GEORGIA

EU COUNTRY ROADMAP FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

2014 - 2017

Approved by:
Date of approval/ update:

1 STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

1.1 ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Civil society in Georgia continues to benefit from a benign enabling environment in terms of legal and regulatory aspects. Registration of new CSOs is an easy and un-bureaucratic process. CSOs are able to function without harassment by the authorities, including tax authorities, regardless of their activities or the opinions they express. During 2012-2013 especially, significant progress has been made in laying the foundation for the diversification of CSOs' funding sources; in 2012, a legal amendment was introduced which allowed government bodies to provide grants to civil society. The Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Youth and Sports have been particularly active in using this new possibility, as has the Central Election Commission as part of its voter education activities. Further efforts are necessary to extend this possibility to local authorities. Despite these new possibilities, it is a fact that many CSOs remain reluctant to accept funding from state sources, fearing that doing so will limit their ability to act independently, as well as damage public perception of them as independent actors. In this context, careful attention to the development of transparent selection and award mechanisms is of fundamental importance in addressing these concerns. A further improvement in CSOs' financial status came in 2013, when amendments were introduced to the Tax Code which made it possible for CSOs to obtain tax exemption on in-kind donations.

A draft Law on Volunteerism is currently before parliament; it foresees granting legal status to volunteers for the first time, regulates labour relations between the volunteer and host organisation, determines the employer's duties and responsibilities and introduces some tax-breaks on volunteer-related costs for employers such as transportation and accommodation.

The period 2012-2014 has also seen the deliberation and adoption of a new Code on Local Self-Governance in Georgia. While some efforts were made to decentralise power to local authorities, the Code, in its present form, has so far stopped well short of devolving greater competencies to the regions and municipalities. Further important stages in the decentralisation reform, including the key matter of fiscal decentralisation, are scheduled for discussion in 2015. Within the current text of the Code, an undertaking has been given to examine the issue of establishing new forms of public participation in decision-making at local level. A suggestion to develop a draft law on this issue before the end of 2014 has been put forward by civil society representatives to the Parliament, which has accepted to work on the issue.

Civil society also benefits from the improved climate in the media sector, which allows CSOs to gain greater coverage for their organisations, as well as for the issues they raise. During 2012 especially, a number of successful advocacy campaigns, which were well documented in the domestic media, considerably raised the profile of participating organisations and civil society in general. Nevertheless, civil society still complains of a tendency among journalists to favour sensational or political stories, while displaying little interest in the issues which civil society tries to raise.

Early 2014 also saw the adoption of the National Human Rights Strategy of Georgia 2014-2020. This is a landmark publication, which complies with the highest international standards in its declarations. The strategy provides numerous entry points for civil society to reinforce the observance of human rights in Georgia. Many of the strategic objectives set out in the document will be supported under interventions financed through the European Initiative for Democracy and

Human Rights. In its broad vision, however, there are a number of fundamental issues of direct relevance to this Roadmap, such as the declared objective of educating citizens about their rights and how to protect them, as well as the human rights based approach, which envisages the active involvement of rights-holders in making decisions on processes which affect them[1]. These concerns are fundamental to many of the priorities set out in this Roadmap, which focus on increased ability of citizens to be involved in processes which affect their lives, as well as the obligations of the state institutions to provide opportunities for that involvement.

Despite this generally positive picture, CSOs in Georgia continue to demonstrate very low levels of overall sustainability; according to the annual NGO sustainability index published by USAID, Georgian civil society remains steadfastly in the evolving sustainability category, with no change, either positive or negative, over the last three years[2]. Some explanation for this apparent paradox of weak civil society in the face of a benign enabling environment can be found when one moves away from a narrow definition of enabling environment as a set of legal norms.

The Enabling Environment Index produced by Civicus[3] defines enabling environment across three dimensions; the governance environment, the socio economic environment and the socio-cultural environment. When looking at the sub-dimensions which make up these categories, Georgia clearly scores relatively well in the governance dimension, where issues such as policy dialogue, corruption, NGO legal context and associational rights are key elements. However, Georgia scores comparatively low on socio-cultural environment, which encompasses elements like propensity to participate, trust and giving and volunteering. All of these elements are fundamental to the development of a consolidated civil society. The absence of these elements has been identified during the consultations which have been held as part of the Roadmap process and have been confirmed by the results of the EU-funded Civil Society Mapping carried out in Georgia in 2014.

Philanthropy and corporate social responsibility remain underdeveloped in Georgia. Current legislation does not provide sufficient incentives to encourage philanthropy and civil society is itself divided on the best means to approach this issue in terms of relevant legislation. Corporate social responsibility is nascent and is hampered by the tendency of companies to support short term charity initiatives with high PR value but low sustainability on the one hand, and the inability, as yet, of CSOs to package their initiatives in a language which would appeal to the private sector.

Financial instability is a serious problem for CSOs, especially those in the regions, forcing them to hunt for donor funds, frequently departing from the organisation's mission in order to fit donor agendas. This tends to undermine any links CSOs may have to constituencies and target groups. Donor behaviour is an issue in this context with the availability of generous foreign funding appearing to have a constraining effect on civil society's desire to be creative in seeking alternative funding sources. A dialogue on how donors and civil society interact with each other has recently begun in Georgia[4].

In conclusion, while civil society benefits from a generally positive, though not uniformly so, enabling framework in terms of the governance environment, significant gaps remain to be addressed in the socio-cultural dimension.

---

[1] National Human Rights Strategy of Georgia, March 2014, pp. 5-6
[2] 2012 CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, p. 80
[3] Civicus' 2013 Enabling Environment Index
[4] Conference 'Dialogue between donors and CSOs', Gudauri, 18-20 September, 2013

1.2 PARTICIPATION AND ROLES

Relations between government and civil society, particularly at the national level, have been greatly enhanced since the 2012 Parliamentary Elections. Partly this is a function of the migration of human resources from the civil society sector into government structures. But it is also facilitated by the relative lack of knowledge and experience of the new government officials who then seek this expertise where it is available in civil society.

The picture is not uniform across all sectors, but, as a general rule consultative councils exist under the aegis of various ministries and function to a greater or a lesser degree depending on the specific sector. The Ministry of Justice has a comparatively long history of openness to collaboration with civil society organisations and has, over the years, established a number of coordination councils with responsibility for developing sectoral strategies, legal amendments and implementing mechanisms in areas such as anti-corruption, criminal justice reform and combatting torture, etc. The Criminal Justice Reform Council (CJR Council), co-chaired by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Corrections, is mandated to steer criminal justice sector reform, consisting of all relevant institutions from across the justice sector, as well as the Ministry of Finance, Parliament and civil society organisations. The CJR Council is supported by a dedicated Secretariat which regularly updates the CJR Strategy and Action Plan and monitors its implementation by issuing annual progress reports. It has around 11 working groups[5].

This model inspired the Inter-Agency Coordinating Council for the development of the National Human Rights Strategy and Action Plan under the leadership of the Prime Minister's Office and the MoJ, where the EU is an active member. The EU provided technical support to the Council in its work, particularly as the report of the EU Special Adviser on Human Rights served as the baseline to the NHRS and AP[6].

Civil society maintains a high profile in the justice sector, with involvement in the Public Defender's National Prevention Mechanism and the establishment of relevant coalitions, such as the Coalition for an Independent and Transparent Judiciary comprised of 32 members from civil society, media and business.

In the case of some specific reform processes, such as the large scale decentralisation reform, a complicated structure of working groups dealing with different aspects of the reform was put in place under the overall supervision of the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure; in some cases the groups are headed by civil society representatives. However, satisfaction with this process has been tempered by the outcome of the reform to date, which has maintained little of the initial vision of local governance reform put forward by civil society representatives. Other reform processes which developed with the active participation of civil society in 2012-14 have been the process surrounding electoral reform, measures to curb electronic surveillance and significant positive changes in media legislation.

A number of thematic coalitions have been established, dealing with a variety of issues from food safety to child welfare and from social enterprise to gender. Apart from thematic coalitions, other

[5] http://www.justice.gov.ge/AboutUs/Council

[6] http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/georgia/press_corner/all_news/news/2013/human_rights_2013/human_rights_report_2013_en.htm

networks also exist, such as the Regional Civil Society Network, which unites organisations based in Georgian regions.

The Georgian National Platform of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum[7] (GNP) now comprises over 120 members, the majority of them based in Tbilisi. The Platform is comprised of five working groups and members have also taken the initiative of forming a number of sub-groups on issues of particular interest to them such as development effectiveness, agriculture and electoral reform. The Platform has actively collaborated with both the Government of Georgia and the Parliament on the development and adoption of a European Integration Information and Communication Strategy 2013-2016. It has also organised three high level trilateral conferences (GoG/civil society/EU) and held over 80 meetings with government officials as part of the structured dialogue process between the GNP and line ministries. The GNP also regularly issues statements on current issues such as the crisis in Ukraine, the borderisation events along the ABL in Georgia, as well as other events with an impact on Georgia's EU integration.

A significant opportunity for meaningful policy dialogue has arisen as a result of the Georgian Parliaments' new found appetite for shaping and enacting state policy. Parliament structures are in great need of professional inputs from NGOs and research and academic institutions both on the policy formulation side as well as in monitoring government execution of budgeted programmes. In December 2013, over 160 CSOs came together to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Georgian Parliament, which foresees greater involvement of civil society in policy processes through collaboration with the Parliament. Parliament has agreed to elaborate jointly with civil society representatives a concept for the development of civil society and a number of joint working groups looking at different issues such as dialogue space and funding mechanisms have been set up[8]. This process is also mirrored at a regional level, where a group of 18 NGOs based in Adjara have instituted a similar process with the Supreme Council of Adjara.

Civil society has also managed to actively participate in the selection of some key officials due to nomination procedures put in place under both the previous and present governments, such as the Chair of the Central Election Commission.

Nevertheless, challenges remain. In some cases, certain government ministries remain to be convinced of the usefulness of involving civil society in policy dialogue; this is particularly the case for highly technical ministries, such as the Ministry of Finance, which often argue that civil society lacks the knowledge to engage in a meaningful way on complicated issues such as the budget process. In other cases, a lack of government planning hampers the process; civil society frequently complains that it is left with too little time to make qualified inputs to policy debates. This comment is heard with particular frequency in relation to the parliament.

On the local level, the main obstacle to policy dialogue is the low level of autonomy of local authorities and the limited capacities of local authority staff. On paper, dialogue mechanisms do exist, but are often hampered by a lack of timely information about the opportunities for dialogue, the low capacities of potential stakeholders in the process, a lack of awareness of rights to participate in decision-making and the limited authority of local government. Where policy dialogue does take place, it is characterised by Tbilisi-based organisations engaging local authorities, but this leads to questions about their credibility in representing local communities.

[7] http://eapnationalplatform.ge/index.php?a=main&pid=2&lang=eng

[8] http://www.civilin.org/Eng/viewtopic.php?id=121

Some Tbilisi-based organisations have regional offices and there are a slowly growing number of competent CSOs in the regions. Positive examples of dialogue in the regions exist and these can be used to build upon[9].

A frequent theme of consultation for the Roadmap was the limited institutional capacities and weak human resources of local self-government institutions in Georgia. The existing unstable and ineffective civil service model does nothing to strengthen their capacities. High staff turnover negatively impacts the institutional efficiency of local self-governments. The existing legislation does not establish suitable regulations on career planning and advancement, promotion, accountability or evaluation. Human resource management tools are non-existent in Georgian local authorities. The ineffectiveness of the local civil service system became particularly obvious after the parliamentary elections of October 2012, when the change of the central government resulted in a high turnover of staff at the municipal level.

In June 2012, the Government of Georgia approved the Decree #1182 on the Training Mechanism for the Civil Servants of the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Regional Governors' Administrations and Local Self-Governments. The decree includes the outline of curricula in certain priority areas. Based on this Decree, the training of civil servants of regional and local authorities was organized in 2013. This mechanism, aimed at ensuring permanent capacity development of the local and regional authorities, however, has not yet substantially influenced the situation for the better, but may represent a useful entry point for support.

The distinction between different types of CSOs, whether they are watchdogs, service providers, think tanks or others, is, in many ways an artificial distinction. Any given organisation can play multiple roles; a think tank which develops economic policy, can at the same time act in a watchdog function as part of a CSO budget coalition. A service provider can be transformed into an effective advocacy organisation or watchdog on the basis of substantive knowledge acquired during the course of its service provision, or on the basis of the credibility it has earned with the authorities because of the professionalism of the service it has provided.

In Georgia, the tradition of watchdog organisations is a strong one. Many organisations exist in a variety of fields to hold government, and on occasion international donors, especially IFIs, to account. Particularly well served sectors for these activities are public procurement, environment, access to information and the situation in penitentiary establishments.

Georgia has become a signatory of the Open Government Partnership, through which the government has voluntarily taken several commitments which are aimed at improving the transparency of government and citizens' levels of participation in decision-making. While CSOs are involved in the process, which is regular and structured, CSO progress reports also indicate that a number of commitments taken by the government are only of marginal relevance to the improvement of openness in government, while efforts to involve citizens to a greater extent have foundered due to lack of planning, organisation and appropriate information[10]. Despite this, some substantial progress has been made on some important indicators.

[9] http://goodgovernance.ge/portal/alias__G3/newsid__4867/callerModID__9352/tabid__4742/default.aspx
http://goodgovernance.ge/portal/alias__G3/newsid__4761/callerModID__9352/tabid__4742/default.aspx

[10] http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/georgia ; Independent Reporting Mechanism: Georgia Progress Report

Think tanks have begun to enhance their capacities and the range of issues they deal with over the last few years. The 2013 Global Go To Think Tank Index mentions 13 think tanks in Georgia[11]. However, in terms of rankings, matters are confused by the fact that some are listed under the Central Asia category, while others appear under listings for Central and Eastern Europe. USAID has funded a targeted think tank support programme, while the EU has had some modest success in reaching out to think tanks through its Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility, primarily targeting policy dialogue within the ENP framework.

As service providers, Georgian NGOs have benefited from modest increases in government funding for CSOs, which have been mainly available in the areas of voter education, juvenile justice and youth issues. More government entities have still to fully explore and make use of this possibility. CSOs active in the provision of social services have found it more difficult to continue their activities as recent changes to methods of social service provision have decreased the number of government contracts for social welfare provision[12]. On the whole, civil society often finds itself in the position of stopping gaps in government provided service provision, especially in sectors such as support to Internally Displaced Persons, rather than supporting the state as the primary provider of social care. Nevertheless, policy dialogue with government on a wide range of social services (IDPs, children's welfare) is well developed and supported by strong CSO coalitions in the respective areas.

The economic sector remains largely unexplored and unexploited by civil society. Professional associations, where they exist, are weak. A history of compliant trade unions and ineffective employers' associations, combined with the absence of social dialogue processes, has undermined any sort of economic development base on equality and mutual respect. CSO involvement in economic activities is largely precluded by the unhelpful legal framework which does not allow for NGOS providing grants for economic activities or business start-ups, and taxes social enterprises in the same way as standard enterprises[13]. The situation is further compounded by CSOs' lack of knowledge on taxation issues in general and a certain lack of creativity in coming up with innovative funding mechanisms. Finally, relatively few CSOs have given any thought to establishing mutually beneficial relationships with local business and many express a certain suspicion towards such types of co-operation. Some progress has been made towards the establishment of agricultural cooperatives within the framework of the EU-funded ENPARD programme. With the assistance of CSOs, 70 cooperatives have been established in Georgia over the past year. However, any gains are hard won due to the low level of social capital in Georgian society generally[14], as well as mistrust towards such developments on the part of farmers, who tend to associate the concept with that of Soviet collective farms. Despite these issues, the expansion of the cooperative movement together with social enterprise initiatives remain two of the most potentially promising paths to achieving sustainable and inclusive development in the Georgian regions, and present obvious opportunities for CSOs' engagement in awareness-raising, advocacy, capacity-building and addressing some key social concerns.

2012, Lasha Gogidze, Transparency International Georgia

[11] http://gotothinktank.com/the-2013-global-go-to-think-tank-index-ggttti/

[12] 2012 CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, p. 85

[13] Findings from civil society consultation conducted by UN Women on April 4, 2014 as part of the Roadmap process.

[14] http://www.iset.ge/blog/?p=1753, The Soviet Hangover, Maka Chitanava, 8 May, 2013

1.3 CAPACITY

CSO legitimacy and credibility is a function of a number of different and interlinked factors. CSOs are hampered in their development by the fact that the majority of donors, including the EU, have tended to provide funding in respect of specific projects, rather than for institutional strengthening of organisations, so-called core-funding. This often leads to essentially donor driven agendas, although the negative impact of this situation can often be mitigated by extensive consultation with civil society representatives. This situation, in turn, makes it harder for CSOs to build lasting and meaningful relationships with constituencies.

It should also be noted that the discussion around the issue of accountability has only recently expanded to include the issue of CSO accountability for its own activities to their target groups. Some organisations, especially organisations based close to grassroots, or Tbilisi-based organisations with regional offices, are better at establishing links with local people. However, in many instances, applying basic approaches in reporting mechanisms and constituency-building could go some way toward ameliorating the situation. Until recently accountability was understood either in the sense of government accountability, or CSO accountability to donors. With a growing awareness of this new dimension of accountability, there is reason to be optimistic that both CSOs and donors can amend their behaviour to support positive development in this regard. A forum for discussion on these issues has been established.

CSOs are forced to chase foreign donor funding because of the lack of alternative sources of finance. This inevitably affects the organisational capacities of CSOs, as financial uncertainty makes it difficult to retain qualified staff, much less develop any human resources policies or strategic plans for organisational development. The periodic transfer of CSO staff to government institutions has some detrimental effect on organisational capacity, although this may be offset by subsequent new opportunities for dialogue with the authorities and, more recently, the reverse transfer of government officials to civil society, following the change in government in 2012.

Financial management also remain problematic, mainly due to the low level of awareness of the legal framework and tax regime. In general, it seems fair to say that CSOs have less difficulty with financial reporting to donors than they do with reporting to the Georgian authorities. Donors' training on project and financial management has undoubtedly made financial compliance with donors' regulations easier. The Georgian authorities sometimes make little distinction between CSOs' activities and those of businesses and this can be a complicating factor. Lack of information or confusion appears to give rise to missed opportunities as CSOs prefer to err on the side of caution when devising funding models.

In the case of policy dialogue and advocacy, noticeable progress has been recorded since 2012. On the one hand, this has been facilitated by the appearance of more opportunities for meaningful engagement with the authorities. On the other hand, donors, including the EU and USAID, have invested considerable efforts in training on advocacy, evidence-based research, PR and communications and coalition-building. Recipients have engaged both with the government and with the parliament making the most of practical opportunities to utilise their skills, achieving important legislative change in the process. Starting in 2012, Georgian CSOs have successfully launched a number of high profile advocacy campaigns, independent of any donor support. Their raised profile has resulted in more media coverage and consequent improvements in public perception of civil society. Although these achievements are important, it is desirable that these

gains and skills be extended to a wider circle of CSOs, including those active in the Georgian regions.

2 CURRENT EU ENGAGEMENT

2.1 STRUCTURED EU DIALOGUE WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

The EU Delegation regularly engages directly with civil society on both political and operational issues. This happens both on an *ad hoc* basis and as part of formalised processes within a particular policy context. Agendas, normally set by the Delegation, are sent out about a week in advance. Every effort is made to invite CSOs, both members and non-members of the Georgian National Platform (GNP), who may have a professional interest in the topic. The Delegation also does its best to ensure that not only the usual interlocutors are invited, but also includes new, relevant CSOs where these appear. In future, the Delegation intends to institute regular direct consultations with GNP Working Groups, for which agendas will be jointly set to ensure that issues of direct interest to CSOs are also discussed. Feedback is provided in the form of consultation summaries distributed by email, follow-up consultations and bilateral meetings, where necessary, and presentations.

As part of its ongoing support to the GNP, the Delegation has facilitated three 'trialogues', enabling discussion of topical policy issues and the GNP's presentation of its policy recommendations to the authorities[15]. Within the funded project, the GNP Co-ordinating Council and Working Groups have met almost 50 times in the last year to discuss progress on EU integration in their respective fields. In addition, the GNP Co-ordinating Council members had almost 30 collective or individual meetings with GoG officials on the same subject matter.

The Rule of Law Roundtable, established by the EU Delegation in 2008 brought together all relevant stakeholders in the justice sector. It was eventually superseded by the various mechanisms established by the Ministry of Justice (p. 4 above) and now meets on an *ad hoc* basis.

The Election Technical Working Group, which has been co-chaired by the EU Delegation and UNDP since 2008, brings together approximately 30 electoral stakeholders on a monthly basis to hear reports and discuss developments in the electoral arena and co-ordinate electoral assistance activities. Stakeholders include the Central Election Commission, domestic and international election NGOs and key donors. Invited participants regularly make presentation on topical election issues. Since 2012, the CEC has hosted the meeting, thereby demonstrating its ownership of the process.

The Donor Co-ordination Group (DCG) on Agriculture, established and co-chaired by the EU Delegation in 2009 represents a sustainable mechanism for exchange of information, knowledge sharing and technical advice. It now has over 40 members, including key donors, international organisations, NGOs, farmers' associations and Government agencies. It has a complex structure with seven coordination sub-groups focused on different needs of the key agriculture trends in Georgia. The DCG has actively participated in the revision of key documents, including the Strategy for Agriculture Sector Development of Georgia by coordinating strategy review process by donors and consolidating the comments received into a final document. In May 2014 the Donor Coordination Group (DCG) on Agriculture function has been officially transferred to the International Relations Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, as planned within the framework of ENPARD capacity development project.

[15] http://eapnationalplatform.ge/index.php?a=main&pid=283&lang=eng, Policy Papers

2.2 POLICY DIALOGUE FOR AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

The EU Delegation in Georgia has not been called upon to make any direct political interventions regarding the enabling environment for civil society in Georgia, due to the generally positive environment. There are no problems with CSO registration, right to association and assembly or freedom of expression or any overt form of repression against civil society activists. These issues pertain to the governance pillar of the enabling framework. In the case of Georgia, work on the enabling framework is more an issue of fine tuning secondary legislation, especially financial provisions. Other factors, which lie outside the legislative framework, remain to be addressed and are dealt with in other sections of this document.

EU Delegation efforts to support the enabling environment have so far concentrated on addressing the roles and functions of civil society and government in a developing democratic society, including recognition of their autonomy, their basic rights and obligations, the legal and logistical constraints they may face in fulfilling these obligations and their commitment to mutually respected values, such as public participation in decision-making, transparency, accountability, etc.

Taking into account the new openness of the Georgian Parliament to engage with a large variety of stakeholders, the EU Delegation has devoted considerable resources to expanding the space for civil society policy dialogue with parliament. This has been implemented through a number of CSO projects, which have had some notable success, measured both by the number and quality of new laws passed by the legislature upon the initiative of CSOs, as well as by the start of a structured dialogue process between more than 160 CSOs and Parliament aimed at institutionalizing policy dialogue and financial support frameworks for civil society[16]. This will be complemented by an increasing focus on strengthening the oversight capacities of Parliament, supported through and the EU's Comprehensive Institution Building Programme.

The role of donors in determining the conduciveness of the framework for CSOs' activities has not been left without attention either. The EU Delegation has been an active participant in a process initiated by a group of Georgian CSOs, which seeks to debate and arrive at a common set of values by which civil society and the donor community interact. Areas for discussion include CSO participation in the development of donor strategies and policies; communication and coordination (between donors; between CSOs; between donors and CSOs); the functional environment of CSOs; problem of politicisation of CSOs; risk analysis (what works and what doesn't); periodic assessment of strategies, evaluation of CSOs by donors; CSO Code of Ethics; capacity development; innovation vs. risk; development of reporting and evaluation systems; fostering youth and start-up organizations; raising awareness on and trust towards CSOs; development of special approaches to promote civil activism; citizen participation at all stages; inclusion of CSOs by the state in the development process with support of donors;

Finally, returning again to the practical level, the Delegation has, through specific, projects supported the amelioration of the taxation framework to allow more flexibility for CSOs in their activities, including economic activities and supporting volunteerism. This focus is to receive

[16] http://www.wfd.org/upload/docs/The%20Georgia%20Programme.pdf
http://www.civilin.org/Eng/viewprogram.php?id=2

continued support over the next years, as part of a broader effort to support CSOs' abilities to successfully diversify their funding sources.

2.3 MAINSTREAMING CIVIL SOCETY

The EU Delegation has been successfully mainstreaming civil society through its bilateral programming across a number of sectors through all phases from formulation to implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

Coordinated and participatory policy-making is one of the main achievements of the Justice Sector Policy Support Programme (SPSP), which involved CSOs in the programme's design from the outset. A general condition for the SPSP is the creation of a participatory and inclusive environment for policy-making and structured monitoring. CSOs are involved in all elements of the programme through a number of institutionalized mechanisms under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice (see p. 4 above). Through these mechanisms, CSOs contribute to the legislative process, to the design of action plans and their subsequent monitoring and to enhancing national ownership of sector policy reforms through participation in regional debates.

As part of the programme, the Georgian Bar Association, the major professional association representing the interests of lawyers, has received broad capacity development support to enhance its status as a representative body. The EIDHR and Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility Programmes have strengthened CSOs as service providers in the fields of prisoner rehabilitation and re-socialisation.

Support to CSOs' participation in policy dialogue and their engagement in providing complementary services shall continue in future, while a more structured engagement of CSOs in monitoring the implementation of justice sector reforms will be supported under the next programme. Separate assistance to academic institutions to further build up their analytical and research capacities to facilitate their engagement in policy dialogue with evidence based studies/assessments and researches is also a possibility.

In the agriculture sector, the budget support provided by the EU stipulated the establishment of a stakeholder committee as a condition of the support. The role of the stakeholder committee is to engage in policy dialogue and monitor implementation of government strategies and policies in the sector. CSOs have also been involved in the design (e.g. Law on Co-operatives) of other elements necessary for the release of budget support tranches. Some 50% of the total budget of the SPSP was implemented by CSOs in their role in support of the establishment of co-operatives throughout Georgia.

There are considerable opportunities for synergies between this Roadmap and the Public Administration Sector Reform Contract currently under development, especially in the decentralization/sub-national administration and oversight/anti-corruption components. Actions under the SRC may look at the issue of strengthening the capacities of both local authorities and regional CSOs and to stimulate partnerships between them, including the strengthening of already existing networks. Networks may take the form of either geographically focused networks within a region or between regions, or may also be thematic networks, with the emphasis being made on exchange of experience and personnel, coalition-building, capacity development, etc.

CSOs were consulted by the Delegation at all stages of the design of the SPSP in the Vocational Education and Training (VET) sector. In addition, CSOs will actively participate in implementation through actions focusing on partnerships in VET service delivery and cooperation with stakeholders at local level to develop public private partnerships.

Public Finance Management has long been a major focal sector for the EU in Georgia. Involvement of civil society was impeded by the reluctance of relevant government institutions to engage with CSOs on highly technical issues. Nevertheless, civil society participates in the PFM Reform Coordination Council meetings established by a Ministry of Finance decree in 2009 and chaired by the Minister of Finance. The establishment of the Council was one of the General Conditions of the second PFM SPSP. The council reviews and adopts PFM Sector Strategies and Action Plans and monitors implementation. Civil Society participation in this forum will be further supported and strengthened by an additional project financed under the Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility, which also foresees the establishment of a civil society budget monitoring coalition, which will provide capacity building for its members and encourage public debate on current issues in PFM.

Under the Regional Development Sector Reform Contract (SRC), CSOs will be heavily involved in monitoring of the programme. CSOs' research capacities will also be supported by the commissioning of 15 policy papers on regional development enabling the government to conduct an evidence-based results oriented regional policy.

CSOs are involved in policy dialogue on the issue of Internally Displaced Persons via representation at the Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation Steering Committee and direct participation in numerous related Temporary Expert Groups and Working Groups. Civil society was also extensively consulted in the formulation of the IDP IV Programme which has a strong focus on economic opportunities for IDPs. A related Call for Proposals (CfP) will allow CSOs to support the implementation of this programme through funding of actions aimed at supporting IDPs' livelihood strategies. The programme will be monitored by the Public Defender's Office with funding from another EU project.

2.4 COORDINATION

Since 2009 at least two different attempts to coordinate donor activities in the civil society sector have been established and have foundered. Initially, co-ordination was managed by the Open Society Georgia Foundation. When this forum ceased to exist, the EU Delegation took the initiative to organise quarterly meetings. After 3 meetings this mechanism was also discontinued, essentially due to lack of donor interest in participating, but also conditioned by the fact that at that stage co-ordination offered little beyond the chance to share information, but without any real openings for co-operation/synergy, which would have made the process more interesting and worthwhile. Co-ordination, on a bilateral basis, takes place relatively regularly between the EU and USAID as the two most substantial donors to Georgian civil society.

2.5 LESSONS LEARNT

Lessons learnt can be divided between those which have importance in an operational context and those which are related to the political or policy environment.

Operational conclusions

Focus on results – donor should demonstrate sufficient flexibility in allowing their grantees to change approaches midway through a project if something has been shown not to work or something else works better.

Project duration – the possibility to support projects with a longer duration could bring dividends. Donors focus on results, but often these are impossible to achieve within the framework of a two year project. Sustainable results and real change take longer.

Core funding is an important factor in establishing truly sustainable CSOs, especially in a context where salaries in civil society are not competitive with those in the public sector and alternative funding sources are scarce.

Political/policy conclusions

Focus on process – in contrast to the project implementation process, a focus on process during policy and other consultation processes is often more important than the eventual outcome achieved by such processes. Willingness on the part of the donor to be transparent and inclusive in decision-making has an exemplary effect, for both civil society and government counterparts, and can lead to the building of important social capital.

Donor driven agendas weaken CSOs – CSO forced to abandon their mission in order to obtain donor funding cannot become sustainable as they fail to build relationships with core constituencies, retain dedicated staff or build expertise.

Build on existing processes – inventing something new has inherently less sustainability than building on existing processes, especially if these processes grow naturally out of the local context and with the support of local actors.

Recognising entry points – timely recognition of entry points for dialogue with new interlocutors can leverage space for enhanced dialogue.

3 PRIORITIES

The Guidance for the Roadmap for EU Engagement with Civil Society sets out three main focus areas for support: i) improvement of the enabling framework; ii) support to involvement in policy dialogue; and iii) capacity development.

The view of the enabling framework which this document takes is the one promoted by Civicus, which includes not only the governance dimension, but also socio-cultural and socio-economic dimensions. The Roadmap concentrates on the socio-cultural dimension which is the weakest aspect in Georgia. The Roadmap will seek to address the problem of weak civic participation, above all in the regions of Georgia. The approach will aim to strengthen links between CSOs throughout Georgia, both urban and rural, thereby building capacity, linkages, experience and accountability. At the same time, efforts will be made to link CSOs more actively with civic education curriculum, with the aim of increasing civic participation of all kinds in Georgian regions, especially among youth. At the same time, this should enhance the sustainability of civil society, as it becomes more diverse and vibrant and above all, more relevant, to local communities.

Finally, on the enabling framework, the EU will seek to assist in the creation of a more conducive environment for CSO financial sustainability, making available knowledge about new sources and models of funding, as well as supporting efforts to fine tune certain outstanding pieces of legislation which have a financial impact on CSOs, thereby hopefully increasing financial, and overall, CSO sustainability.

In terms of support to the objective of increasing CSO involvement in policy dialogue, the Roadmap takes the view that Georgian CSOs need to make a greater impact in policy dialogue at the local level and that these efforts should be targeted at improving conditions for community development. In line with the more grassroots focus of other aspects of the Roadmap, the approach taken is to support the development of partnerships and dialogue for sustainable development, primarily on the local level, but also eventually feeding into policy dialogue on the national level. That is not to say that other policy areas will not benefit from support, but the primary focus will be on increasing capacity to develop new initiatives on the local level through increased participation and accountability. These actions will be complementary to bilateral EU assistance in agricultural and rural development, regional development and the upcoming public sector reform support, as well as supporting the domestic policy push for decentralisation and agricultural development as the motors for the revival of rural Georgia.

The Georgia Roadmap does not take capacity development as a discrete focal area because capacity development is not seen as an end in itself. Capacity development takes place in order to achieve a specific objective. In this understanding, capacity development is taken as a cross-cutting issue, which will be supported through the actions aimed at achieving the long-term outcomes set out below. For instance, capacity development for coalition-building will certainly play a role in support to the development of regional and thematic coalitions. Or, again, capacity building for financial management will not only enhance CSOs ability to manage donor funds, but will also increase their financial literacy in terms of the financial framework in which they operate, thereby increasing their sustainability. Thus capacity building is present in every part of the Roadmap

.

Desired Outcome: The Sustainability of Civil Society is enhanced

- Space for dialogue between civil society and the authorities at national and local level is enhanced and its inclusiveness is improved

Indicators:

- ✓ The number and diversity of CSOs engaged in dialogue with the authorities grows;
- ✓ The quantity and quality of policies and legislative drafts emerging from consultations grows;
- ✓ Mechanisms for civic participation are established/institutionalised;

- Civil society's capacity to engage with the EU and other donors is enhanced

Indicators:

- ✓ The EU regularly engages with CSOs on programming;
- ✓ CSOs participate in a knowledgeable way in donor consultation exercises;
- ✓ CSOs are engaged in formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of EU programmes;

- CSO accountability is increased

Indicators:

- ✓ An increased number of CSOs demonstrate improved internal governance of their organisations;
- ✓ CSOs have actively identified their principal constituencies and report regularly to them;
- ✓ CSOs engage their constituencies in planning, implementation and monitoring of their activities;

- The financial sustainability of CSOs is strengthened

Indicators:

- ✓ Trend in CSOs having diversified their funding sources (disaggregated by volume, region, thematic area, etc.);
- ✓ CSOs are able to demonstrate strategic development plans, including fundraising strategies;
- ✓ Trend in partnerships between CSOs and the private sector;
- ✓ Trend in sustainable corporate social responsibility programmes across the private sector;
- ✓ Legislative amendments passed which allow more CSOs to engage in economic activities;
- ✓ State funding mechanisms for civil society, at both central and local level, put in place;

Desired Outcome: Civic activism is increased

- Civic education is supported and its practical aspects strengthened

Indicators:

- ✓ Percentage of schools which establish links (visits, project activities) with local CSOs;
- ✓ Trend in pupils and people generally volunteering to work with CSOs;
- ✓ Trend in seed-funding for community-based development;
- ✓ Trend in participation in civic engagement mechanisms at local level;

- CSOs in Georgian regions increase their capacity and outreach

Indicators:

- ✓ Trends in quality of policy dialogue and advocacy efforts conducted by regional CSOs;
- ✓ Frequency and regularity of meetings with local stakeholders (media, business, etc.);
- ✓ Trends in CSO staff members, training opportunities and annual turnover;

Desired Outcome: Local voices in sustainable development policies are promoted

- Civil society's capacity to engage at all levels in policy dialogue for sustainable development is strengthened

Indicators:

- ✓ Quality of needs-based, evidence-based policy papers produced by CSOs;
- ✓ Authorities take CSO recommendations into account;
- ✓ Trend in public perception of civil society;

- Regional and thematic CSO networks are supported

Indicators:

- ✓ Trends in participation in formal and informal regional and thematic networks;
- ✓ Networks offering relevant services to their members;
- ✓ Networks participate in policy dialogue with the authorities and donors;

- Partnerships between CSOs, local authorities, business and media are supported

Indicators:

- ✓ Joint initiatives at local level in favour of sustainable development;
- ✓ Regular dialogue between stakeholders takes place;
- ✓ Trends in community issues successfully addressed;

- Capacities of local officials to engage in participative decision-making processes are developed

Indicators:

- ✓ Local officials effectively manage civic engagement mechanisms;
- ✓ Local budgets reflecting recorded citizen concerns;
- ✓ Active engagement of Citizen Advisory Councils in local development strategies;

- The concept and practice of social enterprise is promoted

Indicators:

- ✓ Awareness of the concept of social enterprise is increased;
- ✓ Number of CSOs engaged in activities supporting social enterprise;
- ✓ Number of social enterprises created;
- ✓ Number of public-private partnerships existing;

4 ACTIONS

Action tables

Priority 1
Space for dialogue between civil society and the authorities at national and local level is enhanced and its inclusiveness is improved
Indicator(s)
✓ The number and diversity of CSOs engaged in dialogue with the authorities grows; ✓ The quantity and quality of policies and legislative drafts emerging from consultations grows; ✓ Mechanisms for civic participation are established/institutionalised;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
Mapping on civil society engagement in policy dialogue in 2014, to be repeated in 2016. *Responsible:* Regional ENPI project 'Civil Society. Dialogue for Progress' Baseline study and Endline Study to map progress in achieving indicators set out in the present Roadmap. *Responsible:* ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
Key messages: Georgian authorities to ensure timely disclosure of information to civil society, enabling their meaningful participation in policy-making; Georgian authorities increase predictability of consultation opportunities through greater institutionalization of relevant mechanisms; EU to encourage GoG to consult civil society within the framework of budget support operations and allow greater monitoring; *Means:* Policy discussion fora, e.g. Cooperation Committees, EU-Civil Society Human Rights Dialogue, budget support formulation exercises, through sector project interventions. *Responsible:* EUD, EEAS, Member States, Georgian National Platform (GNP)
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Support to the secretariat of the Georgian National Platform of the EaP Civil Society Forum; 2) Further support for the development of the Concept on Civil Society, developed as per the MoU between civil society and the Parliament of Georgia; 3) Capacity development of CSOs on policy dialogue skills, advocacy, PR and communication and evidence-based research;

4) Support to CSOs' involvement in policy dialogue within the EU integration framework;

Means:

Component 1 - Direct award under ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project.

Components 2 and 4 - CfPs under the ENI programme as successor to the Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility for components 2 and 4 (within ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project).

Component 4 – EIDHR CBSS and Mainstreaming under ENI SPSPs.

Component 3 – Capacity Development Programme through ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project.

Responsible: EU Delegation, GNP, GoG, LAs, various CSOs.

Priority 2
Civil society's capacity to engage with the EU and other donors is enhanced.
Indicator(s)
✓ The EU regularly engages with CSOs on programming; ✓ CSOs participate in a knowledgeable way in donor consultation exercises; ✓ CSOs are engaged in formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of EU programmes;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
Engagement with key civil society stakeholders on discussion regarding the donor-civil society co-operation framework is continued; Efforts stepped up to conduct consultations on programming in regions of Georgia, not just in Tbilisi; EU Delegation to publish annually a timetable of programming exercises and expected inputs from civil society; *Means:* Consultation, publications. *Responsible:* EU Delegation, GNP
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Capacity-building for CSOs to ensure more effective engagement in EU programming and monitoring of programmes; *Means:* Capacity-building programmes under ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project and through selected SPSPs. *Responsible:* ENI contractor, GNP.

Priority 3
CSO accountability is increased
Indicator(s)
✓ An increased number of CSOs demonstrate improved internal governance of their organisations; ✓ CSOs have actively identified their principal constituencies and report regularly to them; ✓ CSOs engage their constituencies in planning, implementation and monitoring of their activities;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
EU Delegation continues to discuss civil society support framework and best practice with stakeholders; *Means:* Consultation, meetings; *Responsible:* EU Delegation,
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Capacity-building for CSOs to address issues of democratic governance, public outreach, communication, advocacy, reporting standards, etc. *Means:* Capacity-building programmes under ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project. EIDHR CBSS. *Responsible:* ENI contractor, GNP, CSO grantees.

Priority 4
The financial sustainability of CSOs is strengthened
Indicator(s)
✓ Trend in CSOs having diversified their funding sources (disaggregated by volume, region, thematic area, etc.); ✓ CSOs are able to demonstrate strategic development plans, including fundraising strategies; ✓ Trend in partnerships between CSOs and the private sector; ✓ Trend in sustainable corporate social responsibility programmes across the private sector; ✓ Legislative amendments passed which allow more CSOs to engage in economic activities; ✓ State funding mechanisms for civil society, at both central and local level, put in place;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
Engagement with Ministry of Finance and other relevant services to ensure that sub-grantees of EU grants are eligible to receive tax exemptions, e.g. vat; Advocacy of state funding mechanisms for CSOs at national and local level; Advocacy of amendments to tax legislation which provide greater incentives for CSR and enable CSO economic activity; *Means:* EU-Georgia bilateral policy dialogue fora, correspondence; *Responsible:* EU Delegation, DEVCO missions, CSO stakeholders.
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Capacity-building for CSOs on fundraising, tax literacy and financial management. 2) Support to CSO efforts to improve the financial enabling framework; *Means:* Capacity-building programmes under ENI 2015 Support to Civil Society Project. *Responsible:* ENI contractor

Priority 5
Civic education is supported and its practical aspects strengthened
Indicator(s)
✓ Percentage of schools which establish links (visits, project activities) with local CSOs; ✓ Trend in pupils and people generally volunteering to work with CSOs; ✓ Trend in seed-funding for community-based development; ✓ Trend in participation in civic engagement mechanisms at local level;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
• Evaluation of EU involvement in the civic education sector in Georgia (ongoing) *Means:* Framework Contract *Responsible:* EU Delegation
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Support to strengthening of links between local CSOs and schools through visits, CSO volunteer programmes and youth summer schools 2) Support to strengthening youth engagement in local activism through Youth Councils, Youth Banks, etc. 3) Support to small community-based initiatives through the provision of seed funding, administered by local CSOs or Youth Banks. *Means:* CSO/LA thematic programme Calls for Proposals (CfP) EIDHR CBSS. *Responsible:* EU Delegation, various CSO grantees

Priority 6
CSOs in Georgian regions increase their capacity and outreach
Indicator(s)
✓ Trends in quality of policy dialogue and advocacy efforts conducted by regional CSOs; ✓ Frequency and regularity of meetings with local stakeholders (media, business, etc.); ✓ Trends in CSO staff members, training opportunities and annual turnover;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Support to establishment of mentoring relationships between Tbilisi-based CSOs and regional CSOs and between strong regional CSOs and CBOs. 2) Capacity-building for regional CSOs on policy dialogue, fundraising, organisational capacity, advocacy, etc. *Means:* Component 1 - CSO/LA thematic programme Calls for Proposals Component 2 - Capacity-building through ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project *Responsible:* EU Delegation, ENI contractor, CSO grantees

Priority 7
Civil society's capacity to engage at all levels in policy dialogue for sustainable development is strengthened.
Indicator(s)
✓ Quality of needs-based, evidence-based policy papers produced by CSOs; ✓ Authorities take CSO recommendations into account; ✓ Trend in public perception of civil society;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
Mapping on roles of actors (ongoing) Means: ENPI project 'Civil Society. Dialogue for Progress'
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Support to CSOs in building policy dialogue skills. *Means:* Capacity-building through ENI 2015 Civil Society Support Project *Responsible:* ENI contractor

Priority 8
Regional and thematic CSO networks are supported
Indicator(s)
✓ Trends in participation in formal and informal regional and thematic networks; ✓ Networks offering relevant services to their members; ✓ Networks participate in policy dialogue with the authorities and donors;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Technical assistance and capacity building for existing CSO regional networks; 2) Support for staff exchange and knowledge-sharing between regional CSOs. *Means:* Technical assistance component of ENI 2015 Sector Reform Contract on Public Administration Reform. CSO/LA thematic programme CfP. *Responsible:* EU Delegation, ENI contractors, Regional CSO networks;

Priority 9
Partnerships between CSOs, local authorities, business and media are supported
Indicator(s)
✓ Joint initiatives at local level in favour of sustainable development; ✓ Regular dialogue between stakeholders takes place; ✓ Trends in community issues successfully addressed;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Support to partnerships at local level between all stakeholders, including the private sector; 2) Facilitation of dialogue between CSOs and local authorities at local level, possibly through NALA; 3) Support for citizen participation in local decision-making, including on budgetary processes; 4) Awareness-raising on benefits of multi-stakeholder partnerships at local level; *Means:* CSO/LA thematic programme CfP *Responsible:* EU Delegation, NALA, local authorities, CSO grantees.

Priority 10
Capacities of local officials to engage in participative decision-making processes are developed
Indicator(s)
✓ Local officials effectively manage civic engagement mechanisms; ✓ Local budgets reflecting recorded citizen concerns; ✓ Active engagement of Citizen Advisory Councils in local development strategies;
Actions:
A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research
n/a
B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation
n/a
C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming
1) Development of new curricula for local officials on topics such as civic engagement, etc. to be taught via public administration schools; 2) ToT and capacity development for public administration schools; 3) Support for Citizen Advisory Councils, including capacity development and budget transparency; *Means:* Components 1 and 2: Technical assistance component of ENI 2015 SRC on Public Administration SRC; Component 3 - CSO/LA thematic programme CfP. *Responsible:* EU Delegation, ENI contractors, CSO grantees.

Priority 11

The concept and practice of social enterprise is promoted

Indicator(s)

- ✓ Awareness of the concept of social enterprise is increased;
- ✓ Number of CSOs engaged in activities supporting social enterprise;
- ✓ Number of social enterprises created;
- ✓ Number of public-private partnerships existing;

Actions:

A. Analysis: Studies, mappings and research

n/a

B. Policy dialogue, consultation and facilitation

1. Policy dialogue with facilitates the introduction of social enterprise models, both for profit and not for profit, including through legislative change;
2. Policy dialogue with local authorities on the use of public-private partnerships;

Responsible: EU Delegation, CSO Social Enterprise Coalition, NALA.

C. Funding: Operational support including mainstreaming

1) Support to a CSO Social Enterprise Coalition

2) Support for individual projects supporting social enterprise models in communities;

Means:

Component 1 - Direct award under CSO/LA thematic programme;

Component 2 - CSO/LA thematic programme CfP and synergies with ENPARD programme and VET SPSP.

Responsible: EU Delegation, CSO Social Enterprise Coalition, CSO grantees.

5 DASHBOARD

Country:		
Process		
Area	Indicator	Achievement
Involvement of Member States in Roadmap elaboration	Member States present in the country are actively involved in the elaboration of the Roadmap	Yes – 2 out of 15 present in the country actively involved.
Consultation with local civil society	The Roadmap has been prepared on the basis of consultations with a broad range of local CSOs respecting principles of access to information, sufficient advance notice, and clear provisions for feedback and follow-up.	Yes 2 Tbilisi-based consultations conducted. 3 regional consultations conducted. 2 web-based consultations conducted. 1 workshop on indicators conducted. 3 Reference Groups meetings (consisting of key stakeholders) conducted. 28 bilateral meetings.
Joint actions	Member States present in the country are actively involved in the implementation of the Roadmap priorities	Yes, but separately, not jointly with the EU.
Outcome		
Priority	Indicator	Achievement
Space for dialogue between civil society and the authorities at national and local level is enhanced and its inclusiveness is improved	The number and diversity of CSOs engaged in dialogue with the authorities grows; The quantity and quality of policies and legislative drafts emerging from consultations grows; Mechanisms for civic participation are established/institutionalised;	
Civil society's capacity to engage with the EU and other donors is enhanced.	The EU regularly engages with CSOs on programming; CSOs participate in a knowledgeable way in donor consultation exercises; CSOs are engaged in formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of EU programmes;	
CSO accountability is increased	An increased number of CSOs demonstrate improved internal	

	governance of their organisations; CSOs have actively identified their principal constituencies and report regularly to them; CSOs engage their constituencies in planning, implementation and monitoring of their activities;	
The financial sustainability of CSOs is strengthened	Trend in CSOs having diversified their funding sources (disaggregated by volume, region, thematic area, etc.); CSOs are able to demonstrate strategic development plans, including fundraising strategies; Trend in partnerships between CSOs and the private sector; Trend in sustainable corporate social responsibility programmes across the private sector; Legislative amendments passed which allow more CSOs to engage in economic activities; State funding mechanisms for civil society, at both central and local level, put in place;	
Civic education is supported and its practical aspects strengthened	Percentage of schools which establish links (visits, project activities) with local CSOs; Trend in pupils and people generally volunteering to work with CSOs; Trend in seed-funding for community-based development; Trend in participation in civic engagement mechanisms at local level;	
CSOs in Georgian regions increase their capacity and outreach	Trends in quality of policy dialogue and advocacy efforts conducted by regional CSOs; Frequency and regularity of meetings with local stakeholders (media, business, etc.); Trends in CSO staff members, training opportunities and annual turnover;	
Civil society's capacity to engage at all levels in policy dialogue for sustainable development is strengthened.	Quality of needs-based, evidence-based policy papers produced by CSOs; Authorities take CSO recommendations into account;	

	Trend in public perception of civil society;	
Regional and thematic CSO networks are supported	Trends in participation in formal and informal regional and thematic networks; Networks offering relevant services to their members; Networks participate in policy dialogue with the authorities and donors;	
Partnerships between CSOs, local authorities, business and media are supported	Joint initiatives at local level in favour of sustainable development; Regular dialogue between stakeholders takes place; Trends in community issues successfully addressed;	
Capacities of local officials to engage in participative decision-making processes are developed	Local officials effectively manage civic engagement mechanisms; Local budgets reflecting recorded citizen concerns; Active engagement of Citizen Advisory Councils in local development strategies;	
The concept and practice of social enterprise is promoted	Awareness of the concept of social enterprise is increased; Number of CSOs engaged in activities supporting social enterprise; Number of social enterprises created; Number of public-private partnerships existing;	