery with real gains within large service providing entities and major advances in e-governance. The attention brought to civil society has helped to create avenues of input and feedback for each of the three outcome areas and opportunities for the government-civil society relationship to further develop.

The next steps for the project, or other related GoG or development interventions are two-fold:

1. Unfinished Business: There is still some “unfinished business” remaining from the project. These are activities that were not completed mainly because of timing or approval issues or the changes and demands brought about by the crisis and emergency situation of COVID-19. Certain outputs need to be “tied up” so the outcomes and outputs are brought to full completion. These areas are identified in the next section.
2. Furthering the Breadth and Depth of Reforms: Any PAR efforts’ measure of success is how the reforms are implemented and applied government-wide over time. The project helped to catalyze the formulation, adoption and implementation of various changes. Now the challenge is full implementation and application. As shown in other countries, it takes cycles of activities over the short to medium term for changes to “stick” and become day-to-day routines. That is not to say some things won’t change. For instance, the standard mandatory accredited civil service training courses may change or be adjusted. The policy planning process may be adjusted from time-to-time as the processes are used and feedback is provided. The challenge is the constant application of the reforms so the change becomes the common. And, it is important that the changes have a positive impact thus calling for the need of constant feedback from political leadership, civil servants and civil society. Related recommendations to this topic are provided in subsection 3, below.

## Unfinished Business

The following is a set of outputs or activities that are within the existing project framework. They have been delayed for a variety of reasons, but mainly because of the adjustments made in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The changes in government throughout the project timeframe also impacted completion with delays in certain approvals. All of the areas are currently being addressed but some may have completion dates that are beyond the timeframe of the current project (March 2021). Either the activities should be continued under the new project being discussed or an exit strategy needs to be developed so stakeholders can complete the activity. Their full completion will help in not only advancing sustainability of project interventions but also applying the various components government-wide.

***Policy Development and Coordination***

1. *Drafting of National Strategies Applying Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Standards:* Three strategic documents with accompanying action plans are being prepared with project support to include: 1) PAR Roadmap 2021-24; 2) e-Governance Strategy; and 3) Maritime Transport Strategy. The strategies are being prepared by applying the methodologies and processes of the new policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process documented in the accompanying handbook and being applied by the AoG. For overall PAR, the most important document is the PAR Roadmap that will identify the next round of PAR reform. AoG is currently working on the strategy and the project has supported its development. Its completion should be a priority to help provide further PAR reform guidance and keep current advances on track while identifying shortcomings that need further attention. Completion is slated for March 2021 and requires PAR Council approval. Past documents that needed such approval have been delayed so prioritization by AoG, the project team, and possibly other development partners is needed.
2. *Unified Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation e-platform:* The e-platform will be the backbone of the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process. It will provide an electronic system to help standardize inputs and outputs that will standardize national, sector and institution strategies. It will also help make the handbook more accessible and used government-wide thus promoting more evidence-based planning as well as monitoring and evaluation information for better planning and decision making. The first phase of building the platforms architecture is underway and completion is expected in March 2021. The second phase will include adding non-key and the evaluation modules. Completion is expected in the third quarter of 2021. Support will be needed at least until the e-platform is completed and implemented. And training will be needed to at least “train the trainers” as envisioned in the current project framework. There should be support for at least one-year to make sure the system is working properly and meeting the needs of users. Also, an exit strategy needs to be developed so the GoG has the competencies and resources to maintain and upgrade the system as necessary in the future.
3. *On-Line Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Course:* The project has trained policy planning managers and staff throughout the government. The plans for the next phase of the project is to create an on-line course that is part of the e-learning platform. Such on-line access will allow users to more easily take the course. Such an effort will provide sustainability and reduce future external donor-supported training effort needs. The more accessible training would also further solidify the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation process adopted. Once the e-course is completed and on-line, its use should be measured for at least one year to ensure users are applying what was taught. A survey of policy planning skill adoption should also take place in/about 2022. Also, why it appears the training is required for new personnel and the training is required every 3 years, the training is not mandatory. Such training should be mandatory for policy unit management and staff.
4. *PAR Communication and Action Plan:* The plan was finalized in October 2020. However, it has not been approved. Approval is expected at the next PAR Council meeting. Implementation should immediately follow approval and could focus on the PAR Roadmap that is currently being prepared.

***Civil Service Reform and Human Resource Management***

1. *Linkage of Performance Appraisals and Professional Development Plans:* Work continues regarding performance appraisals and professional development plan preparation in pilot ministries. Given that the activity is being applied at project end, it will be difficult to determine the sustainability and the ability to bring the approach government-wide. Results of the pilot phase should be analyzed to see how the experience of linking various stages of performance management could be replicated in other ministries. Follow-up is needed in the future project phase or in another manner if follow-up is not provided in the future project phase. The linking of the two is essential to allow for true human resource development.
2. *E-HRMS Support:* The project supported adding 4 modules to the e-HRMS: performance appraisal, professional development, self-service modules for civil servants, and smart analytical module. In line with the previous recommendation, the use of the e-HRMS modules should be monitored to ensure they are being used as designed and contributing to at least better store data and report on performance appraisal and professional development information. And, to make sure the linkage between the two components is achieved. There should be at least a one-year time period to monitor its implementation and provide any technical support. An exit strategy should also be developed so that the GoG can manage and upgrade the system as needed.
3. *Unified e-Learning Platform:* The e-platform concept was due to be completed in February. The platform is scheduled for piloting by April 2021. Support will be needed to complete the platform and pilot its use. There should be at least a one-year time period to monitor its implementation and provide any technical support. An exit strategy should also be developed so that the GoG can manage and upgrade the system as needed.
4. *Civil Servants’ Forum Meeting Support:* The Civil Servants’ Forum and Human Resource Managers’ Forum meetings have proven effective as a way to advance civil service reform in a participatory manner. The project reports that most attendees are female. Improved registration information will help to get more detailed participant information, including gender. CSB is the main stakeholder in the forums and have expressed interest to continue the meetings. Further meetings are expected during the project’s next phase. There should be a transition period and agreement at the start of the next project phase so that the CSB steadily takes on more responsibility and tasks so that project support is phased out within an agreed timeframe.
5. *Advancing Dispute Resolution:* Advances on dispute resolution have been made with the investment in a multi-year effort. The project is currently implementing a plan consisting of formulating detailed guidelines on mediation, cooperation with the Association of Mediators of Georgia and building capacities of human resource units in conflict management techniques. A group of human resource personnel and other civil servants will be trained on the guidelines. A MoU with the Mediation Association of Georgia will be signed to allow civil servants to engage in external mediation if necessary. Since these activities are underway, further attention will be needed during the next project phase. If successful and accepted, formalizing the approach and methodology will be necessary.

***Public Service Delivery***

1. *UPSDD Full Implementation Government-Wide:* The UPSDD is designed and implemented in two pilot entities that provide services Georgia-wide. The pilots are reportedly successful. However, the standards are not yet approved. It appears that PSDA is prepared to coordinate the application of the standards. Future senior level support may be needed to spur formal acceptance of the standards so they can be applied government-wide. The COVID-19 pandemic is a good reason for the standards and provides evidence for adopting such standards immediately.
2. *Monitoring of CSO Input into Public Service Provision and Comparative Perception Survey Study:* Avenues were built and capacities developed through various project interventions to allow for CSO input and feedback. During the next phase of the project, such input and feedback should be monitored to measure if CSOs interests are being considered. Also, the project has supported three public and civil servant perception surveys. If not done in the survey report to be completed in March 2021, there should be a comparative assessment of the surveys’ findings to show how perceptions have changed over the years and what areas need further attention in the future. The survey results should be information inputs to the AoG, CSB, PSDA, DGA, PAR development partners, and the project team.

## Recommendations to Move Forward

The following is a set of recommendations to help move the PAR effort forward. Any project intervention needs to be fully aligned with the PAR Roadmap strategy now under development. Such alignment, with the project staying “within its lanes,” helped to make progress in each of the outcome areas. Some of the recommendations are aimed at PAR in general while some are more related to a PAR project intervention.

1. *Leadership and Ownership of the of PAR Process:* The project, development partners as well as actions by the GoG itself show that PAR leadership and ownership are with the GoG. While the support and advancement may not have been as consistent as initially envisioned, despite a changing environment PAR continues to advance. Development partner support will remain crucial to help advance the reforms. The PAR Roadmap, currently under development, will help to set the direction for further interventions. The project was well placed as a catalytic actor that helped to advance change in a constructive, collaborative and results-oriented manner. The project team showed resourcefulness even when outputs or activities appeared stalled.

While external support (leadership, expertise, finance resources) must be provided to those entities responsible, such support should be carefully gauged and planned out so that there is a clear transition from any future project support to GoG management and implementation. Such transition should account for government leadership, personnel and financial resources to take on the roles and responsibilities developed.

And, as has been shown through the project and other efforts, the adoption and tailoring of EU and international standards is possible, practical and having an impact. Sometimes it takes several efforts, as was done with attempting to address dispute settlement. Such EU and international standards should continue to be pursued and applied though some require some adjustments to apply to the Georgian context.

1. *Developing Linkages Within and Between PAR Components:* The project has developed several components of different systems and approaches within each of the outcome areas. Toward project end, these components began to be linked. Examples are the policy planning policy, monitoring and evaluation process and methodology; performance appraisal and human resource development planning; and public service assessment and standard setting to upgrade public services. Also toward project end, there were some synergies with placing the policy planning, monitoring and evaluation training as an e-course (and AoG and CSB agreement to do so), developing the accompanying e-systems for training, policy planning and e-HRMS on-line with the cooperation of various entities (AoG, CSB, DGA); and applying the UPSDD and CAF even though not approved (PSDA). There is room for more such synergies as these processes and systems are rolled out and implemented past the pilot phase.

For the next PAR phase, such cooperation and collaboration should be sought at the beginning of intervention planning rather than towards the end. Such collaboration will provide more GoG ownership and help facilitate implementation at a more rapid pace.

1. *Medium Term Depth and Breadth of PAR:* Applying PAR government-wide takes time and cycles of activity. The legal/regulatory framework is mostly in place. At this time, various reform areas have been addressed with components in place or at least piloted. The challenge now is to keep on conforming to the legal/regulatory framework and applying the requirements by using the methodologies, systems and processes developed. This will take time and attention of the political leadership as well as all levels of the civil service. There will also be trial and error. Public feedback should be a key ingredient and some advancement has been made to allow it to happen.

The challenge will be to keep on applying what the project, other development partners and the GoG have developed so that PAR and its specific components can move forward. There has been much “push” in the last five years. The “push” of these advances must continue so they become ingrained and routine.

Two issues remain outstanding and one suggestion.

First, while there have been advances on a professional and merit-based civil service, the question of “independence” still lingers. Changes in government over the project’s timeframe and the public and civil servant perception of independence, keeps independence as a front burner issue. The project has attempted to raise attention to this issue. For instance, the prospect of having a senior civil servant at each ministry was reviewed. While such an approach may not be suitable for the GoG context, the issue of independence continues to warrant attention and needs to be pursued. The effort to address dispute resolution is a good example of using various avenues and tools to address a sensitive topic. A transparent and accountable civil service should continue to be a main PAR priority. There are many examples of what other countries have done to develop such independence.

Second, the status of LEPLs also seems to be an issue for PAR. Though not an output area for the project, the project has had to work with LEPLs as stakeholders as well as participants in project activities. While PAR is being undertaken, LEPLs seem to be treated differently and there are similarities and dissimilarities between LEPLs themselves. If the GoG is truly interested in PAR, such rules, regulations, etc., should be applied equally and across government. Currently, LEPLs operate in a different manner than line ministries and agencies yet also provides public services and help to administer the state. The current approach creates distortions for all of PAR. As reported by the project early on, there was proposed legislation to reform LEPLs but it has not advanced. Future attention is warranted if the GoG truly wants PAR to apply government-wide. The LEPL situation needs to be addressed so there is more conformity with the public administration framework, laws and policies.

The suggestion is in regard to the PAR civil service and public perception surveys. The surveys are excellent tools to measure PAR performance. However, not all data is comparable between the two completed surveys and the one scheduled for completion in March 2021. First, there should be an assessment to compare date across the surveys to the extend possible. Second, for any future surveys, the framework should be built so that the data could definitely be comparable from survey to survey. Such comparative information will help show progression, weaknesses, and gaps. The information should be used for PAR-related planning (not only roadmaps) and development partner project design.

1. *Human Rights-Based PAR Addressing Gender, Various Community Needs and Civil Society Input:* The project has made significant gains to help streamline and implement a human rights-based PAR. Though it is in the early stage to tell the impact, some of the tools have been developed as well as avenues opened to allow for civil society input and feedback. For the next round of the PAR Roadmap, it is reported that this focus will continue. UN Women has helped with the formulation of the next roadmap. Human rights based approaches, including addressing SDGs, are built into the policy planning monitoring and reporting methodology and approach and there are avenues for input for civil society that are required as well as monitoring information from civil society that will also be required. Civil service training, hiring rules, performance appraisals, dispute resolution or mediation, are all elements to a more equitable and merit-based civil service that is open to all with equal opportunity. And, the new service delivery standards have emphasized broadening use or make better use of services for those with disabilities as well as increasing access for all citizens across the country.

While the above advances have been made, the human rights emphasis needs to continue. Implementation is always challenging and attention can be refocused elsewhere. For the next phase of the project, indicators should be identified at the beginning along with collection modalities so the impact can be better measured. There should be constant monitoring of indicators to make sure the appropriate feedback is being provided from civil society so that needs are met.

1. *Decentralization and Local Government*: Decentralization and local governance development are priority areas as indicated by the decentralization strategy and various local government strengthening efforts, including those supported by UNDP and other development partners. It appears that the project touched upon local governance to a certain extent. This effort has been somewhat piecemeal. For true decentralization and local government development to occur that is on par and synchronized with the central level PAR, a more concerted effort is needed. It is not currently foreseen that the next phase of the project will be able to address applying what has been developed through the project at the local level. Such activities could be integrated into projects that are currently active at the local level, if additional funding is added to such a project. Or, additional funding could be added to bring the next phase of the PAR project’s activities to the local level.
2. *GoG External Assistance Coordination:* As previously mentioned, development partner coordination is happening by the development partners amongst themselves and with government stakeholders as required. However, given that the PAR is intended to be government-wide and given the depth that is needed across government, there seems to be the need for more government-led development partner coordination. Such coordination could help PAR to move at a more rapid pace, concentrate resources on priorities, and address issue that seem sensitive or difficult. Development partners are key collaborators and the current coordination has helped to avoid repetition and has contributed to some concentration of attention and resources. However, given a further stage of PAR about to begin, and in line with leadership, ownership, transparency and accountability, such government-led coordination appears appropriate. An emphasis should be on government management and execution. Also, it may give impetus for the PAR Council to be more active. Its activity has waned the last two years. This has slowed some approvals.

Also, the governance and PAR space has many players working throughout government to include, the parliament, policy planning and management, civil service reform, public service delivery, decentralization, local governance, public finance, anti-corruption, etc. The GoG and development partners may benefit to have an inventory of all such interventions. It is reported that USAID is preparing a list of PAR projects. Such an inventory should be thorough and show what areas are being addressed, timelines and counterparts/stakeholders. It should also be aligned with the new PAR Roadmap to show what areas are being addressed and what areas need attentions. Such an effort will help the GoG and all development partners to be on the same page. It will also show what government agencies are doing since some entities are involved in several interventions at once. Such an inventory is essential for government-development partner coordination.

UNDP is positioned to assist in facilitating this government-led coordination given its experience with the governance reform agenda and its objective stance.

1. *Exist Strategy, Exit Strategy, Exit Strategy:* The next phase of the project should have an exit strategy for each outcome area. The respective strategies should be agreed to with each stakeholder and a “handover” timeline prepared. Included in the strategy should be the “elements of sustainability” to identify what is needed for interventions sustainability. For instance, if an e-system is being transferred over, what is needed to maintain it (time, human and financial resources, etc.)? If a mid-term review is being contemplated for the project, one of its emphases should be regarding the status of the output exit strategies.

It is not known at this time if the research and CSO grant schemes and emerging needs sub projects will be continued with the next phase of the project. These interventions have helped the project in a variety of ways as described previously. Such grant schemes and sub projects can’t continue unlimited. If future grants or sub projects are planned they should be discrete and targeted and directly related to a project output. One of the criteria should be how the grant would integrate a human rights based approach and address key issues such as gender and vulnerable groups.

# Annex A: Terms of Reference

Location: Home based (remotely)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Job Title: International Consultant for External Evaluation of the Project

Expected Duration of Assignment: Up to 40 working days within a 4 months period (December 2020-March 2021)

**1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:**

In 2016 UNDP Georgia rolled out the multi-year project “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia” (PAR Project), funded by the UK Government.  The project addresses a complementary, but distinct, set of specific, predetermined needs in three crucial areas of the ongoing Public Administration Reform (PAR) - Policy Development and Cooperation; Civil Service and Human Resource Management, and Service Delivery, as stipulated by the PAR Reform Roadmap 2020. The initiative intends to sustain, support, and build key institutions and processes required for advancing Public Administration Reform by offering consultancy, capacity building, technical assistance, etc.

The project aims to support the Government of Georgia to increase the level of professionalism, independence and credibility of the civil service, develop a whole-of-government approaches in national level policy making and further improve service delivery, by introducing the unified system of professional development, coaching and strategic policy planning, monitoring and evaluation practices, mediation and dispute-settlement mechanisms, staff performance evaluations across the civil service, development of unified principles for service design and delivery, etc.

The expected project impact contributes directly to the overall UN Partnership for Sustainable Development priority, which foresees that by 2020, *expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels.*

**The targeted outcomes of the project are as follows:**

**Outcome 1:** Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation;

**Outcome 2:** Performance of Civil Service is more professional and effective;

**Outcome 3:** GoG delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens.

More specifically**,** under the Policy Development and Coordination pillar the project has been aiming at advancement of the policy making process in the country through enhancement of policy planning and coordination and introduction of strong mechanisms for government-wide monitoring and evaluation, coupled with strengthening the capacity of the policy units of the line ministries. National level policy planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are being strengthened through provision of hands-on assistance and consultancy support to the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) in the development and deployment of unified standards for whole-of-government policy planning and coordination along with necessary electronic tools for tracking and monitoring of government-wide programs, while at the same time strengthening public participation in policy making processes.

Through the Civil Service Reform pillar, the project has been supporting the national partners – Civil Service Bureau of Georgia (CSB) and the line ministries towards development of an increasingly professional, uniformly trained civil service that is protected from arbitrary decisions. This is being achieved by: interactive, tailor-made trainings to increase knowledge and awareness among civil servants about ongoing civil service reform and its implications; operationalization of unified training system for civil servants; introduction of staff performance appraisal systems based on effective international models and with due consideration of the local context; development of tools for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in civil service. Furthermore, the project has been supporting the CSB to build the capacity of civil servants and public officials on the new Law on Civil Service and new Anti-Corruption mechanisms thereby contributing to effective implementation of the Civil Service Reform in Georgia.

As part of Service Delivery pillar, the project has helped its primary national partners – the Public Service Development Agency (PSDA) and the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) in laying solid foundations for the creation of unified standards for public service design and delivery. These measures target the established discrepancies in the quality of public service delivery in Georgia, between various service provider agencies, but also between the national and local levels. Creation of the common service delivery standards and their subsequent implementation is intended to impact the overall quality of public services, and to also have a knock-on positive effect on the level of support to PAR among citizens and civil servants.

By introducing common standards of public service delivery, the project assists the Government of Georgia to further institutionalize the significant achievements made in service provision and ensure that they are sustainable, replicable and cover the ever-widening array of the government agencies. Supporting e-Governance development, increasing digitization of public services, coupled with enhancing the uptake of e-services is yet another component falling under the wider service delivery pillar of the project, which became even more critical amid the COVID-19 pandemic and associated restrictive measures prompting Government agencies to speed up the digitization of public services and reemphasize the “digital-by-default” principle by fully harnessing the technologies internally, within their organizations, as well as externally, when interacting with citizens.

The Civil Society Organizations’ (CSO) engagement component of the project cuts across its all three outcomes and aims at fostering engagement of CSOs and academia to provide evidence and practical solutions for enhancing policy planning, advancing civil service reform and improving public service delivery.

Predictably, the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the planned activities of the project starting from March 2020, as the virus-related restrictions interfered with the scheduled trainings, workshops and forums. The project team together with the partner agencies moved to online collaboration platforms to keep up with the plans. By the end of 2020 while the restrictions still apply, the project is on track with the planned activities as the workshops and trainings have been moved online. Apart from adapting to the new working modalities, the PAR project also responded to some of the urgent needs identified by the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) while still remaining within the overall broader scope of the project, by fine-tuning its CSO and Emerging Needs’ components to offer emergency support to partner agencies and to foster collaborative initiatives between the government and civil society.

**2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives**

The main objective of the final external evaluation is to assess the efficacy of the project design and structure, relevance of the project outcomes and outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of assistance, and sustainability of interventions. The evaluation must include an analysis of how PAR interventions address Human Rights and Gender Equality (HR and GE) principles[[44]](#footnote-45).

The project underwent the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) covering the period from the project’s initiation in 2016 through the end of December 2018. Given the project’s designated end date of March 2021, MTE allowed to track the progress achieved through 2018 and chart out the next steps in the process. The final evaluation is expected to cover the full cycle of the project (2016-2021) covering all three key pillars of Policy Planning and Coordination, Civil Service Reform and Public Service Delivery and focusing more on the period after the MTE was conducted (2019-2021). However, considering the specific context of PAR, where the results take longer to materialize, some of the MTE findings might need to be revisited and validated.

The international consultant will be tasked to perform the final evaluation of the Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR Project) in Georgia outcomes with corresponding outputs as set out in the Results Framework of the project. The evaluation also aims to inform decision-making on the continuation and designing of the subsequent phase of the project through a methodologically sound, credible, impartial and independent assessment of the achievements and shortcomings of the project, as well as lessons learned and recommendations for future interventions.

The specific objectives of this final evaluation are:

* To evaluate the achievements against the project’s objectives and expected outcomes;
* To identify strengths and weaknesses in design and implementation;
* To assess the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the project in terms of achieved outputs and results and its contribution to Country Program Document (CPD) outcome;
* To identify lessons learned and good practices;
* To provide recommendations for future phase of the project.

The scope of work for consultancy will include, but may not be limited to:

* Complete a desk review of all project-related documents including the project document, budgetary documents, reports, and internal evaluations;
* Elaborate an evaluation matrix using evaluation criteria/questions provided below as a basis to develop the evaluation questions (and, where needed, sub-questions), the data sources required to answer the questions, the data collection and data analysis methods;
* Conduct meetings/interviews with current team members, along with the counterparts at the Government of Georgia, donors and key partners, and the UNDP Country Office;
* Facilitate a workshop with PAR project team and key partners on project outcomes and outputs, conducted activities, and the likelihood of achieving an impact;
* Collect quantitative data, including retrieving public information from government agencies (if needed), necessary for the evaluation;
* Analyse data in accordance with the evaluation objectives per component, and in a broader context: against the project's objectives and project’s impact;
* Analyse the project’s contribution to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – Goal 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions;
* Assess and – as relevant - Incorporate the findings of Evaluation of Civic Innovation and Research Grants including Grants in response to Covid-19, commissioned separately within the PAR project into the final evaluation of the project;

Assess the project strategy for knowledge transfer, identify encountered risks and ’lessons learned’; assess the potential for continuation or up scaling of UNDP’s work in respective area and develop recommendations incorporating project experience for future programming likely to lead to improvements, adjustments to the implementation approach, and alternatives as required in the context of future phase of the project;

* Prepare a draft evaluation report providing descriptive overviews, laying out the evidence, analysing project’s contribution based on evaluation criteria and SDGs, providing conclusions and recommendations;
* Finalize the evaluation report based on solicited feedback from UNDP team and the key project stakeholders;
* Present the document to the national partners, project donors and the other key stakeholders, as needed through a dissemination workshop.

**3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The incumbent will be tasked to conduct the evaluation as per UNDP Evaluation Policy[[45]](#footnote-46), as well as OECD/DAC criteria and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of PAR efforts in all three pillars of the project. Evaluation should consider using participatory approach and use HR and GE lenses during data collection, data analysis and evaluation process. The following are guiding questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria to be used as a basis and further elaborated by the consultant in the evaluation inception phase.

**Relevance:**

* To what extent did project interventions address the needs of the targeted group/partner organizations?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to Covid-19 health crisis and the respective changes amid pandemic?

**Effectiveness and Results:**

* To what extent were the project’s intermediary outcomes achieved?
* What progress been made towards achievement of project outcomes? What has been the projects’ contribution to the observed change?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
* To what extent has the PAR Project partnership strategy been appropriate and effective including during the times of the health crisis of Covid-19?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? How these achievements can be used for future project designing and programming?
* In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome? Did the project identify these constraints/ failures early and stop activities?
* What, if any, alternative strategies could have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives or should be considered in the potential next phase of the project?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How much capability has been built and which areas can government now lead on independently?
* To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* What are the strengths and weaknesses in terms of project management, implementation and monitoring?
* Did the project have nay unintended consequences? If yes what were they?

**Efficiency:**

* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?
* To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Impact:**

* What impact did the PAR Project have on ongoing Public Administration Reform?
* What impact did the PAR Project have on the policy development and coordination; Performance of Civil Service and Service delivery?
* What Impact did the PAR Project have on Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) capacity building and engagement in PAR? Did government use the research, evidence and innovations carried out by civil society?
* What is the forecasted impact of the PAR Project on policy planning, advancing civil service reform and improving public service delivery?

**Sustainability:**

* Examine the political, organizational, human resource, and financial sustainability of PAR sub-projects/consultancies. What threats exist to sustainability, and how has the risk of these threats been mitigated/anticipated?
* Which of the PAR strategies/policy frameworks developed and supported through this programme are actively used? If not, why not?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* To what extent PAR Project has taken the necessary steps to transfer capacities and skills to its key partners? To what extent are these results long-lasting? How could transfer be strengthened?
* How, and to what extent did PAR Project’s design, implementation strategy/partnership foster ownership and capacity development? How could this be strengthened?

**Coordination:**

* To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies/UNDP, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?

**Gender and Inclusion:**

* To what extent and how has the project contributed to gender equality and the empowerment of women, and social inclusion/human rights been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? What are potential opportunities to strengthen contribution to gender equality in future?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women, and social inclusion? Were there any unintended effects?

**4. Methodology**

The consultant will work together with the project team in the preparation of a methodology to answer the key research questions outlined above, as well as any other pertinent questions that may arise to adequately assess the final picture. The incumbent must take into account [UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (2019)](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/) and relevant programmatic documents, which will be supplied to the consultant at the beginning of the assignment. As a result of this exercise the consultant will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as part of the evaluation inception report. The final methodology should be approved by UNDP.

Given the specific nature of the Public Administration Reform and the project targeting the given area, where results take longer to materialize, the consultant should adopt an integrated mixed-method approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to capture both the tangible and the unquantifiable impacts of the PAR Project and generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. The methodology should be robust enough to ensure high quality, triangulation of data sources, and verifiability of information. It is expected that the evaluation methodology will comprise of the following elements:

1. Secondary research:
   1. Document Review of all relevant project documentation: Project Document, Results Frameworks, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, Theory of Change, Annual/Semi-Annual/Quarterly Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project and other relevant knowledge products;
   2. Collect quantitative data, including retrieving public information from government agencies (if needed), necessary for the evaluation.
2. Primary research – aimed at forming new knowledge by collecting information through:
   1. Key informant interviews (KIIs), semi-structured interviews, stakeholder consultations and other participatory methods;
   2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and workshops with different Government and non‐government institutions, donors and external stakeholders;

Other quantitative data collection methods as required. Considering all the safety measures enforced by the Government of Georgia to stop the spread of the Covid-19 virus, most of the activities envisaged by the external evaluation methodology might have to be conducted remotely. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country by the time of the data collection, workshops and meetings are planned, the international consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conducts the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the UNDP’s commissioning unit (Governance Team Leader and M&E specialist).

**5. Deliverables**

* **Inception report** including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan, schedule of data collection, study instruments, report outline, etc.;
* **A draft of an evaluation report** with the following key chapters, but not limited to:

1. Executive Summary (brief description of the project, context and purpose of the evaluation, main conclusions, lessons learnt, recommendations for future programming, etc);
2. Introduction (purpose of the evaluation, key issues addressed, methodology of the evaluation, structure of the evaluation, etc);
3. The project and its implementation context (project start and its duration, problems/challenges’, the immediate and development objectives of the project, main stakeholders, results achieved, etc.);
4. Evaluation findings (assessment of project outcomes per evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness and results, efficiency, impact, sustainability), assessment of coordination and analysis through HR and GE lens, relevance and contribution to SDGs, etc.);
5. Recommendations and Lessons Learned (overview of project encountered risks and ’lessons learned’, recommendations incorporating project experience for future programming)

* **Final Evaluation Report** taking into account the initial comments from UNDP team and/or key partners as applicable.
* **Presentation** of the evaluation results on the dissemination workshop for the national partners, project donors and the other key stakeholders[[46]](#footnote-47).

*In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.*

*Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete due to circumstances beyond his/her control.*

**6. Required competencies**

Required Qualifications and competencies for International Consultant envisage the following:

**Education:**

* At least Master’s degree in Public Administration, Public Policy, Political Science, Management or related Social Science fields (minimum requirement).

**Experience**

* At least 10 years of professional experience in Projects’ Monitoring and Evaluation, preferably in governance (minimum requirement);
* Advanced knowledge of the public administration reform framework (minimum requirement);
* At least 15 projects on conducting baseline, mid-term and final evaluations, out of which at least 3 are in international setting (minimum requirement);
* Solid understanding of contemporary thinking related to development practices and public administration reform programmes, notably in the given region;
* Familiarity with the region (particularly Georgia), its overall governance features, development needs, and directions;
* Hands-on knowledge of evaluation methodologies and data collection methods;
* Hands-on knowledge on online collaboration platforms to be used for remote workshops and interviews and online data collection methods;
* Experience with the UN organization is an asset.

**Language:**

* Excellent command of written and spoken English.

**Corporate competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Understanding of the mandate and the role of UNDP would be an asset;
* Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

**Functional competencies:**

* Strong communication and analytical skills;
* Demonstrated skills in drafting reports;
* Ability to work under pressure with several tasks and various deadlines;
* Actively generates creative, practical approaches and solutions to overcome challenging situations;
* Excellent writing, presentation/public speaking skills;
* A pro-active approach to problem-solving;
* Computer literacy.

**Leadership and Self-Management skills:**

* Builds strong relationships with the working group and with the project partners; focuses on impact and results for the project partners and responds positively to feedback;
* Cooperates with the working group effectively and demonstrates strong conflict resolution skills;
* Consistently approaches work with energy, positivity and a constructive attitude;
* Demonstrates strong influencing and facilitation skills;
* Remains calm, in control and good humored under pressure;
* Demonstrates openness to change, new ideas, and ability to manage ambiguity;
* Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
* Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge and competencies;
* Is able to work independently and manage competing priorities.

**Conflict of interest:**

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

**7. Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on the data. The Consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**8. Implementation arrangements**

The International Consultant will work under the overall oversight of UNDP’s commissioning unit (Governance Team Leader and M&E specialist). PAR Project Manager will provide necessary information for the evaluation and will be the primary point of contact for the evaluator. The PAR project team will be responsible to share relevant documents, contact details and other necessary information with the evaluator.

The Consultant will report to the Governance Team Leader. UNDP M&E specialist will be assigned to oversee and support the overall evaluation process. The CO Senior Management will take responsibility for the approval of the evaluation report.

During the final evaluation, the evaluator is expected to interact with/interview the implementing partners of the “Supporting Public Administration Reform” project, including: Policy Planning and Coordination Department of Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG), Civil Service Bureau (CSB); Ministry of Justice – LEPL Public Service Development Agency (PSDA), LEPL Digital Governance Agency (DGA) and other line ministries, public agencies, donor agencies, consultants, civil society organizations and all other relevant stakeholders whose list and contact details will be provided to the International Consultant by the commencement of the contract.

In case the evaluation is conducted remotely or partially remotely, the PAR Project team will assist the international consultant with the planning of the online activities and workshops and ensure the stakeholder engagement.

**9. Timeframe for the evaluation process**

The consultancy is expected to be carried out in 40 working days over a period of 4 months from December - March 2021. The timeline for submission of specific deliverables is the following:

| **Deliverables** | **Duration (working days)** | **Due dates** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1/ Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan (suggested content in Annex 1) | 7 working days | Within 2 weeks upon signing the contract |
| 2/ Draft Evaluation Report prepared and accepted (suggested template in Annex 2) | 30 working days | Within 2,5 months upon submission of Inception report |
| 3/ Final Evaluation report and presentation for the dissemination workshops | 3 working days | Within 2 weeks after receiving the comments from UNDP. |

The timeline of the activities will be detailed in the inception report including flexibility and delays in the timeframe for the evaluation, with additional time for implementing evaluation virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19.

**10. Payment modality:**

The payment will be made through four instalments upon satisfactory submission and approval of the deliverables:

1. Deliverable 1– 30% of the of the consultancy;
2. Deliverable 2 – 30% of the of the consultancy;
3. Deliverable 3 – 40% of the of the consultancy.

**Annex 1**

**Inception report**

**(Suggested content)**

1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. Evaluation objective, purpose and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. Evaluation criteria and questions. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. Evaluability analysis. Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. Cross-cutting issues. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. Evaluation matrix. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites or scheduling online meetings, interviews and workshops amid COVID-19 restrictions.
10. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019) and ensuring quality and usability. The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in Annex 3.

**Annex 2**

**Evaluation Report Template**

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:

* Name of the evaluation intervention.
* Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
* Countries of the evaluation intervention.
* Names and organizations of evaluators.
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
* Acknowledgements.

1. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluationreports on second page (as one page):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project/outcome Information** | | |
| **Project/outcome title** |  | |
| **Atlas ID** |  | |
| **Corporate outcome and output** |  | |
| **Country** |  | |
| **Region** |  | |
| **Date project document signed** |  | |
| **Project dates** | Start | Planned end |
|  |  |
| **Project budget** |  | |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** |  | |
| **Funding source** |  | |
| **Implementing party[[47]](#footnote-48)** |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Information** | | |
| **Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)** |  |  |
| **Final/midterm review/other** |  |  |
| **Period under evaluation** | Start | End |
|  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
| **Evaluator email address** |  |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | Start | Completion |
|  |  |

1. **Table of contents,** including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**
3. **Executive summary (four-page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages thatshould:

* Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
* Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
* Include the evaluators’ quality standards and assurance ratings.

1. **Introduction**

* Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
* Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
* Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

1. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logicand assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:

* Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
* Explain the **expected results model or results framework**, **implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
* Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other **programme or country-specific** **plans and goals.**
* Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant** **changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, andexplain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
* Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
* Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
* Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
* Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
* Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
* Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation** **constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

1. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of theevaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

* **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, forexample, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
* **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluationusers will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
* **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performancestandards used.[[48]](#footnote-49) The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
* **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. Thereport should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

1. **Evaluation approach and methods.[[49]](#footnote-50)** The evaluation report should describe in detail theselected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders’ groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

* **Evaluation approach.**
* **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) aswell as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
* **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size andcharacteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
* **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collectdata, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
* **Performance standards:[[50]](#footnote-51)** the standard or measure that will be used to evaluateperformance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
* **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of bothmen and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
* **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentialityof informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).[[51]](#footnote-52)
* **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, thebackground and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
* **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed asto their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

1. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collectedto answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
2. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.
3. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknessesand outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
4. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasiblerecommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women’s empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.
5. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should includediscussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.
6. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report userwith supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

* TOR for the evaluation.
* Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
* List of supporting documents reviewed.
* Project or programme results model or results framework.
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
* Code of conduct signed by evaluators.

**Annex 3**

**Evaluation Report Quality Assessment Requirements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are the evaluation report’s objectives, criteria, methodology and data sources fully described and are they appropriate given the subject being evaluated and the reasons for carrying out the evaluation?** | |
| **2.1** | **Is the evaluation report well-balanced and structured?**   * With sufficient but not excessive background information? * Is the report a reasonable length? * Are required annexes provided? |
| **2.2** | **Does the evaluation report clearly address the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR?** |
| **METHODOLOGY** | |
| **2.3** | **Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined?**  - Any changes from the proposed approach are detailed with reasons why |
| **2.4** | **Are the nature and extent of the role and involvement of stakeholders in the project/programme explained adequately?** |
| **2.5** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of relevance?** |
| **2.6** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of effectiveness?** |
| **2.7** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of efficiency?** |
| **2.8** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of sustainability?** |
| **DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **2.9** | **Are data-collection methods and analysis clearly outlined?**   * Data sources clearly outlined (including triangulation methods)? * Data analysis approaches detailed?   Data-collection methods and tools explained? |
| **2.10** | **Is the data-collection approach and analysis adequate for the scope of the evaluation?**   * Comprehensive set of data sources (especially for triangulation) where appropriate? * Comprehensive set of quantitative and qualitative surveys, and analysis approaches where appropriate? * Clear presentation of data analysis and citation within the report? * Documented meetings and surveys with stakeholders and beneficiary groups, where appropriate? |
| **2.11** | **Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained?**   * Issues with access to data or verification of data sources? * Issues in availability of interviewees? * Outline how these constraints were addressed |
| **REPORT CONTENT** | |
| **2.12** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme strategy and/or UNDAF?** |
| **2.13** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to related national government strategies and plans in the sector/area of support?**  - Does the evaluation discuss how capacity development or the strengthening of national  capacities can be addressed? |
| **2.14** | **Does the evaluation detail project funding and provide funding data (especially for GEF)?**   * Variances between planned and actual expenditures assessed and explained?   Observations from financial audits completed for the project considered? |
| **2.15** | **Does the evaluation include an assessment of the project’s M&E design, implementation and overall quality?** |
| **2.16** | **Does the evaluation identify ways in which the programme/project has produced a catalytic role and has demonstrated: (a) the production of a public good; (b) demonstration; (c)**  **replication; and/or (d) scaling up (GEF evaluations)?** |
| **2.17** | **Are indicators in the results framework assessed individually, with final achievements noted?** |
| **Does the evaluation report address gender and other key cross-cutting issues?** | |
| **3.1** | **Are human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable group issues addressed where relevant?** |
| **3.2** | **Does the report discuss the poverty/environment nexus or sustainable livelihood issues, as relevant?** |
| **3.3** | **Does the report discuss disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant?** |
| **3.4** | **Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues as relevant?** |
| **3.5** | **Are the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women integrated in the evaluation’s scope and indicators as relevant?** |
| **3.6** | **Do the evaluation's criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how gender equality and the empowerment of women have been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention and the results achieved, as relevant?** |
| **3.7** | **Are a gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques selected?** |
| **3.8** | **Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations take aspects of gender equality and the empowerment of women into consideration?** |
| **3.9** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to the Sustainable Development Goals and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated?** |
| **3.10** | **Does the terminal evaluation adequately address social and environmental safeguards, as relevant? (GEF evaluations)** |
| **Does the report clearly and concisely outline and support its findings, conclusions and recommendations?** | |
| **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS** | |
| **4.1** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of findings?** |
| **4.2** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of conclusions?** |
| **4.3** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned?** |
| **4.4** | **Do the findings and conclusions relate directly to the objectives of the project/programme?**  - Are the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR? |
| **4.5** | **Are the findings and conclusions supported with data and interview sources?**  - Are constraints in access to data and interview sources detailed? |
| **4.6** | **Do the conclusions build on the findings of the evaluation?**  - Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and present a balanced picture of the strengths and limitations of the evaluation’s focus? |
| **4.7** | **Are risks discussed in the evaluation report?** |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS** | |
| **4.8** | **Are the recommendations clear, concise, realistic and actionable?**   * A number of recommendations are reasonable given the size and scope of the project/ programme   Recommendations link directly to findings and conclusions |
| **4.9** | **Are recommendations linked to country programme outcomes and strategies and actionable by the country office?**   * Is guidance given for implementation of the recommendations?   Do recommendations identify implementing roles (UNDP, government, programme, stakeholder, other)? |

## 

**Annex 4**

**Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

# Annex B: List of Supporting Documents Reviewed

Annual Report 2017, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

Annual Report 2018, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

Annual Report 2019, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

Contribution Agreement Amendment Letter, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, January 2020, UNDP and other project extension documents

Current Study of Public Administration Reform, Mid-Term Study Report, ACT, 2019

Decree on “Approving the Rule for Determining Professional Development Needs of Public Servants, Standard and Rule for Professional Development,” Government of Georgia, 22 May 2018

Evaluation of Civic Initiative and Research Grants in the Framework of, “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia Project, Nodar Kherkheulidze and Dea Tsartsidze, January 2019

Evaluation of Civic Initiative and Research Grants in the Framework of “Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR) in Georgia” Project, Nodar Kherkheulidze and Dea Tsartsidze, UNDP, January 2020

Implementation Context Analysis, Public Administration Reform in Georgia, 2017, UNDP Project Office, December 2017

Implementation Context Analysis, Public Administration Reform in Georgia, 2018, UNDP Project Office, December 2018

Joint Staff Working Document: Association Implementation Report on Georgia, European Commission, Brussels, 5 February 2021

Law of Georgia on Public Service, 27 October 2015

Mapping of the Donor and Implementer Activities in PAR, UNDP Project Office

Mid-Term Evaluation, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, Elinor Bajraktari and Giorgi Gabrieleshvili, July 2019

PAR Project Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs, UNDP Project Office, 29 January 2021

Policy Planning in Georgia Survey Results, Support to Public Administration Reform in Georgia, European Union/Sofreco, Tbilisi, June 2020

Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook, Administration of the Government of Georgia with the assistance of UNDP and UK aid from the UK Government, March 2020

Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook, Annexes, Administration of the Government of Georgia with the assistance of UNDP and UK aid from the UK Government, March 2020

Political Economy Analysis, Public Administration Reform in Georgia, 2016, UNDP Project Office

Progress Report, Supporting Public Administration in Georgia, Inception Phase of the Project, UNDP Project Office, 9 December 2016

Project Document, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP, 2016

Semi-Annual Report January-June 2018, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

Semi-Annual Report January-June 2019, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

Semi-Annual Report January-June 2020, Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia, UNDP Project Office

SIGMA Opinion on Implementation of its Recommendations Set Out in the Baseline Measurement of Georgia against Principle of Public Administration in the area of Policy Development and Coordination, 2019, SIGMA (a joint initiative of the OECD and the EU)

SIGMA The Principles of Public Administration, Policy Development and Co-ordination, Georgia Baseline Measurement Report, May 2018

Various Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks and budget reports, UNDP Project Office

# Annex C: List of Those Interviewed

Abashmadze, Natalia Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operations Officer, Public Service Hall

Aghapishvili, Irina Head, Analytical Department, Civil Service Bureau

Baratashvili, Natalia Capacity Development Coordinator, PAR Project

Beselia, Gvantsa Head, Human Resource Management Department, Civil Service Bureau

Bobghiashvili, Giorgi Head, Policy Planning Unit, Department of Policy Planning and Coordination, Administration of the Government of Georgia

Bregadze, Gigi Team Leader, Democratic Governance, UNDP

Burduli, Etuna Specialist, Strategic Projects and Reforms Department, Public Service Development Agency, Ministry of Justice

Chanukvadze, Khatuna Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, UNDP

Chernyshova, Anna Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP

Devdariani, Jaba Part-Time Policy and Planning Advisor, PAR Project

Dolidze, Nino Professor, Ilia State University

Dvalishvili, Maia Deputy Head, Civil Service Bureau

Ejibia, Inesa Administration, Finance and Procurement Associate, PAR Project

Evans, George Georgia Country Programme Manager, Good Governance Fund, Government of the United Kingdom

Gabrielashvili, Giorgi Director, IRC

Gagnidze, Nika Deputy Chairman, Digital Governance Agency

Ghonghadze, Nino Public Policy Specialist, PAR Project

Gomelauri, Katie PAR Project Team Lead/Behavioral Expert, IRC

Japaridze, Natia Deputy Head, International Affairs Department, Ministry of Internal Affairs

Kardava, Catherine Head, Civil Service Bureau

Khvedeliani, Tata Manager, Unified Service Center, Ministry of Internal Affairs

Kobakhidze, Mariam Junior Capacity Development Consultant, PAR Project

Macharashvili, Nana Professor, School of Governance, Georgian Institute of Public Affairs

Mejlumiani, Giorgi Chairman, Digital Governance Agency

Mrulishvili, Eka Acting Director, Strategic Projects and Reforms Department, Public Service Development Agency, Ministry of Justice

Omanadze, Sopho Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, PAR Project

Panteleeva, Lina Project Management Specialist, U.S. Agency for International Development

Pipia, Zviad Marketing and Service Development Department Adviser, Public Service Hall

Samadashvili, Levan Chief of Party, U.S.AID Good Governance Initiative, TetraTech ARD

Shengelia, Tamar NEQE

Simongulashvili, George GEC, Director

Trapaidze, Tamar Projects Manager, Good Governance Fund, Georgia, United Kingdome Embassy

Tsanava, Keti Head, Public Administration Unit, Department of Policy Planning and Coordination, Administration of the Government of Georgia

Tsiklauri, Nana Project Manager, PAR Project

Van Den Muijzenberg, Marc Policy Expert, European Union PAR Technical Assistance Project

Vinton, Louisa Resident Representative, UNDP Georgia

Whyte, Kate Senior Governance Adviser, Head of the Adviser Hub, Good Governance Fund, Government of the United Kingdom

Wichmann, Ellen Head, Good Governance Fund, Georgia, United Kingdom Embassy

# Annex D: List of Project Personnel and Main Contractors

1. **Project Personnel**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Start Date** | **End Date** |
| Nana Tsiklauri | PAR Project Manager | September 2017 | March 2021 |
| Jaba Devdariani | Part- time Policy and Planning Advisor | July 2016 | March 2021 |
| Natalia Baratashvili | Capacity Development Coordinator | November 2016 | March 2021 |
| Nino Ghonghadze | Public Policy Specialist | November 2016 | March 2021 |
| Maia Giorbelidze | M&E Specialist | July 2016 | February 2020 |
| Sopho Omanadze | M&E Specialist | January 2020 | March 2021 |
| Mariam Kobakhidze | Junior Capacity Development Consultant | March 2019 | March 2021 |
| Inesa Ejibia | Admin/Finance/Procurement Associate | March 2018 | March 2021 |

1. **Main Contracting Companies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contractor** | **Details** |
| 1. Center for Effective Dispute Resolution | International |
| 2. Public Administration International | International – contract twice in consortium with GEC JCS identified below |
| 3. ACT Ltd. | Local – contracted to conduct the PAR Baseline Review in 2016 and PAR Mid-Term Review Survey in 2019 |
| 4. Behavioral Insights U.S. Ltd. | International |
| 5. Betterfly Ltd. | Local – contracted twice |
| 6. GEC JSC (GEC Coorps) | Local – contracted through competitive procedures several times and implemented 5 contracts |

**C. Main individual Contractors**

**Outcome 1 – Policy Planning and Coordination**

1. David Johnson – International Expert in public policy, monitoring and evaluation
2. Nani Macharashvili -Local Expert/trainer in Policy Analysis
3. Nodar Tangiashvili - Local Expert/trainer in Policy Analysis
4. Irakli Mizandari – Local Expert in Policy Planning
5. Giorgi Gabrielashvili – Local PAR Expert

**Outcome 2 – Civil Service Reform**

1. Ia Tsulaia – Local Expert in Performance Appraisal
2. Nino Okhanashvili - Local Expert in Performance Appraisal
3. Marina Kuchukhidze - Local Expert in Performance Appraisal
4. Tamar Simongulashvili - Local Expert in Performance Appraisal
5. Natia Zedginidze – Local Expert in Strategic Planning
6. Maia Khositashvili – Local Expert (Civil Servants Curricula Development and Communication in Civil Service)
7. Baria Ahmed – International Expert in Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms
8. Hans Rieger – International Expert on Unified e-Learning Platform for Civil Servants
9. Giorgi Urchukhishvili – Local Expert/Researcher on ADR and Professional Development

**Outcome 3 – Public Service Delivery**

1. Giorgi Vashakidze – International Expert in Public Service Delivery and Common Assessment Framework (CAF)
2. Giorgi Simongulashvili – Local Expert in costing methodologies for services
3. Christin Chastain – International Expert in Service Design Methodologies
4. Irakli Gvenetadze – Local Expert in Service Delivery Models
5. Khatuna Nachkhebia – Local Expert in Citizen Satisfaction Surveys

# Annex E: Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs

*The following table presents the project’s status as of 25 February 2021.*

*KEY:*

***Not Available (N/A)*** *– The data has not been measured yet / analysis to support the indicator has not been performed yet*

***Underachieved*** *– The future activities are not targeting this activity and the target is not likely to be achieved*

***Partially Achieved*** *- The future activities are targeting this activity and it is likely to be achieved / The target is likely to be achieved but falls outside the project timeline*

***Achieved*** – *The target is fully achieved*

**Outcome 1**

***Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation***

| *#* | *Outcome Indicator* | *Baseline* | *Target* | *Progress to date* | *Status* | *Issues and Next Steps* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Share of Government Strategies drafted in line with new policy standards | *0* | 80% of drafted Government strategies are in line with new policy standards | *53,3%* | *Partially Achieved | GoG has approved 8 policy documents out of submitted 15. Source: PAR 2019-2020 Action Plan Progress Report January-June 2020.* | *The government decree # 2275 (dated November 19 2020) of Administration of Government of Georgia (AoG) lists the policy documents that were planned to be reviewed in 2020 against UNDP supported new Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook for national, sectoral and institutional policy documents (approved by the Government Decree #629 on December 20 2019). Due to spread of COVID-19 some activities envisaged in the policy document development cycle were delayed and respectively the review of the documents by AoG was postponed to 2021. The list to be approved as per decree contains 15 strategic, 2 concept documents and 6 action plans. Out of 15 strategic documents subject to AoG screening against new methodological guidelines, three strategic documents are being drafted with the project support - PAR Strategy 2021-2026 and its Action Plan, e-Governance Strategy 2021-2025 and its Action Plan, Maritime Transport Strategy 2021-2025, and its Action Plan. Presumably, the target will be reached – as the current practice shows, the process of developing national strategies involves consultation of strategy developers – mostly ministries – with the Administration of the Government Georgia. The consultations give the strategy creators a possibility to closely follow the new standards.* |
|  | Degree of institutionalized coordination between government institutions | *0* | All line ministries and their subordinate agencies are part of e-platform | *0* | *Partially Achieved | The M&E e-system (e-platform) of public policy documents is under the development. All ministries, their subordinated agencies and coordination structures (such as secretariats responsible for coordinating certain strategies) are already integrated into the platform (envisaged in the concept based on which the e-system is being developed).* | *The development process of M&E platform includes two critical phases: the first one is building the overall architecture of the platform and creation of parts/services for policy planning and monitoring stages. The second phase will include the integration of additional non-key services and creation of parts for policy evaluation stage. 1st phase of the government-wide M&E e-System will be completed by March 2021.* |
|  | Rate of satisfaction by CSO participation in policy processes | *0* | 60% of surveyed CSOs representatives satisfied by participation in policy processes | *0%* | *N/A | Data will be available March 2021.* | *Ongoing study “Assessing Public Participation in Policy Making Process” (through a low value grant supported by the project), to be finished by March 2021, will demonstrate achievements in this regard.* |
|  | Share of civil servants supporting ongoing PAR through the development of PAR communication strategy and action plan | *92%* | 85% of civil servants support ongoing PAR | *79%* | *N/A |Data will be available March 2021.* | *The indicator was measured as a part of the larger study commissioned by the local research and consultancy company in 2019. The indicator will be measured in March 2021 using the same questionnaire and closely following the methodology of the study.* |
|  | Number of PAR Council meetings reviewing the new PAR Strategy and Action plan for 2021-2024 | *0* | New PAR Strategy and Action plan for 2021-2024 reviewed and approved via 1 PAR council meeting | *0* | *N/A |Data will be available March 2021.* | *COVID-19 associated disruptions combined with the political hustle caused by elections, which in turn protracted formation of the Cabinet, delayed the process of drafting of the strategy as well as PAR Council meetings. The PAR council meetings are planned in February and March 2021 for the mid-term verification of the strategy priorities, logical framework as well as approval of the new PAR strategy and action plan.* |

**Outputs for Outcome 1**

| *#* | *Output* | *#* | *Output Indicator* | *Baseline* | *Target* | *Progress to date* | *Status* | *Issues and Next Steps* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Policy planning unit staff from line ministries trained in line with new policy standards | *1.1.2* | Share of Policy Planning Unit staff from central and Adjara AR trained on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation standards | 0 | 90% of female and male civil servants from Policy Planning Units trained on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation from all line ministries | 94% | *Achieved | 94% of female and male civil servants from Policy Planning Units trained on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation from all line ministries.* | *Following the onset of the social distancing and quarantine measures linked to the C-19 pandemic, one third of the 3rd cohort training was delivered on-line. The primary focus was to retain the quality of the training: deliver the best experience to the training participants, while enabling the trainers and the participants to focus on the process rather being distracted by technology. The online sessions were trainings were observed and evaluated at the end of the session to identify the shortcomings and address them accordingly. The overall assessment of the participants over the online training experience was positive.*  *To ensure sustainability of the training program, together with AoG next phase of the project plans to digitalize the training and integrate it on the unified e-learning platform. The training became mandatory for policy unit staff as per official agreement between AoG and CSB according to which all policy unit staff need to undergo trainings at least every three years while the new staff will have to complete upon entering civil service.* |
| *1.1.3* | Share of female and male policy planning unit staff demonstrating increased knowledge of the unified standards | 0 | 80% of female and male civil servants attending the trainings demonstrating 10% of increased knowledge | 87% | *Achieved | 87% of female and male civil servants attending the trainings demonstrated increase in knowledge.* | *The increased knowledge of the civil servants is likely to contribute to higher quality of the policy documents in the future.* |
|  | Government strategic documents drafted through coaching of individual ministries in line with new policy standards | *1.2.1* | Number of government strategic documents drafted via coaching | 0 | One Government strategic document is drafted via coaching in each of the 3 target ministries | *N/A |Data will be available March 2021.* | *Partially Achieved | Three strategic documents are being drafted in line with the new policy standards - PAR Strategy 2021-2026 and its Action Plan, e-Governance Strategy 2021-2025 and its Action Plan, Maritime Transport Strategy 2021-2025 and its Action Plan.* | *All three documents are included in the list of the policy documents to be approved by AoG in compliance with the new policy standards in 2021. Project consultants are actively engaged in the AoG screening process and the target is likely to be fully achieved by March 2021.* |
| *1.2.2* | Quality of government strategic documents drafted via coaching | 0 | AoG's Positive feedback on all 3 strategic documents drafted by all 3 target ministries | *N/A |Data will be available March 2021.* | *Partially Achieved | Due to COVID-19 disruptions, all three strategies are still in development phase and will be finalized and submitted for review to the AoG in early 2021.* | *As creators of all three agencies have close consultations with the AoG, it is expected that they will be positively assessed once submitted for review.* |
|  | Unified electronic system for Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation is operational and meeting its objectives | *1.3.1* | Number of Government strategic documents produced using new system | 0 | One Government strategic document drafted in the system | *Partially Achieved* | *1st phase of the government-wide M&E e-System is scheduled to be completed by March 2021. The second phase will be finalized by August 2021 and thus, all three critical stages of public policy-making process – planning, monitoring and evaluation will be integrated into the system. Thus, the Government will be able to draft a strategic document via the system by September 2021.* | *The project supported Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) to develop and finalize the concept of the M&E e-system together with the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) and through active participation of the line ministries. The project has been facilitating the collaboration on M&E system development between AoG and DGA from the initial phases; in order to ensure the collaboration continues with the same efforts from both parties once PAR project (phase I) is completed in March 2021, project initiated the process of signing an MoU between the AoG and DGA. The idea was welcomed from both stakeholders. The MoU will incorporate the responsibilities on the e-system development process after March 2021 once the first phase of the PAR project is completed.* |
| *1.3.2* | Number of men and women from the respective ministries and LEPLs trained | 0 | 20 men and women designated from the respective ministries and LEPLs trained in usage of the system | *N/A* | *Partially Achieved | 1st phase of the government-wide M&E e-System is scheduled to be completed by March 2021. The trainings will be feasible to conducted after the first phase of the system is completed.* | *Training of public servants in usage of the system is planned once the 1st stage is completed, in April and May 2021 falling outside of the timeframe of the current phase of the PAR project. AoG has already committed to conduct the trainings once the first phase of the system is completed and this has been articulated in PAR Strategic documents.* |
|  | New training module on policy planning, monitoring and evaluation incorporates inclusive public participation elements | *1.4.2* | Rate of female and male participants reporting usage of inclusive public participation elements | 0 | 60% of participants demonstrate the understanding of inclusive public participation elements | *Achieved |75%* | *75% of participants demonstrated the understanding of inclusive public participation elements via providing correct answers to 2 public participation questions included in the final exam of the training.* | *The project supported an independent CSO study on compliance with public participation component in policy making as part of which the researchers have developed an index for measuring the public participation element in the policy making process that can serve as an effective tool to measure public engagement in the future.* |
|  | AoG has tools to improve the communication on PAR both internally and externally | *1.5.1* | PAR communication strategy and action plan drafted | 0 | PAR communication strategy and action plan drafted and approved | *Partially Achieved | PAR communication strategy and action plan drafted* | *PAR communication strategy and action plan were shared with the PAR Council and will be officially adopted on the next PAR Council’s session (March 2021).* | *The PAR Communication Strategy and its Tactical Plan were finalized in October 2020. The piloting of the Strategy and Tactical Plan across at least two pillars (public policy and service delivery) is foreseen as part of the next UNDP PAR Project.* |
|  | AoG is able to launch and steer the implementation of the PAR beyond 2020 | *1.6.1* | New PAR Strategy and Action plan for 2021-2024 is compliant with new policy guidelines and is based on PAR Roadmap 2020 review | 0 | PAR Strategy and action plan for 2021-2024 drafted and approved by GoG | *Partially Achieved | PAR Strategy and action plan for is being developed* | *New PAR Strategy and its Action Plan is being drafted in collaboration with AoG and UN Women. The team of consultants has conducted multiple focus groups and workshops with academia, CSOs and public entities for the purposes of drafting situational analysis and problem tree of the document, further workshops are expected to take place in January/February 2021 to prioritize the problems, develop Logical Framework with the respective indicators, monitoring and evaluation plan and action plan. The document is expected to be finalized in March 2021.* | *PAR Roadmap 2020 expired in December 2020 and AoG, the main administrative body overseeing and coordinating the reform initiated the process of developing the new PAR Strategy. New PAR Strategy for 2021-2024 and associated Action Plan will be developed in line with new policy standards and a strong focus on GESI elements with the project support ensuring the high quality of the document.*  *Moreover, in December 2020, the Government officially submitted the Program for years 2021-2024. Chapter 4 of this program, titled “Public Administration” stipulates, “Professional, conscientious, functional public administration system will form the basis for effective implementation of the government… Continued reform of Public Administration and enhancing cooperation with international partners in this area remains a priority for this Government.” Further, the chapter outlines the priorities of policy planning and coordination, continued reform of civil service, promotion of transparency and accountability, de-concentration and decentralization, development of service delivery and e-governance, and enhancement of cyber-security as key priority areas. The program states, that these priorities will be further expanded upon in the new Public Administration Reform Strategy 2021-2024. All of these priorities and their wording reflect the elements developed in collaboration with UNDP PAR project during the first phase of implementation, while some elements, especially in policy planning and coordination, as well as service delivery can be considered as directly impacted by the UNDP PAR project.* |

**Outcome 2**

***Performance of Civil Service is more professional and effective***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *#* | *Outcome Indicator* | *Baseline* | *Target* | *Progress to date* | *Status* | *Issues and Next Steps* |
| 2.1 | Share of female and male civil servants whose individual performance plans are in line with organizational strategic goals/objectives | 0 | 80% of female and male civil servants of target Ministries’ individual performance plans are in line with organization strategic goals/objectives | 0 | *Partially Achieved | Data will be available March 2021.* | *Due to COVID-19-related emergency the consultancy support at the three target ministries has been delayed. However, by January 2021, the local experts provided significant assistance in enhancing performance appraisal models and related documents/forms. Individual performance plans have been already revised in the Ministry of Environment and Agriculture and aligned with departmental goals. Similar work is underway in the Ministry of IDPs, Health, Labor, and Social Affairs. Additionally, the same work is ongoing at the AoG with the project support.* |
| 2.2 | Share of female and male civil servants satisfied with individual performance plans | 0 | 70 % of targeted female and male civil servants satisfied | 0 | *N/A | Data will be available March 2021.* | *The analysis will be conducted by end of February 2021.* |
| 2.3 | Quality of drafted individual performance plans | 0 | 90% of the individual plans meet quality standards developed by an expert | 0 | *N/A | Data will be available March 2021.* | *The analysis will be conducted by end of February 2021.* |
| 2.4 | Share of female and male civil servants, who support project-relevant changes brought by civil service reform | *0* | 70% of female and male civil servants in all line ministries, support the civil service reform | *76%* | *Achieved | New data will be available March 2021* | *The vast majority of respondents (96%) appear to be aware of key civil service reform issues such as the new Law on Civil Service, and most of them believe that the changes brought about by the law are definitely (or more or less) positive (76%). Source: Public attitudes towards Public Administration Reform, ACT, 2019*  *The indicator was measured as a part of the larger study commissioned by the local research and consultancy company in 2019. The indicator will be measured in February 2021 using the same questionnaire and closely following the methodology of the study.* |

**Outputs for Outcome 2**

| *#* | *Output* | *#* | *Output Indicator* | *Baseline* | *Target* | *Progress to date* | *Status* | *Issues and Next Steps* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 | Trained managers develop individual performance and professional development plans jointly with civil servants | *2.1.1* | Share of female and male managers trained in elaboration of professional development plans | 0 | 90% female and male managers trained in 3 target ministries | 0 | *N/A | Data will be available March 2021.* | *Professional development plans will be enhanced in three ministries: Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of environmental Protection and Agriculture and Ministry of IDPs, Health, Labor and Social Affairs. Further trainings is planned for February 2021.* |
| *2.1.2* | Share of female and male civil servants that have professional development plans | 0 | 70% of targeted female and male civil servants have professional development plans in 3 target ministries | 0 | *N/A | Data will be available March 2021.* | *The results can be measured as soon as the process of enhancement of professional development plans is completed.* |
| 2.2 | Accreditation system of civil servants’ training programs is operational | *2.2.1* | Number of accredited training programs | 0 | 10 training programs (both classroom and online) are accredited | 11 | *Achieved | 11 training programs (both classroom and online) are accredited* | *To further improve Accreditation procedures, with the support of a local expert the project team will evaluate the existing legislative provisions and develop a set of recommendations.* |
| *2.2.2* | Number of female and male civil servants from all line ministries trained through accredited programs | 0 | 100 female and male civil servants are trained through accredited professional development programs | 300 | *Achieved | 1510 female and male civil servants are trained through accredited professional development programs* | *Sex disaggregated data is not available. The fact that the training programs are officially accredited will ensure continuous training process among respective civil servants. Moreover, more training programs are expected to be accredited in the upcoming period.* |
| 2.3 | Civil servants access learning opportunities online through unified platform | *2.3.1* | Share of female and male civil servants using the unified e-learning platform | 0 | 15% female and male civil servants from all line ministries are registered on e-learning platform | 0 | *Partially Achieved | The development of the platform is currently ongoing.* | *The concept of the unified e-learning platform is planned to be finalized by February. In parallel, a technical work on integration of E-Human Resource Management System and open-source Moodle platform is ongoing. Given that ready-made Moodle platform does not require an intensive technical development work, the platform will be open for piloting by April 2021.* |
| 2.4 | Enhanced knowledge of female and male civil servants on civil service reform | *2.4.1* | Number of female and male civil servants participating in Civil Servants’ Forum meetings | 0 | 700 female and male civil servants from 11 ministries participate in meetings | 1388 | *Achieved | 1388 female and male civil servants from 11 ministries participate in meetings* | *CSB arranged 21 thematic Civil Servants’ Forum meetings attended by 1,388 female and male civil servants. Sex disaggregated data is not available since vast majority of the forums were conducted online and part of the attendees’ gender could not be identified. Observing the forum participants who were using their cameras during the meetings, the forum can be characterized as female dominant. To track the attendance by gender, CSB will be recommended to use the online registration form for the future forums.*  *Civil Servants’ Forum meetings proved to be a successful platform for enhancing the knowledge civil servants on civil service reform and CSB is planning to continue this effort with the support of another UNDP project.* |
| *2.4.2* | Share of female and male civil servants who report satisfaction with participation in forum meetings | 0 | 80% of men and women report the meetings as “useful” | 93% | *Achieved | 93% of the surveyed forum participants report the meetings as “useful”* | *93% of the surveyed forum participants report the meetings as “useful” Source: CSB Study, 2020* |
| *2.4.3* | Number of trained managers in management and civil service reform-related issues | 0 | 300 female and male managers trained from the line ministries and CSB | 330 | *Achieved |330 managers trained on Management and Leadership Skills* | *CSB took the ownership of the subject training which received positive assessments from the participants and is planning to continue training delivery to the civil servants in the future.* |
| 2.5 | Civil Service Bureau has instruments to effectively manage civil service | *2.5.1* | Number of Human Resources Forum (HR Forum) meetings held on key issues of CSR | 0 | 7 HR Forum meetings held | 6 | *Partially Achieved | 6 HR Forum meetings held* | *By January 2021, 6 HR Forum meetings were held. The next meeting is planned to be organized in February 2021.* |
| *2.5.2* | Electronic Human Resources Management System (HRMS) generates key statistics on civil service | 0 | All line ministries input relevant statistical data into HRMS | eHRMS pilot | *Partially Achieved | All line ministries input relevant statistical data into HRMS in pilot mode.* | *With the support of the project team, four new modules were integrated into the E-Human Resource Management Platform. The technical work was finalized by July and training held in August-September 2020. At this stage, platform is fully operational and allows to integrate new data via four new modules – i) performance appraisal, ii) professional development; iii) self-service modules for civil servants; iv) smart analytical module.* |
| *2.5.3* | Number of female and male civil servants trained in dispute management | 0 | 100 female and male civil servants trained from all line ministries and 80% of trainees demonstrating 10% of increased knowledge through pre-post tests | 86 | *Partially Achieved | 86 civil servants (F=66; M=34) trained from all line ministries and 83% of trainees demonstrating more than 10% of increased knowledge through pre-post tests* | *In December 2020, new comprehensive qualitative research was conducted to understand perceptions and attitudes of civil servants towards work-place disputes and non-judicial dispute resolutions. The findings coupled with previous research documents is being used by the local expert which was tasked to develop a plan of action for the introduction of a mediation service in the public sector. Based on the document, first, the detailed guidelines on mediation and conflict management techniques shall be developed, then based on the guidelines a group of HRs and other selected civil servants shall be trained. In addition, a memorandum with the Mediation Association of Georgia will be signed which would allow civil servants to engage an external mediator in case of necessity. As a result, through these pilot activities, civil servants will be able to apply mediation as an alternative way of resolving a conflict without any formal judicial proceedings. The process will include an awareness raising activities and training of managers on the new opportunity. It is noteworthy, that initially, the plan was to focus on dispute prevention without any reference to mediation or other alternative measures due to the reluctance from the CSB. However, the new research and conducted discussions have created a momentum to expand the possibilities for dispute management and thus, this shall be integrated into the training program of managers (to be conducted on a later stage, once all preparatory work is finalized and mediation is available as a service).* |
| 2.6 | CSO initiatives supported through small grants scheme provide required research and expertise in designing inclusive policy, improving civil service and offering practical solutions to Government | *2.6.1* | Number of CSO initiatives providing expertise to the government inclusive policy making process and civil service reform | 0 | 10 CSOs providing evidence-based inputs for future policy decisions | 25 | *Achieved | Analysis will be available March 2021.* | *To encourage and support initiatives from civil society that contribute to the implementation of PAR, the project initiated five cycles of CSO grants throughout the project lifetime. In 2017 four research and five CSO grants were awarded; in 2018 four civic initiatives and three research grants were awarded, in 2019 four research grants were awarded. In 2020, CSO component was fine-tuned in response to COVID-19; three new research grants were initiated in thematic areas of PAR in the context of COVID-19 focusing on digital learning readiness assessment, challenges in provision of services to women victims of domestic violence by the Ministry of Internal Affairs during pandemic and compliance with public participation component in policy making; additionally two grants were provided to support development and deployment of Risk Communication Strategic Guidelines for public health emergencies and provision of professional home care services to elderly and vulnerable persons, as well as creation of Home Care (HC) online learning platform and adaptation HC mobile application.*  *All CSO grants are subject to external evaluation. The external evaluation focuses on contribution analysis of the initiatives to the PAR Process, assesses the impact and capacity increase of sub-grantees, gender dimension is among the evaluation criteria as well. The indicator will be measured as soon as the third external evaluation results are available (by March 2021).* |

**Outcome 3**

***GoG delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *#* | *Outcome Indicator* | *Baseline* | *Target* | *Progress to date* | *Status* | *Issues and Next Steps* |
| 3.1 | Number of key service delivery agencies initiating implementation of disability inclusive unified service delivery standards | 0 | 2 key service delivery agencies have initiated implementation of unified delivery standards | *2* | *Achieved | 2 key service delivery agencies have initiated implementation of unified delivery standards* | *The Public Service Hall as well as the Patrol Department Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs have already implemented Common Assessment Framework (CAF) – a total quality management tool designed for self-assessment and improvement of public organizations from the context of service delivery.* |
| 3.2 | Usage rate of the unified government services portal (my.gov.ge) increases | 45,000 | Usage rate of my.gov.ge portal equals to 360,000 | 423,555 | *Achieved | Usage rate of my.gov.ge portal equals to 423,555* | *Usage rate of my.gov.ge portal equals to 423,555 as of December 2020, thus there was an 89 % increase in the usage rate as compared to the baseline data (2016).* |

**Outputs for Outcome 3**

| # | Output | # | Output Indicator | Baseline | Target | Progress to date | Status | Issues and Next Steps |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 | Public Service Delivery officials ready to use Unified Service Delivery Standards | 3.1.1 | Number of disability inclusive (where applicable) Unified Public Service Design and Delivery (UPSDD) methodological packages developed | 0 | Five methodological packages developed and ready to use (costing, delivery, CAF, PwDs inclusive service design and delivery, customer satisfaction) | 5 | *Achieved / Five methodological and training packages are developed and ready to use (costing, PwDs inclusive public service design and delivery, CAF, customer satisfaction)* | *UPSDD methodological packages have to undergo official government approval after which full scale implementation of the standards provided in the methodological packages should start in relevant service delivery agencies with the overall coordination from PSDA. The fact that the UPSDD is still pending government approval is due to lack of high-level backing and support from the Ministry of Justice limiting PSDAs ability to move on with the necessary approvals and implementation.* |
| 3.1.2 | Number of female and male civil servants trained under each of UPSDD packages | 0 | 30 male and female civil servants from key service provider agencies trained under each of UPSDD packages | 187 | *Achieved | 187 public servants (F=139; M= 48) from more than 10 different public agencies trained under UPSDD packages* | *Training Center of the Ministry of Justice has taken over the training programs which will be constantly available through their training portfolio, thus ensuring their sustainability.* |
| 3.1.3 | Number of agencies implementing new quality assurance standards in line with UPSDD | 0 | 2 agencies comply with quality assurance elements of UPSDD | 2 | *Achieved | 2 agencies comply with quality assurance elements of UPSDD* | *Two agencies -* *Public Service Hall and Patrol Department Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs have already implemented quality assurance element of UPSDD - CAF* |
| 3.2 | More services and data are accessible in digital format on unified government portals and the uptake of service is increased (my.gov.ge) | 3.2.1 | Number of new services accessible on my.gov.ge | 0 | 49 new services are accessible on my.gov.ge | 133 | *Achieved | 133 new services are accessible on my.gov.ge* | *Only in 2020 37 new services were added to the Unified Service Portal My.gov.ge by DGA; in total 699 services are now available on the Portal, 133 with support of the PAR project* |
| 3.2.3 | Number of citizens covered by public relations and information outreach | 0 | 850,000 citizens are aware of my.gov.ge, the services available and the modalities of its usage via face-to-face meetings. | 845,939 | *Achieved| Analysis will be available March 2021.* | *DGA has been conducting informational meetings with various stakeholders. The promotional video has been disseminated via TV channels during various time periods of the day. In 2020, DGA widely disseminated a promotional video for use of My.gov.ge during the COVID-19 pandemic (detailed outreach figures will be provided by March 2021)* |

# Annex F: Main PAR Laws, Policies, Decrees, By-Laws, Strategies Prepared

| **#** | **Subject** | **Brief Description** | **Partner** | **Date**  **Prepared** | **Date Approved** | **Result and/or Next Steps** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Development and Coordination** | | | | | | |
| 1 | New policy methodological package approved by a Government Decree the Government Decree #629 | The new policy methodological package, including: the “Rule on Development, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policy Documents”, along with the relevant Policy Handbook and detailed guides was approved by a Government Decree, thereby introducing a whole-of-Government approach in national-level policy development and coordination. | AoG | 2018-2019 | December, 2020 | “Rule on Development, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policy Documents”, along with the relevant Policy Handbook and detailed guides became mandatory standards for developing the national level policy documents. AoG will screen the policy documents against the new standards, recommend respective changes ensuring the overall high quality of the documents prior to GoG approval. |
| 2 | PAR Communication Strategy | The PAR Communication Strategy and its Tactical Plan finalized and presented. | AoG | 2020 | October 2020 | The PAR Communication Strategy and its Tactical Plan were shared with the PAR Council and will be officially adopted on the next PAR Council’s session (February – March 2021). The piloting of the Strategy and Tactical Plan across at least two pillars (public policy and service delivery) is foreseen as part of the next UNDP PAR Project. |
| 3 | The project supported development of four pending strategic documents for 2020: E-Governance Strategy by the Data Exchange Agency, PAR Strategy and Action Plan 2021-2024, Public Service Design and Delivery Policy Document (PSDD) and Maritime Transport Strategy. | 15 strategic documents pending for 2020 (delayed to 2021 due to C-19): the ministries and agencies notified the AoG of 15 policy documents requiring GoG approval. New e-Governance Strategy 2021-2025 and its Action Plan is being drafted with the project's support and is on the list of the documents to be approved in 2020/2021 by GoG. This strategy will be drafted in line with the new policy standards and it is already going through the AoG screening with the project consultant support. The strategy draft will be available by end of March 2021. New PAR Strategy and its Action Plan is being drafted in collaboration with AoG and UN Women. The document is expected to be finalized in March 2021. Public Service Design and Delivery Policy Document (PSDD) is already finalized and is pending Government approval; work on Maritime Transport Strategy 2021-2025, and its Action Plan is still in progress and is expected to be finalized by end of March 2021. . | DGA, AoG, PSDA and Maritime Transport Agency of the Ministry of Economic Development and Sustainable Growth | 2018-2021 | 2020 | **E-governance Strategy**: The second e-Government strategy and its action plan will become a basis document for the GoG to ensure strategic approach for the development of e-Governance.  **PSDD**: The project has supported the first comprehensive assessment of the state of service delivery in Georgia; and initiated the drafting of a policy document on common guiding principles and standards for public service delivery. The PSDD establishes common principles and standards on the design, delivery, pricing and quality assurance of public services in Georgia. The creation of common standards targets the discrepancies in the quality of service delivery in various agencies, but also between the national and local levels.  **PAR Strategy**: GoG has made PAR one of its highest priorities. In 2014-2015 the "Public Administration Reform Roadmap – 2020" and its corresponding action plan were developed. The roadmap is based on the OECD/SIGMA PAR principles, which aims to improve and bring the public administration of Georgia closer to the standards of the European administrative space. The PAR Roadmap has been used as the key strategic document for the implementation of the Public Administration Reform (PAR) since 2015. In December 2020, the PAR Roadmap 2020 expires and new PAR Strategy for 2021-2024 and associated Action Plan will be developed in line with new policy standards and strong focus on GESI elements.  **Maritime Transport Strategy:** Maritime Strategy 2021-2030 has been drafted as part of the EU-funded Technical Assistance project, supporting the GoG in the implementation of the EU-Georgia Association Agreement in the field of maritime transport. Technical assistance aimed at supporting the MTA in developing a Maritime Strategy considering relevant provisions of the AA and the country’s priority objectives and sector policies. Even though the draft Strategy document has been prepared to reflect both the framework of the EU-Georgia AA and the GoG policy guidelines, additional support was provided by the project to ensure full alignment of the Strategy with the new Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation standards. The document is already being screened by AoG and is pending for GoG approval in 1st Q of 2021. |
| 4 | Development of a National Risk Communication  Strategy for Public Health Emergencies in Georgia | At the request of the National Center for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC), the development of a national risk communication  strategy for public health emergencies in Georgia has been supported. | NCDC | May – December, 2020 | Pending for approval | Risk Communication Strategic Guideline for public health emergencies was drafted and is currently pending for the GoG Approval. As a part of National Risk Communication Strategy deployment activities, United Nations Association of Georgia (UNAG), jointly with the National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC), facilitated a series of online trainings on key guidelines of the Strategy for up to 200 local government and public health centre representatives across 52 municipalities and 9 regions, including Tbilisi. In addition, UNAG developed multiple videos with healthcare workers’ participation to promote the key guiding principles of the Strategy among the broader public to be disseminated via NCDC [channels](https://www.youtube.com/user/NCDCGeorgia/videos). Upon finalization of the Strategy, NCDC made a decision to create dedicated in-house unit to focus on implementation of action plans in line with the guidance stipulated in the Strategy. |
| **Human Resources Management and Civil Service Reform** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Government Decree on Staff Performance Appraisal | Government Decree on Staff Performance Appraisal adopted | CSB | 2016 | 2017 | Government Decree on Staff performance appraisal laid down the basic principles of performance appraisal in the civil service of Georgia as well as rights and obligations of parties involved. Based on the Decree, ministries have developed their own internal performance appraisal procedures. |
| 2 | Package of policy documents to set the training accreditation Council, Experts’ Corps and the organizational unit within the Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (NCEQE) | Expert has been hired to assist the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement to elaborate and prepare for adoption the package of policy documents, for creating the legal frame for formation and operation of the institutional mechanisms to ensure the smooth and effective training program accreditation process and ensure the quality enhancement of Civil Servants’ professional development training programs. The package includes the following regulations and rules:   * Decree on Civil Servants’ Training Program Accreditation (standards, procedures and costs) (Ministerial Decree, and Accreditation Statute adopted, methodological guidelines developed); * Policy and rules to hire the training accreditation Experts’ Corps (qualification requirements, hiring and firing procedures, scope and compensation) (adopted by the Director of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement). | CSB, NCEQE | August 2018 | December 2018 | Training Accreditation system for civil servants’ professional development has been set up and became operational. The accreditation-related framework led to the development of 11 training mandatory programs for civil servants by five training providers, their accreditation by the Accreditation Council and delivery of training sessions to 1510 civil servants only in 2020-2021. |
| 3 | The Change Management Plan (CMP) and respective Civil Service Reform (CSR) communication strategy developed and implemented | The consulting company (Public Administration International (PAI) in cooperation with Grow Expand Compete (GEC) was contracted by the project to facilitate change management associated with the civil service reform. The effort was conducted in close partnership with the AoG, the CSB and several ministries and produced two substantial outputs: the central CMP and its declination into Individual CMPs for nine ministries, as well as the associated Communication Strategy and Action Plan. These strategic documents constitute the first outcome of the engagement of civil servants who have been identified as potential agents of change.  The Communication Strategy and Action Plan developed by the project implementers in cooperation with the Change Management Team (CMT) ensure provision of targeted, consistent and comprehensive information about the changes brought about by the implementation of new Civil Service Law (CSL) and CSR for both internal and external audiences. The Communication Strategy supports the main changes foreseen by the CMT and responds to identified risks in terms of resistance to change and possible misrepresentations. | CSB, AoG | 2017 | 2018 | Given the adoption of subsidiary legislation that foresees a much more de-centralized system than originally foreseen, the Human Resources Managers Forum, supported by the PAR project has become, in effect, the change management instrument for CSB, through which detailed and substantive discussion has been facilitated on emerging problems and needs with the implementation of the new Law on Civil Service and its by-laws, while CSB has been providing either immediate and hands on assistance, or – if the issue where of a generalized nature - developed guidebooks and instructions for the human resources professionals most of them with PAR project support, such as guide on performance appraisal of civil servants, manual of professional development of civil servants, etc.As part of the follow up initiatives, the project team has been working closely with the CSB to respond to the needs identified in the National Change Management Plan and its respective Communication Plan, through another sub-project with the CSB. |
| 4 | Decree on Professional Development of Civil Servants | The Decree on Professional Development of Civil Servants was adopted by the GoG on 22 May 2018. However, contrary to the original intention, the Government has opted for decentralizing the delivery of basic, mandatory programs. Initially, the project team aimed at facilitating the establishment of a unified training delivery process. According to the adopted Decree, each basic course will be developed by a training provider and will have to then undergo accreditation, managed by a group of experts under the National Centre for Educational Quality Enhancement. | CSB | 2017 | May 2018 | Decree on Professional Development of Civil Servants and relevant standards forms represent the backbone of the daily implementation of the new continuous training system. Decree reflects the recommendations provided by the project: the document respects the standards of professional development and corresponding implementation rules, enshrines the principles of training needs assessment process and defines two types of obligatory trainings reflecting international good practices – mandatory basic program and additional professional development programs. The Decree on Professional Development of Civil Servants establishes an accreditation requirement for mandatory training programs of civil servants. |
| 5 | Internal procedural acts on performance appraisal | Throughout the initial stage of performance appraisal introduction, the project supported public agencies in elaboration of their internal acts on performance appraisal adopted by respective ministers of head of their agencies) (Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Economic Development, Administration of the Government, Ministry of Education, three ministries of Adjara Autonomous Republic). | MEPA, MoH, MoESD, AoG, MoE, Four ministries of Adjara Autonomous Republic | 2018-2020 | 2018-2020 | Internal performance appraisal procedures are based on the Decree of the Government on Performance Appraisal. Ministries conduct evaluation of their staff based on these internal procedures which include relevant forms, a detailed description of a performance process, key obligations of parties involved. The project facilitates the development of a professional development system through the support of the National Centre for Educational Quality Enhancement. In particular, assistance is provided for organizational set-up of the Group of Experts responsible for accreditation of mandatory programs (development of a Statute, related legal documents, etc.). |
| 6 | Draft legal amendments to the accreditation-related framework | Legal amendments to the accreditation-related framework in being drafted, in order to improve Accreditation Standards and Procedures for Professional Development Programs of Civil Servants. | CSB, QEC | February 2021 | March 2021 | The legal amendments to the accreditation-related framework will lead to the enhancement of the accreditation procedures. The process will be finalized by March 2021. |
| **Public Service Delivery** | | | | | | |
| 7 | Policy concept document on Common Principles of Service Design and Delivery | Policy concept document on Common Principles of Service Design and Delivery developed. | PSDA |  | 2017 | The Policy concept document on Common Principles of Service Design and Delivery was the basis on which later the strategic Policy Document on Public Service Design and Delivery was built. |
| 8 | The Policy Document on Public Service Design and Delivery (PSDD) | The project has laid solid foundations for the creation of unified standards for public service delivery: it has supported the first comprehensive assessment of the state of service delivery in Georgia; and initiated the drafting of a policy document on common guiding principles and standards for public service delivery.  The Policy Document on Public Service Design and Delivery (PSDD), establishes common principles and standards on the design, delivery, pricing and quality assurance of public services in Georgia. The creation of common standards targets the discrepancies in the quality of service delivery in various agencies, but also between the national and local levels. The international and local experts hired by the project presented the policy document to the PAR Council on February 16, 2018. | PSDA | 2018 | Pending for Approval | Although the policy document has not been approved yet by the government, its main components became part of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan 2019-2020 and their implementation have started. |
| 9 | Legislative Amendments on e-services | DGA prepared a package of legislative amendments that will oblige all public agencies to offer all their services also in electronic format. | DGA | 2018 | Pending for Approval | The amendments have not been adopted yet. |
| 10 | Legal analysis of legislative framework related to design and delivery of public services | Legal analysis of legislative framework related to design and delivery of public services has been carried out and finalized | PSDA, DGA | 2019 | Pending for Approval | Based on the legal analysis and the developed recommendations, amendments have been elaborated to the General Administrative Code and the Law on Electronic Documents and Electronic Trust Services in tandem by PSDA and DGA. The package is expecting the Ministry of Justice’s approval before it is submitted to the Parliament. |

# Annex G: Accredited Training Programs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Subject** | **Synopsis** | **Date** | **# of Participants (M/F %)** |
| 1 | Course for the development of personal and professional competencies of civil servants | Course for the development of personal and professional competencies of civil servants | 2020 | 565 |
| 2 | Remote course on personal and professional development of civil servants | Remote course on personal and professional development of civil servants | 2020 | 529 |
| 3 | Civil Servant Managerial Skills Course | Civil Servant Managerial Skills Course | 2020 | 224 |
| 4 | Civil Servant Managerial Skills Remote Course | Civil Servant Managerial Skills Remote Course | 2020 | 192 |

# Annex H: Key Training Events

| **#** | **Subject** | **Ministries, Agencies, LEPLs Involved** | **# of Participants (M/F %)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Policy Analysis, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Training | Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG);  Civil Service Bureau (CSB);  Public Service Development Agency (PSDA);  Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Labor, Health and Social Affairs of Georgia (MOH);  Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia (MIA);  Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia (MOESD);  Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (MEPA);  Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia (MFA);  Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia (MRDI);  National Statistics Office of Georgia (GEOSTAT);  Ministry of Justice of Georgia (MOJ);  Ministry of Defense of Georgia (MoD);  Ministry of Education, Science, Culture And Sport of Georgia (MES);  State Ministry for Reconciliation and Civic Equality of Georgia (SMR);  National Center for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC);  Prosecutor's Office of Georgia (PoG);  LEPL Technical and Construction Supervision Agency (MOESD);  LEPL National Agency of State Property;  LEPL Legislative Herald of Georgia (MOJ);  Agricultural Cooperatives Development Agency (ACDA);  National Probation Agency;  State Security Service of Georgia;  Training Center Of Justice Of Georgia;  LEPL Enterprise Georgia;  Georgia’s Innovation and Technology Agency;  Georgian National Tourism Administration;  Notary Chamber of Georgia;  National Agency of Public Registry of Ministry of Justice of Georgia (NAPR);  Public Service Hall (PSH);  Agricultural Project Management Agency;  Notary Chamber of Georgia;  The National Agency of Mines (NAM);  Training Center Of Justice Of Georgia;  National Archives of Georgia;  Georgian Civil Aviation Agency;  Revenue Service;  Service Agency of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia;  Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia;  Georgian National Agency For Standards And Metrology;  LEPL 112 Georgia (112);  MIA Border Police of Georgia;  State Agency of Oil and Gas;  LEPL "National Center for Children and Youth"  Adjara:  Ministry of Health & Social Affairs of Adjara (MoHSAA);  Ministry of Finance and Economy of Adjara (MoFEA);  Ministry of Agriculture of Adjara (MoAA);  Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of Adjara (MoECSA)  Administration | 291 (M – 93; F- 198) |
| 2 | Public Policy Analysis, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation ToT | MOH, Training Center of Justice of Georgia, MEPA, MOESD, MOH, MOESD, MIA, LEPL Financial – Analytical Service | 10 (F=8; M=2) |
| 3 | Training on Performance Appraisal System in the Public Service of Georgia (2018-2019) | Ministry of Justice of Georgia; Administration of the President of Georgia; Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia; Ministry of IDPs, Health, Labor, and Social Affairs of Georgia; Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport of Georgia; High Council of Justice of Georgia; Ministry of Health and Social Affairs of Autonomous Republic of Adjara; Ministry of Economy and Finance of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara; Ministry of Education and Science of Autonomous Republic of Adjara; Ministry of Agriculture of Autonomous Republic of Adjara. | 460 managers |
| 4 | Training in Performance Appraisal Techniques (2020) | Line managers of the MEPA | 65 |
| 5 | Training in Performance Appraisal-Related Topics (2020) | Managers of the MoESC | 50 |
| 6 | Training of AoG staff in performance appraisal process techniques (2021) | AoG | 50 |
| 7 | “Training of HRs in Managing Difficult Conversations” (2019) | Training of trainers provided by the trainers of Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution (CEDR) in managing difficult conversations and prevention of workplace conflict. | 15 (ToT) (F=14, M=1) |
| 8 | Common Assessment Framework (CAF) | MRDI; Education management information system (EMIS); National Agency of State Property (NASP); Revenue Service (RS); The Unified Service Center Of The Patrol Police; Public Service Hall (PSH); National Archives of Georgia; Civil Registry; Public Service Development Agency (PSDA); National Archival Fund; Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG); NAPR; MoD | 53 (F-41; M-12) |
| 9 | CAF TOT | Training Center of Justice of Georgia; PSH; PSDA; The Unified Service Center of The Patrol Police | 10 (F-10; M-0;) |
| 10 | Training on Customer Satisfaction Survey | Training Center of Justice of Georgia, PSDA, NASP, MIA Academy, EMIS, RS, Patrol Police Department, Maritime Transport Agency of Georgia, National Archives of Georgia, the National Bureau of Enforcement, PSH, LEPL Agency of State Care and Assistance for the (statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking, Service Agency (MIA), MIA, | 34 (F= 29; M=5) |
| 11 | Customer Satisfaction Survey TOT | Training Center of Justice of Georgia, PSDA, MIA Academy, NASP, Tbilisi City Hall | 11 (F-10; M-1) |
| 12 | Training on Public Service Design | Training Center of Justice of Georgia; E-Governance Georgia; PSDA; UNDP | 8 (F-8; M-0) |
| 13 | Training in Public Service Delivery | RS; NAPR; DGA; EMIS; Service Agency of MIA (SA); Special Penitentiary Service; National Archives of Georgia; The Legislative Herald of Georgia; National Bureau of Enforcement | 26 (F-17; M-9) |
| 14 | Public Service Delivery TOT | Training Center of Justice of Georgia, PSDA, NASP | 11 (F-10; M-1) |
| 15 | ToT in Costing of Public Services | Academy of the Ministry of Finance, PSDA, Consulting company GEC, National Property Agency, Training Center of Justice of Georgia | 6 (F – 3; M – 3) |
| 16 | Training in Costing of Public Services | Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Finance Service Agency, Academy of the Ministry of Finance, PSDA, National Property Agency, Public Service Hall, Ministry of Finance Revenue Agency | 31 (F – 21; M – 11) |
| 17 | Provision of Services for Persons with Disabilities in Public Institutions | PSH | 10 (M-1; F-9) |
| 18 | Trainings in Design and Development of e-services, Information Systems Packages and Cyber Security | Employees of the former Data Exchange Agency, as well as designated representatives from relevant public entities. | 71 |
| 19 | Training on the Novelties  Foreseen by the New Law of Civil Service and Related Regulations | Civil servants from ministries and LEPLs | 1,123 (F=649; M=474) |
| 20 | Training for the Parliament to Improve its Policymaking and Oversight Functions with the New Policy Methodological Framework | Parliament | 29 (F= 17; M=12) |
| 21 | A series of training courses for building the capacity of the front-line staff in efficient service  provision, especially for PWDs and psycho-social needs. (trainings included COVID-19 related psychological resilience during public service delivery) | Front-line officers from Public Service Halls across Georgia | 732 (F = 667; M =65) |
| 22 | Training sessions on Professional Development (2021) | Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of IDPs, Health, Labour and Social Affairs, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture | Ongoing |
| 23 | Training on Management and Leadership | Civil Service Bureau | 330 (F=189; M= 141) |
| 24 | One session for two-days training conducted in cooperation with the Local Consultant on Communication Techniques and Dispute Prevention for three groups of managers (2020) | Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development | 71 (F=47; M=24) |
| 25 | Three training sessions aimed at linking individual appraisal plans with department/strategic goals (2021) | Ministry of IDPs, Health, Labour and Social Affairs | Ongoing |

# Annex I: Emerging Needs - PAR-sponsored Sub Projects

|  | **Subject** | **Brief Description** | **Partner** | **Start/End Dates** | **Result and/or Next Step** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. **Policy Development and Coordination** | | | | |
|  | **N/A** | | | | |
|  | 1. **Human Resources Management and Civil Service Reform** | | | | |
| 1 | Capacity Building in Civil Service and Anti-Corruption Area (Emerging Needs) | To enhance awareness concerning the implications of the Law on Civil Service and its relevant by-laws, the project provided support to the CSB for the activities targeting a) civil servants on central and local levels; b) NGOs, media and administration of Courts, as well as c) young researchers and students. | CSB | 2017-2018 | CSB elaborated five detailed guidelines for civil servants on: reorganization, disciplinary proceedings, gifts, institutional arrangements and the conflict of interest in public organizations. In November 2018, the CSB announced an open call for receiving new ideas and insights on the further development of civil service from students and civil servants. The winners were awarded at the “Civil Servant’s Day” on December 19, 2018, with the project’s support. |
| 2 | Supporting the Ministry of Finance and Economy of Adjara to Improve Organizational Structure, Policy Planning and HR Practices (Emerging Needs) | The sub-project “Supporting the Ministry of Finance and Economy of Adjara to Improve Organizational Structure, Policy Planning and HR Practices” aimed at updating of the organizational structure and functional and job descriptions of MoFEA, improvement of business processes, elaboration of one-year action plan and the department-level action plans, assessment of staff training needs, and creation of professional devel­opment planning system. | Ministry of Finance and Economy of Adjara | 2018-2019 | As a result of the sub-project: The mandate of the ministry has been re-defined and amendments to bylaws have been implemented according to recommendations. The strategy document of the Ministry has been developed and approved by the Ministry; The organizational structure of the Ministry has been developed and changes in organizational structure have been approved by the Ministry according to the recommendations; Training has enhanced MoFEA staff ability to engage in planning: trained staff contributed productively to the development of the departmental action plans. |
| 3 | Ensuring widespread communication on the new Law on Civil Service and Anti-Corruption Mechanisms | The sub-project aimed at supporting implementation of the new LCS and new Anti-Corruption mechanisms by increasing awareness levels among a) civil servants on central and local levels, b)NGOs, media and administration of Courts, and c) young researchers and students. | CSB | 2018 | Awareness on Civil Service has been raised and communication with stakeholders has been enhanced (PR departments, NGOs, Media);  Level of integrity among different categories of civil servants has been increased, all over the country; Guidelines have been elaborated on: a) reorganization, b)disciplinary procedures, c) conflict of interest and gift regulations, d) institutional arrangements, and e) religion neutrality; Communication on Civil Service Reform has been enhanced; The level of public confidence in legitimacy of decisions made by more informed and accountable public officials has been increased. |
| 4 | The project with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of Adjara (MoECS) (Emerging Needs) | The sub-project aimed at supporting revision of organizational structure and functionaland job descriptions of the ministrystaff, improvement of business processes,assessmentof staff training needs, and creationof professional development planningsystem. | Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of Adjara | 2019 | The project resulted in update of the organizational structure and functional and job descriptions of MoFEA, improvement of business processes, elaboration of one-year action plan and the department-level action plans, assessment of staff training needs, and creation of professional devel­opment planning system. |
| 5 | Supporting the enhancement of the electronic Human Recourse Management System (eHRMS) administered by the Civil Service Bureau of Georgia | The eHRMS was created by the Financial Analytical Service (FAS) in collaboration with the Civil Service Bureau. With the adoption of the new Law on Civil Service and its by-laws, the need to enhance and improve the existing e-tool emerged. The sub-project aimed at enhancement of the eHRMS ensuring unified implementation of newly established standards and regulations, facilitating effective reporting by public agencies, and monitoring the implementation of the new Law on Civil Service by the Civil Service Bureau. | Financial Analytical Service (FAS) | 2020 | With the support of the project team, four new modules were integrated into the eHRMS. The technical work was finalized by July and training held in August-September 2020. At this stage, platform is fully operational and allows to integrate new data via four new modules – i) performance appraisal, ii) professional development; iii) self-service modules for civil servants; iv) smart analytical module. |
| 1. **Public Service Delivery** | | | | | |
| 6 | Increasing Accessibility of the Remote (Electronic) Services at the Registry of Commercial and Non-Commercial Legal Entities within the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) (Emerging Needs) | The project aimed at development and digitalization of electronic services. | NAPR | December 2017- 2018 | The project digitalized 20 services for commercial and non-commercial services and also created a new electronic service – Electronic Board Meeting, helping entities with non-resident board members manage their affairs more efficiently. |
| 7 | Support to Public Service Development Agency (PSDA) towards the enhancement of Information Security and Trust Service Provision Capacities (Emerging Needs) | The project aimed to strengthen the security of the internal systems of the PSDA by ensuring compliance with the Law of Georgia “On Information Security” and the applicable international standards (ISO/ETSI). The project was launched in the beginning of December 2017 and all activities were finalized by October 2018. | PSDA | December 2017 – October 2018 | The project identified information security drawbacks in PSDA critical business processes and offered 74 corrective recommendations. The PSDA has gained a full picture of existing information security risks, sorted by severity level, along with risk treatment plans. This helped to improve efficiency by allocating limited human and financial resources to mitigating the most critical risks first. The Information Security Steering Committee has developed 2-year plan for the implementation of the elaborated recommendations. |
| 8 | Supporting the Data Exchange Agency (DEA) efforts towards more transparent and efficient e-Government | In 2017 DGA/ DEA’s efforts were focused on ensuring the availability (i.e. supply) and use (i.e. demand and take-up) of online public services by government, businesses and citizens, and on gaining internationally competitive experience and Excellency in e-government sector as a whole.  Throughout 2019-2021 DGA/ DEA aimed to ensure that e-Governance development process in Georgia is based on a strategic approach, rather than driven by fragmented, reactive interventions, while enhancing public service delivery and ensuring transparency of public administration and the efficient use of public resources. DGA aimed at increased access and awareness of e-governance services for all citizens ensuring that no one is left behind. | DGA / DEA | 2017-  2021 | New e-Governance Strategy 2021-2025 and its Action Plan is being drafted with the project's support and is on the list of the documents to be approved in 2020/2021 by GoG. This strategy will be drafted in line with the new policy standards and it is already going through the AoG screening with the project consultant support. The strategy draft will be available by end of March 2021. Only in 2020 37 new services were added to the Unified Service Portal My.gov.ge by DGA; in total 699 services are now available on the Portal, 133 with support of the PAR project. Usage rate of my.gov.ge portal equals to 423,555 as of December 2020, thus there was an 89 % increase in the usage rate as compared to the baseline data of 2016. Additionally, DGA has been conducting informational meetings with various stakeholders. The promotional video has been disseminated via TV channels during various time periods of the day reaching an estimated 423,555 audience. |
| 9 | Supporting the DGA (former DEA) in the Development of the Electronic System for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation | The overall objective of the project is the introduction of e-System of Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation by the DEA. This involves a detailed process of business analysis including all the major stakeholders, to be followed by electronic program development phase, along with relevant program testings, detailed manual development and post system development activities, as listed below. | DGA / DEA | 2019-2021 | As a result of the sub-project the concept of the M&E e-system together with the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) and through active participation of the line ministries is finalized. The project has been facilitating the collaboration on M&E system development between AoG and DGA from the initial phases; in order to ensure the collaboration continues with the same efforts from both parties once PAR project (phase I) is completed in March 2021, project initiated the process of signing an MoU between the AoG and DGA. The idea was welcomed from both stakeholders. The MoU will incorporate the responsibilities on the e-system development process after March 2021 once the first phase of the PAR project is completed. |
| 10 | Introducing Electronic Apostille Ser­vice at Public Service Development Agency (PSDA) (Emerging Needs) | The project aiming to develop an Electronic Apos­tille Service at Public Service Development Agency was finalized on June 30, 2020. Document authentication with Apostille is one of the services provided by PSDA. Apostille Division of the Public Service Development Agency certifies over 100 types of documents issued by the administrative agencies of Georgia. However, many state and private organizations issue documents in electronic format and with introduction of the “On Electronic Document and Electronic Trust Services”, which legally recognized electronic signature as the analogue of wet signature, the number of electronic documents will increase rapidly. As e-Apostille was not implemented in Georgia before this initiative, authentication of “original” electronic documents by paper Apostille required issuing authorities to reproduce these documents in paper form. Consequently, improved document security and transmittability - advantages of issuing document in electronic form – were lost, to say nothing about inconvenience it caused to customers and extra costs related to the service provision. | PSDA | June 30, 2020 | The main achievement of the project was the creation of an electronic apostille service that makes the process of issuing or obtaining a certified document easier and more secure for users. Interested parties will now have an opportunity to submit a document in electronic form for authentication and issuing organizations will no longer have to produce paper analogues of documents for Apostille. Increased security and reliability of documents bearing Apostille ensure that no changes are made after certification. Moreover, introduction of this new service serves to reduction of costs as substantial time, human and financial expenses related to scanning, printing, binding and applying stickers will be saved. The project contributes to adhering to “digital by default” principle of service delivery as well as fulfilment of European Union Visa Liberalization long-term objectives with regard to document security. |
| 11 | Supporting the implementation of Public Administration Reform through the enhancement of Public Service Delivery in Georgia | The overall objective of the sub-project was to improve public services in Georgia through the introduction of the unified service design, delivery, quality assurance and costing standards and transferring the knowledge and experience to the respective civil servants. This included training of service delivery agency employees in unified service delivery guidelines to support the capacity building of the service provider agencies. The sub-project contributed to the successful implementation of the activities outlined in the PAR 2019-2020 Action Plan under the Service Delivery pillar. | PSDA | 2020 - 2021 | As a result of the project five methodological and training packages were developed and ready to use (costing, PwDs inclusive public service design and delivery, CAF, customer satisfaction) and in total 187 public servants (F=139; M= 48) from more than 10 different public agencies trained under UPSDD packages. |
| 12 | Support to Public Service Development Agency towards the Enhancement of Information Security and Administrative Data Management Processes (Emerging Needs) | The objective of the sub-project is to enhance PSDA cybersecurity systems and data management processes in response to the increased global cyber threats, challenges posed by Covid-19 reality and associated remote working practices. The sub-project builds on the achievements of the UNDP funded project - “Support to Public Service Development Agency towards the Enhancement of Informational Security and Trust Service Provision Capacities” (implemented from 2017 to 2018) as well as EU supported project - “Supporting Public Service Development Agency to continuously implement all benchmarks under the Visa Liberalization Action Plan” – Component 3 (implemented from 2017 to 2020) by significantly expanding the scope of the activities geared towards improving PSDA’s information security infrastructure and data management capabilities. | PSDA | 2020 - 2021 | Ongoing |
| 13 | Supporting the Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to Strengthen its Organizational Capacity for Improved Service Delivery | The aim of the sub-project is to support the Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to strengthen its organizational capacity through series of capacity building measures of effective and inclusive delivery of human-centered services coupled with increased accessibility of these services to Persons with Disabilities (PwDs). | Ministry of Internal Affairs | 2020 - 2021 | As a result of the sub-project Patrol Department of the Unified Service Center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs has implemented Common Assessment Framework (CAF) – a total quality management tool designed for self-assessment and improvement of public organizations from the context of service delivery. Additionally, capacities of the center staff were enhanced in customer services and quality control as well as PwDs service delivery. |

# Annex J: Project-Sponsored Conferences and Public Events

| Subject | Synopsis | Date | # of Participants (M/F %) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Launch of a programme for Public Administration Reform | Launch of a programme for Public Administration Reform | February, 2017 | N/A |
| Professional Development Forum | Two Forum meetings conducted between local private and public training providers | March- April, 2017 | N/A |
| Innovative workshop to promote civil service reform in Georgia | Innovative workshop has been organized in cooperation with the PSDA ServiceLab, to promote civil service reform in Georgia. | June 2017 | N/A |
| Working Meeting: “Development of a Unified Performance Tracking and  Monitoring System for Georgia” | Brief overview of SIGMA baseline study on public policy coordination Processes has been presented, along with the preliminary findings on Developing a unified system for monitoring and reporting government policy implementation, and presentation of the PSDA on online reporting platform Public Service. Meeting was concluded with the discussion on improving the Annual Government Work Plan. | November 22, 2017 | N/A |
| Presentation:  Development of Performance Appraisal System in Georgia:  Achieved Results and Selected Models | Presentation has been provided on the development of Performance Appraisal System in Georgia, with major focus on achieved results and selected models. | December 22, 2017 | N/A |
| Regional Civil Society Network (R-CSN) Conference | Regional Civil Society Network (R-CSN) Conference | December 2017 | 21 (M=13; F=8) |
| Presentation of the results of a training cycle for civil servants on novelties of the Law on Civil Service | Presentation of the results of a training cycle for civil servants on novelties of the Law on Civil Service | December 2017 | 102 (M=29; F=29) |
| Working Meeting on “Government Work Plan: Enhancement of Planning, Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation processes” | Working Meeting on “Government Work Plan: Enhancement of Planning, Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation processes” | December 14, 2017 | N/A |
| Workshop for the Policy Planning Network, Government of Georgia | The three-day workshop has been presented by the Policy Planning and Strategic Coordination Unit of the AoG under the PAR project, aiming to support the establishment of a sound and unified monitoring system in Georgia and increasing the capacities of Government agencies in the effective implementation of policy planning and improving basic performance tracking practices. | 1 – 3 February, 2018 | N/A |
| Presentation of the project “Support to Public Policy Units of the Ministries of Georgia” | The event aimed to inform the PAR stakeholders from government, donors and civil society on the initiative implemented by PAR project main purpose of which was to increase capacity of ministries’ policy units in public policy analysis and thus improve the policy making process in the country, strengthen the link between policy planning and budgeting, enhance the nexus between policy planning and implementation and build strong mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating and accountability. This initiative resulted in elaboration of the policy trainings for civil servants supported by the project through the year 2020. | March 2018 | 56 (M=15; F=41) |
| Opening of the cyber security Olympiad Cyber Cube | The third national Cyber Olympiad CyberCube 2018, has been organized by the Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT.GOV.GE) of the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia, in cooperation with the Cyber Security Bureau of the Ministry of Defense of Georgia and the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia, and supported by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and UK aid from the UK Government, and by a range of business partners and sponsors. CyberCube 2018 was the third Cyber Olympiad organized in Georgia since 2016. Participants represented youth under 25 who compete to fulfil a variety of tasks related to preventing cyber crisis situations and recovering from cyber security incidents caused by hard drive failures or attacks by adversaries. | May 2018 | 150 |
| Discussion on service delivery reform in the Tbilisi Architecture Service of the Tbilisi City Hall | The reform is based on problem mapping and recommendations, provided to the Tbilisi Architecture Service by a non-governmental organization “Innovations and Reforms Centre” (IRC), with the support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UK aid from the UK Government. The concrete steps planned under the ongoing reform were discussed at a working meeting on 21 June 2018, attended by over 40 representatives of the Tbilisi Mayor’s Office, government agencies, NGOs, private companies, international and donor organizations. | June 21, 2018 | 32 (F=24; M=8) |
| A workshop on the draft study on best practices and lessons-learned of the Policy Planning Network | A workshop on the draft study has been carried out with the relevant stakeholders, for the validation and finalization. | June 2018 | N/A |
| Workshop: New Consolidated Reference Materials for Drafting, Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluating Policy Documents | A workshop aimed at providing information on a new policy making framework to public agencies | 26 - 27 July 2018 | 40 |
| Presentation of the Report:  Management and Efficient Resolution of Service/Labour Disputes in Civil Service | Presentation of the major findings and recommendations on the report “Management and Efficient Resolution of Service/Labour Disputes in Civil Service”. | July 23, 2018 | N/A |
| Workshop: Strategic planning, monitoring, evaluation in public sector | A workshop with public agencies on the elaboration of the new framework | August 2018 | N/A |
| Workshop: Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) for policy document development | Workshop: Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) for policy document development | August 2018 | N/A |
| SCO Grants Fair | 16 distinct SCO/Research initiatives have been supported within the framework of the project, to make the PAR process more inclusive and innovative. The event showcased the mentioned initiatives, focusing on importance of enhancing CSO-Government cooperation and fostering meaningful partnership between various actors in the context of ongoing Public Administration Reform. | December 14, 2018 | N/A |
| Closing event of the project with the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) of Georgia | Closing event of the project with the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) of Georgia | December 2018 | N/A |
| Introduction of the Appraisal Systems in Georgia | Presentation has been provided on the development of Performance Appraisal System in Georgia, with major focus on achieved results and selected models | December 2018 | N/A |
| HR Forum | Two HR Forums conducted in the reporting period have facilitated peer learning and experience sharing among HRs and CSB. Besides, the next steps toward the better implementation of appraisal models, in­cluding relevant legal amendments and additional guidance, were discussed and planned. | February 2019; September 2019 | N/A |
| Presentation of the Research on Professional development system of civil servants in Georgia” | Professional development of civil servants in Georgia and the role of educational institutions in this process were the focus of a discussion on 24 January 2019 attended by the international experts and representatives of the Georgian ministries, training centers and civil society. The event was organized by the Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI). | 25 January, 2019 | N/A |
| Promoting employment for people with disabilities | Presentation and discussion on the research carried out by the Disability Research Center at Tbilisi State University (as part of the CSO grants contest.) explores strengths and challenges of the state programme and examines the factors that influence its implementation. | 28 January,  2019 | N/A |
| The workshop on “Stink Bug & Behavioral Science” | The Behavioral Insights Team (BIT) from the United States helps find out how to change behavior of farmers and rural population in western Georgia and make the fight against a Brown Marmorated Stink Bug more effective. The workshop on 29 January brought together representatives of the National Food Security Agency of Georgia. The initiative is carried out by the Georgian NGO “Innovations and Reforms Centre” with the assistance from UNDP and UKaid. | 29 January, 2019 | N/A |
| A conference on Georgian experience in introducing performance appraisal of civil servants | Performance appraisal of civil servants as an important step in the implementation of the Public Administration Reform in Georgia was discussed at a conference on 8 February 2019, attended by 80 representatives of the Georgian ministries, Government Administration, National Bank of Georgia, civil society and international organizations. The invited experts and representatives of the public agencies presented the benefits and drawbacks of a performance appraisal system, introduced in January 2018. | 8 February 2019 | 80 |
| Public Policy Training Certificate Award Ceremony | Over 170 civil servants have successfully completed training in Public Policy Analysis initiated by the Administration of the Government of Georgia with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UK Government. The certificate award ceremony took place on March 26, bringing together representatives of Georgian public sector organizations, the international and donor community, CSOs, academia and experts. | March 26,  2019 | N/A |
| Introducing accredited training programmes for civil servants | As part of the ongoing Public Administration Reform, Georgia introduced accredited training programmes for civil servants starting from May 2019. Public and private training providers attended an information meeting on 11 April to learn about the accreditation requirements and procedures. The meeting was organized by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (NCEQE) and the Civil Service Bureau of Georgia | 11 April 2019 | N/A |
| Georgia’s Public Service Hall Pioneers Common Assessment Framework in Georgia and South Caucasus | Georgia’s Public Service Hall is the first public agency in the South Caucasus to introduce the Common Assessment Framework (CAF), a European model of self-assessment and quality improvement in the public sector. The initiative is supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UK Government. On 8 May 2019, Minister of Justice of Georgia, Thea Tsulukiani, presented the progress of launching the CAF model in the Public Service Hall to the public, government and international partners. | 8-May-19 | N/A |
| Introducing accredited training programmes for civil servants | In May 2019, Georgia introduced accreditation of the training programmes for civil servants. Accreditation procedures and guiding principles were discussed at a workshop on 24 May, attended by independent experts and representatives of the Civil Service Bureau of Georgia and the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (NCEQE). | 24 May, 2019 | N/A |
| Fourth National Cyber Olympiad CyberCube 2019 | Up to 120 students from universities and schools across Georgia took part in the Cyber Olympiad CyberCube 2019 organized by the Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT.GOV.GE) of the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia, and supported by UNDP and UK aid. | 31-May-19 | N/A |
| Human-centered approach to transform public services in Georgia | Stink bug management service in Guria and Samegrelo is the first attempt in Georgia to blend human-centered approach with behavioral science to redesign an effective public service that responds to the needs of people. For this experiment, UNDP and UK Government teamed up with the Innovation and Reforms Centre (IRC) and an international consultancy organization “Behavioral Insights Team” (BIT). The insights of this innovative project were discussed at the workshop on 31 October. | 31 October, 2019 | N/A |
| Research on Public Administration Reform | The research examined the level of citizens' trust in public services. It was commissioned by UNDP with funding from the UK Government and was carried out by the Georgian research agency ACT between April and September 2019. Quantitative data, as well as an earlier study from 2016, Public Perceptions of Georgia’s Civil Service, is also available online.  The presentation was attended by Louise Winton, UNDP Resident Representative in Georgia, UK Ambassador to Georgia Justin McKenzie Smith and representatives of various organizations. | 29-Nov-19 | N/A |
| See, Hear, Take a Step - International Day of Persons with Disabilities | Five years after ratifying the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Georgia has yet to fully translate its transformative potential into everyday reality, according to speakers at “See, Hear, Take a Step,” a conference organized by UNDP to mark the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. | 3 December 2019 | N/A |
| Civil Servant Day | Celebrating Georgia’s national Civil Servant Day together with the Civil Service Bureau, Government Administration and over 200 civil servants from across the country. | 19 December, 2019 | N/A |
| CyberExe 2019 | Up to 60 representatives of Georgia’s public and private organizations tested their skills and knowledge in cyber security at the sixth national Cyber Exercise on 20 December. CyberExe 2019 was organized by the Computer Emergency Response Team - CERT.GOV.GE of the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia, and supported by UNDP Georgia and British Embassy Tbilisi, within PAR initiative. | 20 December, 2019 | N/A |
| “Towards Better Inclusive Education” | The presented study examined the impact of public services on the progress and quality of inclusive education in public schools; in particular, the process is analyzed from the perspective of two subprograms of the State Program for the Promotion of Inclusive Teaching – ‘Supporting a Multidisciplinary Team’ and ‘Financing Integrated Classes in Public Schools’. The study was conducted in four different cities: Tbilisi, Telavi, Kutaisi and Batumi. | February 3, 2020 | N/A |
| PAR Council Meetings | Progress on implementation of the Public Administration Reform (PAR) Roadmap and respective Action Plans as well as recommendations and priorities for the new phase of the reform beyond 2020 were presented by AoG and discussed among the PAR stakeholders. The council meetings included the representatives of Government, international and non-government organizations. In total there were four PAR council meetings conducted through 2018-2020. Next PAR Council meeting is expected to be conducted 1st Q of 2021. | 2018- 2020 | N/A |
| Presentation of the new Framework on Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation | The Administration of the Government of Georgia presented a new system in national-level policymaking at the meeting on 28 February, bringing together the representatives from ministries, international and civil society organizations and academia. The new policy planning and coordination system was designed in line with the European principles of Public Administration and is expected to improve the way the government develops, implements and evaluates policies and engages citizens in this process. | February 28, 2020 | N/A |
| Career in Civil Service and Gender Equality | Over 1,000 civil servants took part in UNDP study assessing how gender affects career development and professional growth in the Georgian public sector. Among other findings, 71% of civil servants believe that men advance their careers faster than women. Representatives of the government, civil society, academia and international community discussed the findings and ways to enhance gender equality in civil service. | March 10, 2020 | 100 |
| The Forum of Civil Servants | CSB arranged 21 thematic Civil Servants’ Forum meetings attended by 1,388 female and male civil servants. Sex disaggregated data is not available since vast majority of the forums were conducted online and part of the attendees’ gender could not be identified. Observing the forum participants who were using their cameras during the meetings, the forum can be characterized as female dominant. To track the attendance by gender, CSB will be recommended to use the online registration form for the future forums. Civil Servants’ Forum meetings proved to be a successful platform for enhancing the knowledge civil servants on civil service reform and CSB is planning to continue this effort with the support of another UNDP project. | April 28, 2020 | 1,388 |
| Virtual Workshop on Civil Sector Mediation in Georgia for Workplace & Employment Disputes | Virtual workshop has been held on Civil Sector Mediation in Georgia for Workplace & Employment Disputes, hosted by CSB and UNDP. International Comparative Analysis, and recommendations for Georgia have been presented. | July 15, 2020 | N/A |
| Workshop “PAR Communication Strategy and Tactical Plan” | Presentation on the PAR Strategy and communication strategy provided, as well as the presentation on tactical plan. | October 15, 2020 | N/A |
| Two workshops on Civil Servants’ Perception on Dispute Prevention and Management | Two workshops organized with the participation of the CSB team, human resource managers and civil servants aimed at identification of additional topics for the survey instruments, on civil servants’ perceptions and perspectives on broader workplace dispute prevention and management. | November-December 2020 | N/A |

# Annex K: Policy Research Studies, Civil Society Grants, Other Research, Guides, Publications and Videos

|  | Subject | Brief Description | Partner | Start/End Dates | Result and/or Next Step |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **CSO grants** |  |  |  |
| 1 | “Day Care Standards for People with Disabilities” – Child, Family, Society (Civic Initiative Grant) | Comprehensive needs assessment and review of current standards and reimbursement rate structure for day care services in Georgia conducted; Set of recommendations for enhancement of standards of day care services elaborated. | Child, Family, Society | 15-Mar-17 - 15-Sep-17 | The grant component aimed at increasing the capacity of sub-grantees, it has contributed to engaging the civil society organizations in PAR to deliver further expertise of high empirical value now and in the future. |
| 2 | “Improving Public Service Delivery Practices in the Local Government Context” – Innovation and Reforms Centre (IRC) (Civic Initiative Grant) (Phase 1)  “Introduction of Quality Public Service Delivery Practices in the Local Government Context” - Innovation and Reforms Center (IRC) (Civic Initiative Grant) (Phase 2) | 1st phase of the initiative aimed to: Identify problems in three most crucial services of TAS and develop customer feedback report; Map human resources, key competences, ICT and physical infrastructure directly related to the provision of pre-defined three services; Map key business processes in “as is” format - detailed business process descriptions of pre-defined three services; Develop the Optimal Service Model for delivery of pre-defined three services and its presentation.  2nd phase of the initiative aimed to: Improve organizational capacity of TAS; Improve HR management in the context of three pre-defined services; Enhance operational capacities of TAS; Introduce one-stop-shop principle in relation to the services of city departments and companies owning engineering and utility networks | IRC | 15-Mar-17 - 1-Aug-17  13-Dec-18 - 13-Dec-19 | Mapping of human resources and key competencies, ICT and physical infrastructure has been carried out. The description of the business processes related to the three predefined services has been ensured. The description reflected a real picture, applied in practice and not necessarily defined by the normative acts. The vision and the ways for introduction of the optimal service model were elaborated and submitted to TAS for further decision making.  As a result of the 2nd phase of the initiative TAS established an M&E unit limiting its operations to internal auditing only. |
| 3 | “Increasing Effectiveness of Local Governance Using Innovative Mechanisms to Inform the Local Public”- Young Scientists Club of Ozurgeti (Civic Initiative Grant) | Main aim of the initiative was to Introduce SMS system and increase capacities of general public in Lanchkhuti and Chokhatauri on using government internet resources; Establish civic engagement centers in 6 rural areas, to ensure live broadcast of Municipality Assembly meetings and to increase access to public information. | Young Scientists Club of Ozurgeti | 1-Mar-17 - 31-Dec-17 | The project led to increased community awareness on local government activities in Lanchkhuti and Chokhatauri municipalities through the introduction of innovative mechanisms of community participation (SMS system, live broadcast of Municipality Assembly meetings). |
| 4 | ”CSOs Support to Public Administration Reforms (PAR) in Georgia” – Civil Development Agency (CiDA) (Civic Initiative Grant) | Main goal of the initiative was to increase skills, knowledge, and capacity of R-CSN members of PAR implementation and monitoring; Increase the level of awareness of the public sector, private businesses and general public on PAR implementation and monitoring. | CiDA | 1-Mar-17 - 31-Dec-17 | The initiative can be assessed as important contribution to PAR awareness raising as it engaged R-CSN member organizations, that on their part engaged representative of self-governments. |
| 5 | “Public-Civil Cooperation for Improved Service Delivery” - Gori Information Center - Shida Kartli Hub (GIC) (Civic Initiative Grant) | Initiative aimed to: facilitate improvement of service planning, design and delivery processes in Gori Municipality through 1) Conducting qualitative and quantitative research which will cover a) scope and coverage of the services; b) service design process and policies; c) level of public awareness of the services offered; d) relevance of services to the needs of community. | GIC | 1-May-18 - 30-Apr-19 | The research findings on “Local Services in Gori Municipality: Practice, Attitudes and Perceptions” provided evidence-based information and created a unique opportunity to respond to the actual needs of local communities through developing evidence-based solutions. The research also established the baseline value and can serve as a useful tool for measuring future progress.  The initiative delivered short-term (improved service listing on the website) and long term outcomes (potential for higher impact over time, since the research can be replicate and the highly collaborative nature between the non-profit and government sectors, possibly contributing to significant further cooperation and mutual projects with greater impact). |
| 6 | “Building the bridge between communities and local governments” - Iare Pekhit (WALK) (Civic Initiative Grant) | Initiative aimed to: empower citizens by providing better tools (i.e. an activist toolkit) and know-how to advocate for a safer, more inclusive and attractive built environment for everyone. Engage local authorities with the citizens as well as implementation of community driven small, but impactful initiatives. | WALK | 1-May-18 - 27-Feb-19 | The grant aimed at increasing the capacity of sub-grantees, it has contributed to engaging the civil society organizations in PAR to deliver further expertise of high empirical value now and in the future. |
| 7 | “Supporting Establishment of a Professional Development System in Georgia” -  Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI)  (Research Grant) | Conduct a comprehensive analysis of existing practices and gaps related to the professional development of civil servants and assist the CSB in the formulation of policy solutions. | IDFI | 15-May-18 - 15-Nov-18 | The grant component aimed at increasing the capacity of sub-grantees, it has contributed to engaging the civil society organizations in PAR to deliver further expertise of high empirical value now and in the future. |
| 8 | “Implementing Public Service Design and Delivery Standards in the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia” - Innovations and Reforms Center (IRC) (Civic Initiative Grant) | Enhance the efficiency of services provided by the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture through the introduction of standardized, user-centered service design and delivery system. | IRC | 1-May-18 - 1-Mar-18 | As a result of the project “Improving Perfor­mance of National Food Agency in Deliver­ing of the Stink Bug Management Service through Applying Behavioral Approach”, behaviorally informed intervention con­cept has been elaborated. Specifically, the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture’s existing hotline was adapted to become a more effective and accessible resource for dispensing personalized advice and encouraging collective action against stink bugs and behaviorally informed mate­rials were distributed to advertise and en­courage uptake of the hotline. As a result, 85 more hotline calls came from residents in villages that received behaviorally informed SMS messages and flyers advertising the hotline than came from residents in villages that did not receive these materials. Indi­viduals who were in villages that received behaviorally informed advertisement ma­terials were 12.38 times more likely to call the hotline than individuals in villages that did not receive them. This pilot project of re-designing the Stink Bug Management Service is the first case in Georgia when a human-centered approach and behavioral science were used in parallel in the process of public service design. |
| 9 | “Training and Development of Civil Servants in Georgian Public Sector” - Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA) (Research Grant) | Analyze different models for training and development in public sector, their advantages and disadvantages and their relevance to the Georgian context. | GIPA | 9-Mar-17 - 8-Aug-17 | The paper outlines the vision of training providers and beneficiaries (civil servants) on establishment of professional development model in the public sector (centralized, decentralized or semi-centralized) based on the requirements of the Georgian Law on Civil Service. The paper was shared with the CSB for its possible consideration in the process of creating professional development model for public servants. |
| 10 | “Challenges of the Georgian Bureaucratic System in the Context of Public Administration Reform” - Institute For Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI) (Research Grant) | Study the state of government bureaucracy and, more specifically, administrative expenses in 2011-2016 for the purpose of identifying existing problems and challenges. | IDFI | 9-Mar-17 - 8-Aug-17 | The research provides interesting and useful data on administrative costs and spending - the area that requires permanent monitoring and research. The government optimization process was announced after this study has been published and it can be assumed that the study findings laid a solid basis for the optimization process. This can be especially true as some of the recommendations presented in the study, such as restriction on bonuses and salary supplements, found itself in the modified policy. |
| 11 | “What Is the Potential of Blockchain Technologies in Responding to the Challenges in Public Services and Public Administration in Georgia” - Innovation and Reforms Center (IRC) (Research Grant) | Investigate if the Georgian public sector can benefit from the blockchain and what is needed to translate expected benefits into practice. | IRC | 1-May-18 - 1-Sep-18 | The study offers a critical assessment of the utility and effectiveness of the block-chain technology – promoted by the government - in service delivery. |
| 12 | “Provision of Public Services and Effectiveness of Ethnic Minority Engagement in Georgia” - BTKK - Policy Research Group (Research Grant) | Address two major directions of ethnic minority engagement, one on how well do ethnic minorities understand and use the services provided by the Public Service Hall of the Ministry of Justice of Georgia and second, how much information (quantitative and qualitative) do they receive through public broadcaster in their native languages and the official information channels of the government dedicated specially to ethnic minorities. | BTKK - Policy Research Group | 2018 | The study examined policy documents and practices to assess the extent to which the public service delivery is tailored to the needs of ethnic minorities, and to what extent the practices can be improved to augment their engagement in public policy process. |
| 13 | “Social Agents as Street-level Policy Makers: Research and Recommendations” - Center for Study of Social Practices (CSSP) (Research Grant) | Social Agents as Street Level Policy Makers: Research and Recommendations” by the Centre for Study of Social Practices (CSSP) aims to develop a policy document studying everyday work strategies of social agents working in Targeted Social Assistance Program and developing recommendations for the Social Service Agency about possible ways of efficiency improvements. The innovative project takes the principal-agent framework for analyzing the evidence and practices of service provision. It aims at studying the gap in the quality social services provision as opposed to other public services which was made apparent during the baseline study. | CSSP | 6-Dec-17 - 6-May-18 | The study found that although social agents acknowledge many problems, including, in many cases, a less than adequate conceptualization of poverty, they do little to avoid formal regulations. Collecting information about households to supplement formal indicators included in the official procedure is the most significant informal practice they are involved in. Also, many social agents think that giving them back some degree of formal discretionary power would improve targeting, as they would be able to make a more nuanced and detail-based judgment of a household’s welfare level. Recommendations include the restoration of discretion into the Program, improvement of the agent’s working conditions, and a more active information campaign from the side of the Ministry to explain the main functioning principles of the Program to the population. |
| 14 | “Management and effective resolution of workplace disputes within the public agencies of Georgia” - New Vision University (NVU) (Research Grant) | “Management and Effective Resolution of Workplace Disputes within the Public Agencies of Georgia” by New Vision University (NVU), aims to examine current practices, models, challenges and gaps in the resolution of workplace disputes in the public agencies of Georgia. The outputs of the study provides evidence-based support to the discussion on alternative dispute resolution under output indicator 2.4. The research covered nine government agencies and included 48 interviews in total. | NVU | 6-Dec-17 - 6-May-18 | The research provides a very good evidence on existing problems and challenges in civil service associated with the lack of ADR mechanisms. |
| 15 | ‘Improving State Services Supporting the Employment of Persons with Disabilities in Georgia”, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (Disability Research Center (DRC) (Research Grant) | The main aim of the initiative was to: map the services supporting inclusive education in Georgia provided by the central and local governments; analyze educational needs of persons with disabilities in Georgia across the age and type of disability and explore how these needs are met by the existing state services; Analyze the relevant experience of Poland and Germany and learn their best practices that can be taken into consideration whilst working on the research recommendations. | DRC | 16-Jul-19 - 30-Dec-19 | The study explored the effectiveness of the current policies for employment of the persons with disabilities, and developed recommendations for further improving the targeted services, based on UK experience. Research may have contributed to the cumulative effect of various stakeholder efforts that eventually resulted in the relevant policy changes. The study has strengthened TSU’s engagement this dimension as one of the major areas of its research activities and it plans to continue conducting more specific studies in the field. |
| 16 | “Improving State Services Supporting Inclusive Education in Georgia” - Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (Disability Research Center (DRC) (Research Grant) | Map the services supporting inclusive education in Georgia provided by the central and local governments; Analyze educational needs of persons with disabilities in Georgia across the age and type of disability and explore how these needs are met by the existing state services; Analyze the relevant experience of Poland and Germany and learn their best practices that can be taken into consideration whilst working on the research  recommendations. | DRC | 2019-2020 | The study demonstrated that the number of students with special educational needs increases in Georgian schools, bringing the long time tendency of social seclusion of children with disabilities to its end. |
| 17 | “‘Political Independence of Civil Servants and the Role of a Senior Civil Servant” - Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA) – (Research Grant) | The study ‘Political Independence of Civil Servants and the Role of a Senior Civil Servant’ presents an overview of senior civil servant position and its institutional setup in select European countries and provides basis for possible implementation of similar reform in Georgia. The report covers senior civil servant models deployed in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Estonia, Belgium, Lithuania, and Latvia. It also discusses the uneven experiences of the countries of the Western Balkans (Albania, The Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina) as well as Ukraine. | GIPA | 16-Jul-19 - 30-Dec-19 | The report proposed recommendations to decision-makers and stakeholders involved in public sector reform and specifically civil service reform, highlighting the issues that need to be considered and reviewed prior to introduction the of Senior Civil Servant institute. The study findings enabled to continue a strategic dialogue and supported internal consultations at CSB concerning the feasibility of introducing this mechanism. |
| 18 | “Career in Civil Service and Gender Equality”- Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI) (Research Grant) | The research aimed to identify the key ways in which gender determines differences in career paths and the extent to which these differences are perceived as detrimental to the individual civil servants and the civil service as a whole. | IDFI | 16-Jul-19 - 30-Dec-19 | The study can be considered as one of the first systemic attempts at studying the element of gender in civil service in an in-depth fashion. Study results prove that female and male managers at civil service have contrasting career paths. The differences are reflected in various cultural practices, which determine gender inequality at civil service. Results bring forward the invisible barriers, cultural practices and hierarchies. The findings will help policymakers better address the systemic and cultural constraints that result in the “glass ceiling” existing in the public sector. PAR Project, together with Civic Service Bureau, will consider the findings of the study while planning the future collaborations to address the gaps identified in the study. |
| 19 | “Perceptions and attitudes towards Performance  Appraisal systems among civil  Servants” – Ilia State University Ilia State University (ISU) (Research Grant) | The study aimed to explore perceptions and attitudes of civil servants - mid- and low-level (2nd, 3rd and 4th ranks), - as well as HRs, towards performance appraisal in the selected line ministries. | ISU | 17-Jul-19 - 30-Dec-19 | The study indicated that all groups of respondents perceive the introductionof the performance appraisal system in the civil service of Georgia as a necessary step; however, there was some skepticism towards the implemented processes. The latter included lack of legal and factual consequences of the performance appraisal, different approaches used during scoring, a lack of feedback, etc. The research provided a very good evidence and overview on existing challenges as well as good practices of performance appraisal systems in civil service based on detailed analysis of selected ministries. |
| 20 | Digital learning readiness assessment – supporting the shift to online learning in Georgian public sector - PMC Research (Research Grant) | The study aims to assess: a) civil servants' readiness to adopt technology in their daily work (behavioral and cognitive competence); b) willingness, concerns, and anticipations of public servants regarding digital learning ; c) shortcomings of face-to-face professional development courses; d) possible challenges and risks of the shift to online learning (including those faced by ethnic minorities). | PMC Research | 2020-2021 | As a result of the study, recommendations for integrating digital learning into organizational culture of public organizations will be elaborated, possible challenges and risks of the shift to online learning will be assessed and respective mitigation strategies will be drafted. The study findings will be integrated into the online learning platform concept. The concept of the platform is currently under development and will be finalized by March 15. |
| 21 | The challenges in provision of services to women victims of domestic violence by the Ministry of Internal Affairs during Covid-19 – Sapari (Research Grant) | The purpose of the grant is to support the improvement of services provided by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia to women victims of domestic violence. The specific focus of the project is to analyze the provision of these services to the target group during the Covid-19 pandemic and as a result, develop recommendations that will improve service delivery process in future. For this aim, the Union Sapari will conduct sociological research and develop a comprehensive analysis of services in question. The research process will include: i) an analysis of attitudes of victims of domestic violence in relation to the work of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Emergency Service – 112 during the pandemic; as well as ii) an identification of challenges and gaps in the process of combating domestic violence by these two institutions. | Sapari | 2020-2021 | The study will analyze the provision of the services to the women victims of domestic violence during the Covid-19 pandemic and as a result, develop recommendations that will improve service delivery process in future |
| 22 | Assessing Public Participation in Policy Making Process – WeResearch (Research Grant) | The main purpose of the grant is to support research aiming to evaluate public participation aspect of the selected policy documents from 2020 cohort. | WeResearch | 2020-2021 | The study will assess how public agencies follow the public participation component of the unified policy methodological framework. Namely, the framework makes it mandatory for public agencies to conduct public consultations on strategic policy documents before their approval. WeResearch will evaluate compliance to the regulation, analyze the quality and usefulness of public participation and identify existing gaps. As a part of the study, an index for measuring the public participation element in the policy making process was developed. Index can serve as an effective tool to measure public engagement in the future. |
| 23 | Support expansion of the home care services throughout Georgia targeting the most at-risk people affected by the COVID-19 - Georgia Red Cross Society (C-19 Response Grant) | PAR project supported Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) to expand its home care services throughout Georgia targeting the most at-risk people affected by the COVID-19. The initiative aimed to contribute to improving the quality of life of the elderly and vulnerable people. | Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) | May – October 2020 | Following results were achieved: 1/ Professional and community-based home care services are provided by GRCS in targeted locations: Tbilisi and 29 municipalities. 2/ Program for online learning platform for home care staff, volunteers and informal caregivers is developed and launched; 3/ Capacity of Georgia Red Cross home care caregivers, volunteers, and informal caregivers in the provision of both professional and community -based home care strengthened. As a result of the project implementation, GRCS delivered, information and counselling to more than 5,000 elderly and vulnerable persons (5716) in 30 regional locations through a network of more than 600 caregivers and volunteers. GRCS facilitated the process of establishing 150 Self-Support Groups (SSG) with over 30 SSG members each involved in HC. Moreover 22 600 leaflets and 1200 booklets on COVID-19 were developed, published, and distributed to the 30 municipalities. |
| 24 | Development and Deployment of National Risk Communication Strategy for Public Health Emergencies in Georgia – UNAG (C-19 Response Grant) | The project supported the Government of Georgia and particularly the National Center for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC) of Georgia in developing the National Risk Communication Strategy for the NCDC based on the guidelines of the World Health Organization and best international practices to serve as a guidance for public health emergencies. | UN Association of Georgia (UNAG) | May – December 2020 | As part of the Risk Communication Strategy deployment activities, UNAG, jointly with NCDC, facilitated a series of online trainings on key guidelines of the Strategy for up to 200 local government and public health centre representatives across 52 municipalities and 9 regions, including Tbilisi. In addition, UNAG developed multiple videos with healthcare workers’ participation to promote the key guiding principles of the Strategy among the broader public to be disseminated via NCDC channels. |

**Other Major Research, Guides, Publications and Videos**

|  | Subject | Brief description | Partner | Start/End Dates | Result and/or Next Step |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Other Major Research | | | | | |
| 1 | Public attitudes towards Public Administration Reform (Baseline Study) | The project has contracted a local polling and research company for conducting the baseline survey, serving as a quantitative basis for updating the project Results Framework and for revising the project interventions. The Baseline Survey solicited relevant information from civil servants as well as the general public in the PAR context. | ACT, AoG | 2016-2017 | The findings of the study provided a good understanding of the context. The findings were integrated into the results framework of the project for monitoring and evaluation purposes. |
| 2 | Case Study Report on Public Service Delivery Monitoring and New Service Development Processes in Service Delivery Agencies in Georgia | The Case Study conducted by a local expert focused on public service quality monitoring practices and on the business processes related to creating new services as practiced in the Georgian public service. | PSDA | 2017 | The case study was used while developing the policy on Public Service Design and Delivery Policy Document (PSDD) |
| 3 | Public Service Delivery Baseline Assessment | The international and local experts hired by the project have developed the Georgian Public Service Delivery Baseline Assessment Report. The report provides an in-depth overview of the public service delivery practices in Georgia and by studying the design, delivery, pricing and quality assurance dimensions, highlights the best practices and the existing gaps. | PSDA | 2018 | The Public Service Delivery Baseline Assessment served as a basis for developing Public Service Design and Delivery Policy Document (PSDD). This was the first document of its kind developed in Georgia. Its comprehensive character set the stage for the government to holistically approach the public service delivery within the context of PAR. |
| 4 | Policy Planning Needs Assessment Report | The assessment was produced as part of the sub-project ‘Training and Consultation Support (TCS)’ aiming to increase capacity of ministries' policy units in public policy analysis and thus improve the policy making process in the country, strengthen the link between policy planning and budgeting, enhance the nexus between policy planning and implementation and build strong mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating and accountability.  The needs assessment report comprised of two elements - Staff Capacity Assessment (through Self-Assessment and Independent External Assessment) and Policy Planning Assessment of all the line ministries in Georgia. | AoG, GEC | 2018 | The report served as a basis for developing the training and consultancy support package to the line ministries including the training programme for Public Policy Analysis for civil servants supported by PAR project through 2018-2020. |
| 5 | Public attitudes towards Public Administration Reform (Midterm Study) | The project solicited a country-wide study, which was administered by a research com­pany ACT. During the research the midterm progress of public administration reform was assessed in the areas of policy development and cooperation, civil service and human resource management and service delivery. The company polled citizens and civil ser­vants, undertook literature and policy re­search to collect comprehensive data, com­parable with the baseline study conducted by the same company in 2016. | ACT, AoG | 2019 | The study results provided a snapshot of the developments and attitudes of both public and civil servants through generating some comparable data against baseline study and informed project activities as well as contributed to revision of project’s Results Framework. |
| 6 | A concept paper on the introduction of coaching and/or mentoring methods in the Georgian civil service | A concept paper on the introduction of coaching and/or mentoring methods in the Georgian civil service has been elaborated, based on the findings of the pilot research. Two ministries – Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia and Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia were selected for piloting Coaching and Mentoring practices. A study was completed, concerning the various motivational schemes necessary to improve the working environment in the Civil Service. It was complemented by research on existing practices towards planning the workforce. | CSB, MoESD, MRDI | 2020 | Based on the research on Mentoring and Coaching in Civil Service the concept paper on introduction of the coaching and/or mentoring methods was developed, resulting in creating initial mentoring programmes for newcomers in two pilot ministries. |
| 7 | Comparative Study on Mediation and Dispute Management in Public Service | International Expert on Mediation and Dispute Management in Public Service has been hired to elaborate the comparative study, providing recommendations for concrete mechanisms relevant for Georgian civil service. | CSB | March 2020 | The recommendations suggested by the study are expected to be used by CSB during planning of the next steps in regards with ADR introduction in civil service. |
| Guides/Publications/Videos | | | | | |
| 1 | Guidelines on the novelties of CSR and Anti-Corruption regulations | To enhance the culture of integrity among civil servants, the “General Code of Ethics and Conduct for Civil Service” was adopted on 20 April 2017. The amended Law on Conflict of Interests and Corruption in Civil Service and the newly adopted Code of Ethics outlined the basic integrity principles that would enhance the level of accountability among civil servants and strengthen anti-corruption tools in the civil service. Following the amendments, CSB initiated elaboration of guidelines on the novelties of CSR and Anti-Corruption regulations. | CSB | 2017 | Guidelines to the new LCS coupled with additional capacity-building activities enhanced general knowledge and skills regarding the new Law and by-laws. Furthermore, the Handbook served as an excellent tool for analyzing cases in practice. |
| 2 | Handbook on Ethics and Code of Conduct in Civil Service | In 2015, the first edition of the “Handbook on Ethics and Code of Conduct on Civil Service” was developed by the CSB. The Handbook included the duties and responsibilities of civil servants and public officials, outlines the basic ethical standards for civil service members, and illustrates practical exercises, checklists and case studies based on the legislative and organizational framework of the civil service in Georgia. Following the amendments in to the code CSB initiated elaboration of practical guidelines on a) the new LCS and b) the newly adopted Code of Ethics and c) update the Handbook on Ethics and Code of Conduct in Civil Service in line with new legislation. | CSB | 2017 | The Code of Ethics guidelines supports preserving integrity in public institutions, manage conflict of interest and incompatibility cases, and ensure compliance with ethical standards. Guidelines to the new LCS coupled with additional capacity-building activities further enhanced general knowledge and skills regarding the new Law and by-laws. Furthermore, the Handbook served as an excellent tool for analyzing cases in practice. |
| 3 | Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook | In 2018 the project team facilitated the improvement of the existing policy monitoring framework of the Government. Namely, based on a comprehensive assessment of existing performance tracking, monitoring and evaluation systems performed by local and international experts as well as six working meetings conducted among 15 public agencies, a new Glossary of Terms and a new Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook were developed. | AoG  International/local experts | 2018-2019 | The Guide draws mostly on OECD/SIGMA methodology, including its 2018 Baseline Measurement Report on Policy Development and Coordination in Georgia. With the support of the project team, the AoG has finalized the methodological guidelines (Hand­book) on Policy Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation, along with “Rule on Develop­ment, Monitoring and Evaluation of Poli­cy Documents,” which introduced a whole-of-Government approach in nation­al-level policy making approved by Government in December 2019 with a Decree # 629. |
| 4 | Guidelines on reorganization, disciplinary proceedings, gifts, institutional arrangements and the conflict of interest | CSB elaborated five detailed guidelines for civil servants on: reorganization, disciplinary proceedings, gifts, institutional arrangements and the conflict of interest in public organizations. | CSB | 2018 | The guidelines served as a useful tool to provide both theoretical and hands-on information and useful instructions to HR professionals and civil servants on the selected topics and procedures introduced along with the civil service reform and the new Civil Service Law. |
| 5 | Set of publications on performance appraisal | The project team has developed a set of publications including: (1) Handbook of Performance Appraisal System in Civil Service, (2) Guide on Self-evaluation Techniques, (3) Perception Study on Performance Appraisal conducted Among Civil Servants and (4) four video tutorials on goals and major stages of the performance appraisal process. | CSB | 2018-2019 | The guidelines and video served as a useful tool to provide both theoretical and hands-on information and useful instructions to HR professionals and civil servants on the selected topics and procedures introduced along with the civil service reform and the new Civil Service Law. |
| 6 | Handbook on Professional Development of Civil Servant | In May 2018, the Government of Georgia adopted a Decree on “Standards and Rules of Professional Development of Civil Servants” developed by the CSB. With the aim to support other public agencies in implementation of this new Decree, the CSB has requested the project a consultancy support of local experts in developing a detailed methodology for the assessment of professional development needs in the public sector. | CSB | 2018 | In order to support the establishment of a professional, career based civil service, with a unified system and universal standards for civil servants’ professional development local consultants have developed a handbook on professional development of a civil servant. Apart from the handbook development, the consultants have elaborated forms, sample questionnaires and a list of available resources for professional development as well as relevant examples for the civil service context. This has served as practical toolkits for the line ministries and especially their HR Units. |
| 7 | Handbook on Execution of the Training Accreditation | The project consultant supported the preparation of the Training Accreditation Handbook drafting process with the focus on legal issues. | CSB, NCEQE | August – December 2018 | The aim to develop the handbook on execution of the training accreditation was to ensure that all the stakeholders of this process – Accreditation Council members, Experts’ Corp and training providers – know how to execute the policy and procedures to get through the training accreditation process and in this way ensure the quality control of Civil Servants’ training programs. |
| 8 | Handbooks for two courses from the mandatory training program - “Effective Communication” and “Effective Service Delivery” | Handbooks aimed at supporting the public and private training providers while preparing their programs for selected courses for the accreditation in a standardized manner. | CSB | 2019 | To further support the training standardization processes, the project team facilitated the development of curriculum outlines and topical guides (handbooks) for two courses from the mandatory training  program - “Effective Communication” and “Effective Service Delivery”. |
| 9 | The book “E-Georgia: Decades of Successful Transition” | The book “E-Georgia: Decades of Successful Transition” was published and disseminated widely. The book describes reforms and success of Georgia in the field of e-Gov­ernance. | DGA | 2019 | The publication has been dissem­inated among the relevant stakeholders locally as well as internationally (including through UNDP Kazakhstan Astana Regional Civil Service Hub). |
| 10 | Guidebooks and training materials in service design, service delivery, customer satisfaction surveying, Common Assessment Framework and costing of public services. | Five local and international experts contracted by the project to develop guidebooks and training materials in service design, service deliv­ery, quality control and costing of public services. | PSDA | 2020 | International expert in service design, local expert in service delivery, local expert in quality (namely, customer satisfaction component of qual­ity control), international and local experts in costing of public services have prepared five methodological guidelines and training materials. In addition, local legal expert has been contracted to analyze legal framework related to design and delivery of public services and provide recommendations. |
| 11 | Business Analysis Document of the Government-wide E-System for Policy Planning & Monitoring | A business analysis document of the Government-wide E-System for Policy Planning & Monitoring has been prepared | DGA, AoG | 2020 | Business analysis document of the Government-wide E-System for Policy Planning & Monitoring has been widely discussed with the project stakeholders including Academia and CSOs and will serve as a basis for the M&E platform development (IT development work). |
| 12 | The guidebook on Management and Leadership in Civil Service | The guidebook on Management and Leadership in Civil Service was developed by the Civil Service Bureau, covering aspects of effective leader, leader-subordinate relationships and organizational issues in civil service | CSB | June 2020 | In order to enhance knowledge on management and leadership issues within civil service the Guidebook on Management and Leadership was developed with the involvement of 13 local experts. The guidebooks were printed (1710 copies) and provided to the managers from all respective ministries/agencies. |
| 13 | Video on online services available on my.gov.ge | DGA created and disseminated a video about services available online on My.gov.ge, encouraging citizens to use the portal during the COVID-19 lockdown | DGA | 2020 | N/A |
| 14 | Guidebooks for serving PwDs in Public Service Hall | Guidebooks for serving PwDs in Public Service Hall included: detailed guidelines on detecting and reacting to possible citizen rights’ violations and for serving persons with psychosocial needs in Public Service Halls across Georgia | PSH | 2020 | The guidebooks were developed as a result of in-depth analysis of over 400 services provided by the Public Service Halls exploring the procedural and legal challenges PwDs or persons with phycological needs face while receiving public services through these one-stop-shop channels |
| 15 | Concept of the E-Learning Platform for Georgian Civil Servants | International expert developed a conceptual architecture of the platform in close cooperation with the CSB and other relevant stakeholders, such as human resource managers, representatives of training providers, civil servants and other key actors. | CSB, | 2020 | The concept will contribute to finalization of the detailed technical documentation being prepared as a basis for the platform development work (IT development work). |
| 16 | Research document on Civil Servant’s Perceptions and Perspectives on Workplace Dispute Prevention and Management | To contribute to the stimulation of discussions on mediation and enhancement of dispute prevention and management processes in Georgia, the need for comprehensive research on civil servants’ perceptions on dispute prevention and management has been raised and relevant study was administered through a local researcher | CSB | November - December 2020 | An in-depth research document has been elaborated on civil servants’ perceptions and perspectives on broader workplace dispute prevention and management. |
| 17 | Methodological Concept Development of the E-Learning Platform for Civil Servants | Local consultant is working on the outline of the concept document (a detailed methodological overview of the platform), for creation of a learning, information-sharing and personnel development platform for the civil servants in Georgia. | CSB | December 2020 - March 2021 | The concept will contribute to finalization of the detailed technical documentation being prepared as a basis for the platform development work (IT development work) |
| 18 | Concept on the staff appraisal system in the Administration of the Government of Georgia | Consultant hired for the development of a Performance Appraisal System in AoG, elaborated the concept of the staff appraisal system; basic criteria, procedures and forms for a selected model of staff appraisal system. | AoG | August 2020  March 2021 | The concept will serve as a guidance for AoG to move forward with the refining and further improving the staff performance appraisal system within the AoG. |
| 19 | Research on the Mandatory Training Programs for Civil Servants | In 2018, the Government of Georgia adopted the Decree N242 on “Professional Standards and Training Delivery Rules and Procedures for Civil Servants”. According to this by-law, CSB and NCEQE were assigned to set an accreditation system for civil servants’ training programs. In 2019, a new legislative framework creating unified standards for professional development, needs’ identification, and accreditation of mandatory training programs was developed by these institutions. Since then, at least five public and private training providers have received accreditation of their respective programs and more than 1000 civil servants were trained in the past two years. However, throughout the implementation, a need to analyze the conducted training sessions to further improve their quality and also increase civil servants’ satisfaction has been identified. | CSB, NCEQE | February 2020  March 2021 | Local consultant is assessing the effectiveness of mandatory training programs conducted by accredited training providers for civil servants in 2019-2020, in close collaboration with the local consultant for Improving Accreditation Standards and Procedures for Professional Development Programs of Civil Servants, CSB and NCEQE. As a result of the research, detailed recommendations will be elaborated to inform preparation of legal amendments to the Accreditation Statute and Government Decree N242, based on the detailed analysis of the existing regulatory framework in close cooperation with the CSB. |
| 20 | Comprehensive analysis document on the performance appraisal results | In order to support improvement of the existing models of performance appraisal comprehensive analysis document on the performance appraisal results was drafted by a local consultant. | MoILHSA, MoESD | November 2020 December 2020 | In order to support improvement of the existing models of performance appraisal, enhancing systems of professional development of civil servants, and increasing the capacities of the line managers in these areas, a comprehensive analysis document on the performance appraisal results and respective recommendations has been elaborated. |
| 21 | Concept on the Value, Potential, Limits and Relevance of Mediation | The GoG is currently confronted with an increased number of disputes raised in the public service. Traditional court litigation, serving as a significant instrument for resolving conflicts in public service, is far too time-consuming for addressing underlying problems promptly and effectively. Therefore, there is a clear need to develop a more diverse and sustainable system of civil service dispute resolution in Georgia, define clear guidelines on dispute management and promote the usage of alternative dispute resolution methods. With this aim, PAR project supports CSB in analyzing workplace disputes and developing relevant recommendations for further improvements in the given area, throughout recent years. | CSB | September 2020 March 2021 | The concept will be drawn upon the study of civil servants’ perceptions and attitudes, existing challenges as well as reflect the relevant legislative framework and will further contribute to better dispute prevention and management processes in Georgia and increase awareness of civil servants thereon. It will also serve as a basis for CSB to plan concrete measures to introduce ADR in civil service throughout 2021 and beyond. |
| 22 | Promotional Videos for National Risk Communication Strategy | UNAG collaborated with “Pulse TV” to produce feature reports on the strategy development (original story ran amid the July 16 conference) and 6 instructional/educational videos, including one full tutorial video (12 minutes) for project’s training participants and future users of the strategy/guideline. Mixed-format videos, ranging from ten 1-minute public service announcements to full-scale tutorials, feature prominent doctors and public health professionals, who communicate the key messages, tasks and priorities from the strategy/guideline document in these videos. | UNAG, NCDC | July – December 2020 | UNAG developed multiple videos with healthcare workers’ participation to promote the key guiding principles of the Strategy among the broader public to be disseminated via NCDC [channels](https://www.youtube.com/user/NCDCGeorgia/videos). |

# Annex L: Project Supported e-Services

| **#** | **Service Delivery Agency** | **Service** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | PSDA | Issuing duplicates of Identity Document (ID) |  |  |  |  | 227,931 |
| 2 | PSDA | Birth and Death Certificates |  |  |  |  | 126,922 |
| 3 | PSDA | Issuing duplicates of Passport |  |  |  |  | 96,583 |
| 4 | PSDA | Residence Certificate |  |  |  |  | 3,822 |
| 5 | PSDA | Registration of change of name or/and surname |  |  |  |  | 3,058 |
| 6 | PSDA | Information Note |  |  |  |  | 6,760 |
| 7 | PSDA | Certificate on the Number of Residents |  |  |  |  | 2,661 |
| 8 | PSDA | Registering the change of name/surname |  |  |  |  | 546 |
| 9 | PSDA | Status-Neutral ID |  |  |  |  | 4,930 |
| 10 | PSDA | Certificate on Absence of Circumstances Impedimental to Marriage |  |  |  |  | 5,229 |
| 11 | PSDA | Consent to the issues of the PSDA |  |  |  |  | 1,177 |
| 12 | PSDA | Acquisition of Georgian citizenship |  |  |  |  | 1,265 |
| 13 | PSDA | Retention of Georgian citizenship |  |  |  |  | 2,247 |
| 14 | PSDA | Granting citizenship of Georgia through an exempted rule |  |  |  |  | 1,007 |
| 15 | PSDA | Registration of the power of attorney on PSDA matters |  |  |  |  | 1,561 |
| 16 | PSDA | Emigration Permit |  |  |  |  | 590 |
| 17 | PSDA | Abandonment of Citizenship of Georgia |  |  |  |  | 479 |
| 18 | PSDA | Award of citizenship of Georgia under restoration procedure |  |  |  |  | 985 |
| 19 | PSDA | Granting a status of compatriot residing abroad |  |  |  |  | 428 |
| 20 | PSDA | Registration of a person living in the occupied territories and assignment of a personal number |  |  |  |  | 354 |
| 21 | PSDA | Status-neutral Travel Document |  |  |  |  | 474 |
| 22 | PSDA | Postponing the obligation to leave Georgia |  |  |  |  | 566 |
| 23 | PSDA | Marriage Registration |  |  |  |  | 2,313 |
| 24 | PSDA | Divorce Registration |  |  |  |  | 237 |
| 25 | PSDA | Registration of Established Paternity |  |  |  |  | 347 |
| 26 | PSDA | Registration of Change of Name or/and Surname |  |  |  |  | 58 |
| 27 | PSDA | Registration of Birth |  |  |  |  | 3,429 |
| 28 | PSDA | Death Registration |  |  |  |  | 163 |
| 29 | PSDA | Passport |  |  |  |  | 3,857 |
| 30 | PSDA | Certificate on the Number of Residents |  |  |  |  | 776 |
| 31 | PSDA | Civil acts Registration Certificates |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| 32 | PSDA | Electronic Apostille |  |  |  |  | 5,474 |
| 33 | PSDA | Electronic Register of the PSDA |  |  |  |  | 7,205 |
| 34 | PSDA | Apostille and Legalization e-Register |  |  |  |  | 731 |
| 35 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of the Extract from the Registry of Entrepreneurial and Non-entrepreneurial (Non-commercial) Legal Entities |  |  |  | 6 | 94 |
| 36 | National Agency of Public Registry | Electronic issuance of copies of documents |  |  |  | 3 | 19 |
| 37 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information from the Registry of Entrepreneurial and Non-entrepreneurial (Non-commercial) Legal Entities |  |  |  | 3 | 31 |
| 38 | National Agency of Public Registry | Cancellation of Registration |  |  |  | 5 | 23 |
| 39 | National Agency of Public Registry | Change of Identification Details |  |  |  | 3 | 8 |
| 40 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Changes in the Registration Records |  |  |  | 7 | 122 |
| 41 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Commence of Entity’s Reorganization |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 42 | National Agency of Public Registry | Correction of a Technical Defect in the Registry of Entrepreneurial and Non-entrepreneurial (non-commercial) Legal Entities |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| 43 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Termination of the Liquidation Process |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 44 | National Agency of Public Registry | Search for Applications of Entrepreneurs/Legal Entities |  |  |  |  | 1,816,949 |
| 45 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of Entrepreneurial Registry Extract (Unauthorized) |  |  |  |  | 78,144 |
| 46 | National Agency of Public Registry | Correction of Technical Defects in the Registered Data (unauthorized) |  |  |  |  | 13,215 |
| 47 | National Agency of Public Registry | Reorganization/Liquidation |  |  |  |  | 762 |
| 48 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Shares |  |  |  |  | 350 |
| 49 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of entity’s e-mail address/phone number/address different from the legal address |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| 50 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Right to Lien on Shares |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 51 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Commence of Entity’s Liquidation |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 52 | National Agency of Public Registry | Reorganization of the Entity |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 53 | National Agency of Public Registry | Renewal of the Extract on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 326,355 |
| 54 | National Agency of Public Registry | Consent to Registration of Individual property |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 55 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registry of Mortgage/building Right on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 109 |
| 56 | National Agency of Public Registry | Consent to Property Registration and Changes in the Registration Records |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| 57 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of a Sequestration/Prohibition |  |  |  |  | 1,262 |
| 58 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Ownership of Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 711 |
| 59 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Lease/sublease Right on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 134 |
| 60 | National Agency of Public Registry | Primary Registration of Ownership of Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 653 |
| 61 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Change/Formation of Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 562 |
| 62 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Rent/Sublease Right on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 63 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Immovable Property Under Construction |  |  |  |  | 1,254 |
| 64 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of the Origin of the Obligation related to Ownership Rights |  |  |  |  | 70 |
| 65 | National Agency of Public Registry | Systematic and Sporadic Registration of Rights to Plots of Land |  |  |  |  | 1,317 |
| 66 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Leasing Right/Lend of Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 67 | National Agency of Public Registry | Search for Applications in the real estate Registry |  |  |  |  | 7,791,654 |
| 68 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registry of Tax lien/Mortgage/Sequestration |  |  |  |  | 261,362 |
| 69 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information from the Technical Accounting Archive |  |  |  |  | 150,352 |
| 70 | National Agency of Public Registry | Search for Application in the Registry of Tax Lien/Mortgage/sequestration |  |  |  |  | 106646 |
| 71 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of Cadastral Plans |  |  |  |  | 44,440 |
| 72 | National Agency of Public Registry | Certificate of Public-law Restriction |  |  |  |  | 9,384 |
| 73 | National Agency of Public Registry | Correction of a Technical Defect of the Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 29,441 |
| 74 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Tax Lien/Mortgage Rights |  |  |  |  | 5540 |
| 75 | National Agency of Public Registry | Mortgage/Leasing Registry |  |  |  |  | 12,043 |
| 76 | National Agency of Public Registry | Samples of Documents to be Submitted for Registration in the Public Registry |  |  |  |  | 8,962 |
| 77 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Public-law Restriction |  |  |  |  | 3,458 |
| 78 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Immovable Property of the Individual |  |  |  |  | 6,357 |
| 79 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of Cadastral Map (electronic version) |  |  |  |  | 1,031 |
| 80 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of copies of Archival Documents kept in the Archives of the Public Registry |  |  |  |  | 4,235 |
| 81 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on data protected in the public registry |  |  |  |  | 1,293 |
| 82 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of Mortgage/Leasing Excerpt |  |  |  |  | 1,484 |
| 83 | National Agency of Public Registry | Orthophoto (digital) |  |  |  |  | 288 |
| 84 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of Cadastral Maps (hard-copy) |  |  |  |  | 1,034 |
| 85 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Data Protected in the Public Registry (according to drawing) |  |  |  |  | 934 |
| 86 | National Agency of Public Registry | On Land Category |  |  |  |  | 881 |
| 87 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on the Legal Status of the Immovable Property - to obtain the Certificate of Inheritance |  |  |  |  | 671 |
| 88 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information on Assigning a number to Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 242 |
| 89 | National Agency of Public Registry | Orthophoto (hard-copy) |  |  |  |  | 150 |
| 90 | National Agency of Public Registry | Information to be submitted to the Tax Authority |  |  |  |  | 192 |
| 91 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Easement Right on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| 92 | National Agency of Public Registry | Pre-registration of Rights on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 220 |
| 93 | National Agency of Public Registry | Immovable Property - Copying the extract |  |  |  |  | 3,634 |
| 94 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of a lifelong maintenance on an immovable property |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 95 | National Agency of Public Registry | Correction of a Technical Defect in Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 193 |
| 96 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of an Extract and a Cadastral Plan |  |  |  |  | 1,003 |
| 97 | National Agency of Public Registry | Agreement note on servitude agreement for state property |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 98 | National Agency of Public Registry | Linear building |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 99 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of a Right based on a Court Act |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| 100 | National Agency of Public Registry | Consent to Property Registration, Changes in the Registration Records |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 101 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Termination of Lien on Shares |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 102 | National Agency of Public Registry | Initiation of Insolvency Proceedings (bankruptcy, rehabilitation) |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 103 | National Agency of Public Registry | Confidentiality of Public Information |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 104 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Right to Ownership on Immovable Property |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 105 | Agency of Nuclear and Radiation Safety | License for Nuclear and Radiation Activities | 266 | 439 | 499 | 628 | 513 |
| 106 | Agency of Nuclear and Radiation Safety | Reporting on Compliance with the License Conditions for Nuclear and Radiation Activities | 653 | 802 | 769 | 788 | 761 |
| 107 | Agency of Nuclear and Radiation Safety | Permits for Nuclear and Radiation Activities |  | 99 | 143 | 75 | 68 |
| 108 | Data Exchange Agency / Digital Governance Agency | Delivery of the e-document |  |  |  | 43,906 | 671,592 |
| 109 | National Bureau of Enforcement | Debtor Registry |  |  |  | 20,391 | 16,621 |
| 110 | National Bureau of Enforcement | Search Debtor Registry |  |  |  | 8,273 | 8,335 |
| 111 | Georgian National Energy and Water Supply Regulatory Commission | Consent to carry out Network Work |  |  |  | 60 | 6,615 |
| 112 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Economic Activity |  |  |  | 1 | 442 |
| 113 | National Agency of Public Registry | Extension of the Registration Period for the Registered Data on Economic Activities |  |  |  | 1 | 216 |
| 114 | National Agency of Public Registry | Preparation of an Extract from the Registry of Economic Activities |  |  |  | 1 | 48 |
| 115 | National Agency of Public Registry | Retrieval of the Information from the Registry of Economic Activities |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| 116 | National Agency of Public Registry | Correction of a Technical Defect in the Registry of Economic Activities |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |
| 117 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registration of Amendments in the Registered Data of Economic Activity |  |  |  | 1 | 77 |
| 118 | National Agency of Public Registry | Cancellation of Registration in the Registry of Economic Activities |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 119 | National Agency of Public Registry | Search for Applications in the Registry of Economic Activities |  |  |  |  | 87,870 |
| 120 | National Agency of Public Registry | Registering Types and Codes of Compulsory Economic Activity |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 121 | National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement | Confirmation of the Authenticity of Educational Documents Issued in Georgia |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 122 | National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement | Recognition of the Education Received Abroad |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 123 | National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement | Book a visit to the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement |  |  |  |  | 2,531 |
| 124 | Notary Chamber of Georgia | Electronic Register of Notarial Actions |  |  |  |  | 131,700 |
| 125 | Notary Chamber of Georgia | Inheritance Register |  |  |  |  | 23,537 |
| 126 | National Archive | National Archives of Georgia |  |  |  |  | 37,863 |
| 127 | National Agency of Public Registry | Address Register |  |  |  |  | 271 |
| 128 | National Agency of Public Registry | Delivery of documents |  |  |  |  | 715,498 |
| 129 | PSDA | Delivery of documents |  |  |  |  |
| 130 | Community Centers |  |  |  |  |  | 136,827 |
| 131 | Public Service Hall |  |  |  |  |  | 1,957,206 |
| 132 | National Bureau of Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133 | Magti |  |  |  |  |  | 5,569 |

# Annex M: Budget Performance by Outcome, by Year and Totals

*As of 31 December 2020*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016 (July - December)** | | |  | **2017** | | | | **2018** | | | |
|  | **Planned budget** | **Expenditure** | **Balance** | **Execution Rate** | **Planned budget** | **Expenditure** | **Balance** | **Execution Rate** | **Planned budget** | **Expenditure** | **Balance** | Execution Rate |
| **OUTPUT 1. AoG senior staff better prepared to effectively manage (plan and implement) Public Administration Reform as a holistic change management process** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Local Consultants** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 17,500.00 | 21,550.00 | (4,050.00) | 123% |
| **International Consultants** | 15,000.00 | 22,646.40 | (7,646.40) | 151% | 35,000.00 | 17,143.20 | 17,856.80 | 49% | 159,994.81 | 158,688.74 | 1,306.07 | 99% |
| **Grants** |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Events, conferences, travel** |  |  | - |  | 86,532.00 | 64,317.80 | 22,214.20 | 74% | 35,000.00 | 29,271.86 | 5,728.14 | 84% |
| **Output Total** | **15,000.00** | **22,646.40** | **(7,646.40)** | **151%** | **121,532.00** | **81,461.00** | **40,071.00** | **67%** | **212,494.81** | **209,510.60** | **2,984.21** | **99%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **4%** | **10%** | **-6%** |  | **7%** | **6%** | **23%** |  | **13%** | **14%** | **2%** |  |
| **OUTPUT 2. Professional civil service recruited and trained to unified standards, and can protect itself against malpractice and arbitrary decisions** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 193,827.53 | 127,789.00 | 66,038.53 | 66% |
| **Local Consultants** |  |  | - |  | 130,400.73 | 117,236.00 | 13,164.73 | 90% | 204,500.00 | 112,023.00 | 92,477.00 | 55% |
| **International Consultants** | 16,973.00 | 6,950.00 | 10,023.00 | 41% | 108,500.00 | 119,199.00 | (10,699.00) | 110% |  |  | - |  |
| **Grants** |  |  | - |  | 240,343.27 | 270,147.80 | (29,804.53) | 112% | 199,500.00 | 294,801.00 | (95,301.00) | 148% |
| **Events, conferences, travel** |  |  | - |  | 184,938.00 | 210,152.20 | (25,214.20) | 114% | 85,500.00 | 82,869.56 | 2,630.44 | 97% |
| **Output Total** | **16,973.00** | **6,950.00** | **10,023.00** | **41%** | **664,182.00** | **716,735.00** | **(52,553.00)** | **108%** | **683,327.53** | **617,482.56** | **65,844.97** | **90%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **5%** | **3%** | **8%** |  | **41%** | **49%** | **-30%** |  | **41%** | **41%** | **37%** |  |
| **OUTPUT 3 Quality services delivered and innovations planned, based on consistent and replicable methodology, citizens’ needs and feedback consistently integrated into service development** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** | 35,000.00 |  | 35,000.00 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Local Consultants** | 25,546.00 | 23,420.00 | 2,126.00 | 92% | 37,149.17 | 12,712.50 | 24,436.67 | 34% | 96,500.00 | 65,601.00 | 30,899.00 | 68% |
| **International Consultants** | 59,780.00 |  | 59,780.00 | 0% | 171,100.00 | 89,415.29 | 81,684.71 | 52% | 94,683.57 | 101,465.39 | (6,781.82) | 107% |
| **Grants** |  |  | - |  | 123,844.80 | 155,288.50 | (31,443.70) | 125% | 78,709.63 | 79,929.00 | (1,219.37) | 102% |
| **Events, conferences, travel** | 18,200.32 |  | 18,200.32 | 0% | 143,322.73 | 87,601.61 | 55,721.12 | 61% | 96,000.00 | 73,821.61 | 22,178.39 | 77% |
| **Output Total** | **138,526.32** | **23,420.00** | **115,106.32** | **17%** | **475,416.70** | **345,017.90** | **130,398.80** | **73%** | **365,893.20** | **320,817.00** | **45,076.20** | **88%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **40%** | **10%** | **93%** |  | **29%** | **24%** | **73%** |  | **22%** | **21%** | **26%** |  |
| **Management and Administration** |  |  | - |  |  |  | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff Cost** | 54,241.00 | 36,909.10 | 17,331.90 | 68% | 165,188.00 | 123,858.78 | 41,329.22 | 75% | 165,188.00 | 156,611.00 | 8,577.00 | 95% |
| **M&E** | 71,921.00 | 76,281.32 | (4,360.32) | 106% |  |  | - |  | 82,250.00 | 7,855.00 | 74,395.00 | 10% |
| **Admin** | 26,409.35 | 42,625.13 | (16,215.78) | 161% | 83,762.00 | 78,458.22 | 5,303.78 | 94% | 38,497.09 | 71,894.09 | (33,397.00) | 187% |
| **Management and Administration Total** | **152,571.35** | **155,815.55** | (3,244.20) | **102%** | **248,950.00** | **202,317.00** | **46,633.00** | **81%** | **285,935.09** | **236,360.09** | **49,575.00** | **83%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **44%** | **69%** | **-3%** |  | **15%** | **14%** | **26%** |  | **17%** | **16%** | **28%** |  |
| **Net Total** | **323,070.67** | **208,831.95** | 114,238.72 | **65%** | **1,510,080.70** | **1,345,530.90** | **164,549.80** | **89%** | **1,547,650.63** | **1,384,170.25** | **163,480.38** | **89%** |
| **Facilities & Administration (8%)** | 25,845.65 | 16,706.56 | 9,139.10 | 65% | 120,806.46 | 107,642.47 | 13,163.98 | 89% | 123,812.05 | 110,733.62 | 13,078.43 | 89% |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | 7% | 7% | 7% |  | 7% | 7% | 7% |  | 7% | 7% | 7% |  |
| **Grand Total** | **348,916.32** | **225,538.51** | **123,377.82** | **65%** | **1,630,887.16** | **1,453,173.37** | **177,713.78** | **89%** | **1,671,462.68** | **1,494,903.87** | **176,558.81** | **89%** |
| **Grand Total as per actual received** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2019** | | | | **2020** | | | | **Total Planned** | **Total Expenditures** | **Total Balance** | **Total Execution Rate** |
|  | **Planned budget** | **Expenditure** | **Balance** | **Execution Rate** | **Planned budget** | **Expenditure** | **Balance** | **Execution Rate** |
| **OUTPUT 1. AoG senior staff better prepared to effectively manage (plan and implement) Public Administration Reform as a holistic change management process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** | 71,961.00 | 120,521.67 | (48,560.67) | 167% |  |  |  |  | 71,961.00 | 120,521.67 | (48,560.67) | 167% |
| **Local Consultants** |  |  | - |  | 30,417.01 | 27,325.00 | 3,092.01 | 90% | 47,917.01 | 48,875.00 | (957.99) | 102% |
| **International Consultants** | 75,000.00 | 97,952.16 | (22,952.16) | 131% | 8,500.00 | 54,009.00 | (45,509.00) | 635% | 293,494.81 | 350,439.50 | (56,944.69) | 119% |
| **Grants** | 45,403.12 | 52,064.17 | (6,661.05) | 115% | 100,964.00 | 96,535.00 | 4,429.00 | 96% | 146,367.12 | 148,599.17 | (2,232.05) | 102% |
| **Events, conferences, travel** | 10,000.00 | 19,628.00 | (9,628.00) | 196% | 11,928.00 | 16,258.00 | (4,330.00) | 136% | 143,460.00 | 129,475.66 | 13,984.34 | 90% |
| **Output Total** | **202,364.12** | **290,166.00** | **(87,801.88)** | **143%** | **151,809.01** | **194,127.00** | **(42,317.99)** | **128%** | **703,199.94** | **797,911.00** | **(94,711.06)** | **113%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **14%** | **21%** | **-166%** |  | **13%** | **16%** | **-371%** |  | **11%** | **14%** | **-17%** |  |
| **OUTPUT 2. Professional civil service recruited and trained to unified standards, and can protect itself against malpractice and arbitrary decisions** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** | 189,242.00 | 212,985.68 | (23,743.68) | 113% | 42,000.00 | 19,120.00 | 22,880.00 | 46% | 425,069.53 | 359,894.68 | 65,174.85 | 85% |
| **Local Consultants** | 93,000.00 | 75,566.00 | 17,434.00 | 81% | 73,500.00 | 62,495.00 | 11,005.00 | 85% | 501,400.73 | 367,320.00 | 134,080.73 | 73% |
| **International Consultants** | 20,000.00 | 21,753.00 | (1,753.00) | 109% | 24,500.00 | 14,687.00 | 9,813.00 | 60% | 169,973.00 | 162,589.00 | 7,384.00 | 96% |
| **Grants** | 75,586.00 | 92,685.03 | (17,099.03) | 123% | 158,696.65 | 254,730.00 | (96,033.35) | 161% | 674,125.92 | 912,363.83 | (238,237.91) | 135% |
| **Events, conferences, travel** | 45,660.62 | 35,108.29 | 10,552.33 | 77% | 10,098.00 | 11,462.00 | (1,364.00) | 114% | 326,196.62 | 339,592.05 | (13,395.43) | 104% |
| **Output Total** | **423,488.62** | **438,098.00** | **(14,609.38)** | **103%** | **308,794.65** | **362,494.00** | **(53,699.35)** | **117%** | **2,096,765.80** | **2,141,759.56** | **(44,993.76)** | **102%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **29%** | **31%** | **-28%** |  | **26%** | **31%** | **-471%** |  | **34%** | **37%** | **-8%** |  |
| **OUTPUT 3 Quality services delivered and innovations planned, based on consistent and replicable methodology, citizens’ needs and feedback consistently integrated into service development** |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contractual Services-Companies** |  |  | - |  | 82,500.00 | 49,834.00 | 32,666.00 | 60% | 82,500.00 | 49,834.00 | 67,666.00 | 60% |
| **Local Consultants** | 6,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 17% | 97,187.00 | 34,589.00 | 62,598.00 | 36% | 236,836.17 | 137,322.50 | 125,059.67 | 58% |
| **International Consultants** | 63,500.00 | 59,300.00 | 4,200.00 | 93% | 61,175.40 | 75,255.00 | (14,079.60) | 123% | 390,458.97 | 325,435.68 | 124,803.29 | 83% |
| **Grants** | 300,699.00 | 237,554.00 | 63,145.00 | 79% | 85,860.00 | 60,276.00 | 25,584.00 | 70% | 589,113.43 | 533,047.50 | 56,065.93 | 90% |
| **Events, conferences, travel** | 26,524.00 | 19,854.00 | 6,670.00 | 75% | 70,000.00 | 61,374.48 | 8,625.52 | 88% | 335,846.73 | 242,651.70 | 111,395.35 | 72% |
| **Output Total** | **396,723.00** | **317,708.00** | **79,015.00** | **80%** | **396,722.40** | **281,328.48** | **115,393.92** | **71%** | **1,634,755.30** | **1,288,291.38** | **484,990.24** | **79%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **27%** | **23%** | **149%** |  | **33%** | **24%** | **1011%** |  | **27%** | **22%** | **89%** |  |
| **Management and Administration** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Staff Cost** | 165,188.00 | 150,260.00 | 14,928.00 | 91% | 165,188.00 | 156,228.05 | 8,959.95 | 95% | 714,993.00 | 623,866.93 | 91,126.07 | 87% |
| **M&E** | 32,000.00 | 20,262.00 | 11,738.00 | 63% | 15,000.00 | 14,473.52 | 526.48 | 96% | 201,171.00 | 118,871.84 | 82,299.16 | 59% |
| **Admin** | 128,532.48 | 82,713.28 | 45,819.20 | 64% | 64,708.00 | 83,005.43 | (18,297.43) | 128% | 341,908.92 | 358,696.15 | (16,787.23) | 105% |
| **Management and Administration Total** | **325,720.48** | **253,235.28** | 72,485.20 | 78% | **244,896.00** | **253,707.00** | (8,811.00) | **104%** | **1,258,072.92** | **1,101,434.92** | **156,638.00** | **88%** |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | **22%** | **18%** | **137%** |  | **21%** | **22%** | **-77%** |  | **20%** | **19%** | **29%** |  |
| **Net Total** | **1,348,296.22** | **1,299,207.28** | **49,088.94** | **96%** | **1,102,222.06** | **1,091,656.48** | **10,565.58** | **99%** | **5,692,793.96** | **5,329,396.86** | **501,923.42** | **94%** |
| **Facilities & Administration (8%)** | 107,863.70 | 103,936.58 | 3,927.12 | 96% | 88,177.76 | 87,332.52 | 845.25 | 99% | 455,423.52 | 426,351.75 | 40,153.87 | 94% |
| **Percent of Grand Total** | 7% | 7% | 7% |  | 7% | 7% | 7% |  | 7% | 7% | 7% |  |
| **Grand Total** | **1,456,159.92** | **1,403,143.86** | **53,016.06** | **96%** | **1,190,399.82** | **1,178,989.00** | **11,410.83** | **99%** | **6,148,217.48** | **5,755,748.61** | **542,077.30** | **94%** |
| **Grand Total as per actual received** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **6,085,839.98** | **5,755,748.61** | **330,091.37** | **95%** |

# Annex N: Theory of Change



1. Source: Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia through the Governance Reform Fund Project Document, UNDP, 2016, p 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The original budget was $5,778,641 (or GBP 4,500,000) with a project extension to March 31, 2021 agreed to in July 2020 adding GBP 236,000 for a total U.S. dollar value of $6,085,840 and British pound value of GBP 4,736,000. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The Data Exchange Agency (DEA) and Smart Logic were combined in October 2020 to form the Digital Governance Agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Latest Human Development rankings and scores as published by UNDP at: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/GEO>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The overarching strategy is the *Socioeconomic Development Strategy of Georgia – Georgia 2020* and the *Basic Data and Directions of Georgia.* The vision identifies effective public management delivered though the improvement of institutional mechanisms for public policy and improvement of links between policy and budgeting. The documents also foresee civil service reform that will create a system for civil servants’ recruitment, promotion, and dismissal based on merit and independent from political influence. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Source: Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia through the Governance Reform Fund Project Document, UNDP, 2016, p 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The original budget was $5,778,641 (or GBP 4,500,000) with a project extension to March 31, 2021 agreed to in July 2020 adding GBP 236,000 for a total U.S. dollar value of $6,085,840 and British pound value of GBP 4,736,000. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. UNDP Country Programme Document for Georgia (2016-2020), p 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Decree #2328 The National Document for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), November 12, 2019. The GoG established a “Democratic Governance” thematic working group to address and monitor the related SDGs. The AoG’s Policy Planning Unit of the Policy Planning and Coordination Department serves as the coordinator for the SDG working group and is a main stakeholder for the PAR project. While Goal 16 is the most relevant SDG to the project and PAR reform, other SDB goals are also applicable in a direct or indirect manner. For example, elements of goals aimed at gender equality and empowerment, community development, the environment, and global partnership for sustainable development implementation are related to or impacted by PAR. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. The number of civil servants amounted to 53,109 in 2015 and 46,708 in 2017 according to the Public Administration Reform in Georgia Implementation Context Analysis, December 2018, p. 13. Two government reorganizations led to the downsizing of the number of ministries in November 2017 from 18 to 14 and further reduced to 11 in June 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Georgia’s Transparency International corruption index ranking has improved to 44 in 2019 (index score 56) compared to 48 in 2015 (index score 52). <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2015/index/nzl>. However, Georgia’s 2020 score showed a drop of two points. Transparency International stated, ”Georgia has not seen significant improvement since 2012, when CPI scores became comparable year to year. In a country once celebrated as a reformer, anti-corruption efforts have stagnated in nearly a decade.” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Current Status of Public Administration Reform Mid-Term Study Report, 2019 ACT, p. 68, Table 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Public Administration Reform in Georgia Political Economy Analysis, PAR Project, 2016, p. 9 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. The Data Exchange Agency (DEA) and Smart Logic were combined in October 2020 to form the Digital Governance Agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. An LEPL is a Legal Entity of Public Law and appear to be part of the public administration and service delivery but have unique characteristics that set them apart from the traditional civil service system. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. The technical assistance covers: 1) support to policy development, coordination, monitoring and evaluation; 2) civil service reform; 3) accountability; 4) public service delivery; and 5) PAR communications. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Capacity Building of the Civil Service Bureau of Georgia to Implement the Civil Service Reform. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. PAR Project Final Evaluation Terms of Reference, p. 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. IBID, p. 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Evaluability analysis was performed by UNDP internally prior to commencing the external evaluation. As per UNDP guidelines the evaluability analysis takes into consideration whether the project has clearly defined theory of change, well-defined results framework sufficient data for evaluation, whether there are well-documented progress reports, field visit reports, reviews and previous evaluations, if the evaluation is relevant and whether there are sufficient financial and human resources available to perform the evaluation. In case these criteria were not met, UNDP might have initiated the discussion to delay the evaluation process to adjust accordingly. The External Evaluator rechecked several evaluability criteria during the desk review to ensure all information is available for the independent evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Please note that separate samples or surveys were not conducted for this evaluation given other evaluations conducted during the course of the project and the timeframe of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Please see Annex F for the main laws, policies, decrees, by-laws and strategies prepared with project input and/or support. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Please see Annex G for QEC Accredited training designed with project support. Annex H identifies key system training events. Annex I identifies PAR-sponsored sub projects (Emerging Needs); J identifies project-sponsored conferences and public events; and K project-sponsored policy research studies and civil society grants. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. The usage rate of my.gov.ge increased to 423,555 as of December 2020 compared to 45,000 in 2016 (baseline). 133 new services were added to my.gov.ge with project support (target: 49). Annex L lists the e-services added. Two service delivery agencies: Public Service Hall and Patrol Department Unified Service Center of he Ministry of Internal Affairs implemented the Common Assessment Framework of the UPSDD (target: 2). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. For 2016, 2017 and 2018 the context analysis was an independent document. For 2019 and 2020, the contact analysis became part of the project’s annual report, as agreed to with the project’s donors. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. AoG has not yet finalized the Roadmap’s timeframe. The new Roadmap is to be completed in 2021. The AoG is applying the Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook (referred to in this report as the “policy planning handbook”) to the formulation of the new Roadmap. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia through the Governance Reform Fund Project Document, UNDP, 2016, p. 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. The survey was contracted-out to Analysis and Consulting Team (ACT) and included 2,400 general public and 1,500 civil servant respondents. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Also conducted by ACT. The survey included 2,400 citizens and 571 civil servants. The findings reported in this paragraph are abstracted from the project’s 2019 Annual Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Per the 2019 Annual Report for Outcome 1 of 6 targets, 2 full achieved, 3 partially achieved and 1 not achieved; Outcome 2, of 17 targets, 12 fully achieved, 3 partially achieved and 2 not achieved; and for Output 3, of 8 targets, 1 fully achieved, 6 partially achieved and 1 not achieved. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Accelerating Progress Towards the SDGs: Identifying Priority Areas for Action in Georgia, UNDP, GOG, January 2020, p. 8 [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Policy Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook, GoG with UNDP and UK Government, p. 27. The Handbook’s Annex further illustrates how SDGs should be directly linked to strategy goals. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. 6 working groups: policy development; civil service reform; service delivery; accountability including separate WGs on Open Government Partnership and Anti-Corruption; Public Finance Management; and Local Government. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. [www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Baseline-Measurement-Report-2018-Georgia.pdf](http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Baseline-Measurement-Report-2018-Georgia.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. SIGMA Opinion on Implementation of the Recommendations Set Out in the Baseline Measurement of Georgia Against the Principles of Public Administration in the Area of Policy Development and Coordination, OECD SIGMA, 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Ministry of Environment and Agriculture, Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons, Health, Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development. AoG also requested support to link performance plans to departmental goals/objectives. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. Supporting Public Administration Reform In Georgia, Progress Report, December 9, 2016, p. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure Ministry of Justice, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. After the restructuring, the number was reduced to 4: Ministries of Labour, Health and Social Affairs, Agriculture, Justice, Culture. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture; Ministry for Internally Displaced Persons; Ministry of Labor, Health and Social Affairs; and Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Evaluation of Civic Initiative and Research Grants in the Framework of, “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia Project, Nodar Kherkheulidze and Dea Tsartsidze, January 2019

    Evaluation of Civic Initiative and Research Grants in the Framework of “Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR) in Georgia” Project, Nodar Kherkheulidze and Dea Tsartsidze, UNDP, January 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. By the end of the project, a total of 11 government agencies received performance appraisal support. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. The work with the Public Service Halls was jointly implemented with the UNDP GRF project with funding from the Swedish Government. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. UNEG, ‘Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations’, August 2014. The guidance outlines practical steps on how to prepare, conduct and use HR & GE responsive evaluations. Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616> [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2019/DP_2019_29_E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Workshops might be held online amid the COVID-19 restrictions, more than one workshop might be necessary to disseminate the report among various project partners and stakeholders. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)