

Concept Note
Democratisation Programme
in
Georgia
(2017 – 2021)



**“Strengthening of Civil Society Organisations
- bringing democratic change in Georgia”**

“Strengthening of Civil Society Organisations - bringing democratic change in Georgia”

Summary

The Danish Foreign Ministry’s strategic and thematic objectives defined in its Neighbourhood Programme responds very well to the priorities articulated in the EU current roadmap (2014-17) for engagement with the Georgian civil society. When mapped against the current Georgian government’s aspirations reflected in the country’s human rights strategy for the next five years (2014-20), and its associated democracy and governance documents, the suggested Danish programme fits in with several other actors’ strategies already on the scene.

The international community’s interventions in Georgia in the past few years targeted cooperation with state institutions and government agencies, with the activities concentrated in the capital, Tbilisi, and major cities. With more attention given to good governance and judicial reforms in the past programmes came the growing need to revert to more grassroots approach of targeting civil society and regions outside Tbilisi in the future – something identified early and being put into practice by Europe Foundation.

The suggested support to civil society will be provided through a delegated cooperation with SIDA with core support to Europe Foundation. The total budget will be 30 million DKK for a five years programme.

The overall objective of the programme is to improve Civil Society’s capacity and sustainability to address societal needs at regional and local level covering neglected or marginalised areas and communities. More specifically, the programme will have the following targeted objectives:

- *to raise the capacity of regional and local CSOs to empower and mobilise local communities and to improve their long-term impact and sustainability*
- *to increase participation of young people, women and disadvantaged members of communities in the democratic and economic life and self-governance on the local level*

A special feature of the proposed programme is to subordinate the media component of the overall intervention to the wider civil society action as an empowerment tool enabling local beneficiaries to use media and digital skills, increased media literacy and community media outlets in order to increase impact and outreach of civil society organisations’ activities in their communities.

1. National and Thematic Context

1.1. General Context. Many of Georgia’s democratic and reform processes are being re-examined and reassessed by the international community in the light of a radical reshaping of its political landscape following the parliamentary and presidential elections in 2012-14. In particular, new ways of engaging with the government, public institutions and the Georgian society as a whole are being developed amid concerns that the democratic achievements of the Saakashvili era (2004-2013) may be under threat. This is taking place in the context of evidence that the influence of the Russian media on Georgian society is growing despite continued support from the West for its closer integration with Europe.

The year 2008 was a turning point for the 5 million citizens of Georgia as a result of the week-long war with Russia over South Ossetia. Despite its unsettling effect, Georgia passed the test of the strength of its democracy, when the first peaceful transfer of power in the country's history took place in 2013-14. The departure of pro-Western Mikheil Saakashvili and his political bloc from power was a major political shift, but this time it did not trigger internal conflict or instability.

The democratic investment in Georgia of the last 25 years has produced a vibrant society with pluralistic and freedom-minded attitudes but beleaguered by continuous democratic and governance deficits. Georgia stands out in this area in the Caucasus region and the international community is determined not to allow erosion or squandering of the achievements of the reforms conducted so far in the country which acts as a beacon of democracy and progress for the whole of the region.

1.2. Civil Society. The past several years have not been easy for the Georgian civil society organizations, however, as they were forced to deal with the aftermath of the war with Russia, and confront low levels of transparency in public administration, as well as the lack of judicial independence and impartiality exposed in the process of the transfer of power from Saakashvili to the political bloc of Bidzina Ivanishvili. This has produced a highly polarized political environment characterised by shifts within civil society movement, whereby some of its leaders moved into public office, while many former public officials shifted into the civil society sphere, often creating new CSOs or reinvigorating existing ones.

Despite this generally positive picture, CSOs in Georgia continue to demonstrate low levels of overall sustainability and institutional strength. USAID's annual NGO sustainability index continues to place Georgian civil society in the evolving sustainability category, with an unchanged status over the last several years. Many Georgian CSOs suffer from limited legitimacy and weak internal governance. Most are geared to the expectations and requirements of the donor community rather than their target beneficiaries. The net result is that they enjoy a limited mandate from the citizenry who do not fully trust many of them and often perceive them as vehicles of internal politics.

Georgia has demonstrated remarkable improvements in governance and democracy during the past years – largely as a result of international support. But the limited capacity of the media and civil society to ensure proper advocacy and oversight of public reforms, especially outside the capital remain key challenges in the area of democracy and human rights. One of them is to link CSOs closer with civic education programmes with the view to increasing civic participation particularly in the regions, and especially among the youth.

It is widely perceived that CSOs play a very important role in ensuring continuation of reforms and modernisation in Georgia, which has been facing big economic challenges. For example, the National Statistics Office of Georgia estimates the official unemployment rate in the country at around 15%, while the average monthly salary stands at about 350 USD. But the result of a survey by the National Democratic Institute suggests that more than 50% of the

Georgians consider themselves unemployed. It firmly identifies poverty and unemployment as the key issues to address in the Georgian society. Civil society organizations play a significant role in alleviating poverty by creating possibilities for citizens to access information, education, healthcare and decision making processes. However, CSO links with their constituencies remain weak, which deters them from effectively advocating on behalf of the country's disadvantaged groups.

While some positive trends can be reported with respect to gender equality, including mainstreaming gender considerations in the country's electoral and labour laws, much needs to be done to address the gender gap in Georgia, particularly outside urban centres. Women and girls from ethnic minority-populated areas face additional challenges, including cases of denial of basic human rights and freedoms. Georgian women are under-represented in decision-making and planning, and at the same time traditional views about women's role in society persist to this day. This includes the Georgian parliament, central and local governments. Gender inequality in Georgia remains high with the 81st ranking in the world gender inequality index among 187 countries.

2.3. The Media. In contrast to sustained levels of activity and international funding for civil society programmes in Georgia, one can speak of relative disengagement with the Georgian media on an autonomous basis. This is reflected in the programmatic content of major donors and implementing agencies. For example, SIDA has not been supporting any media programmes directly for some time, while the Council of Europe and the European Delegation to Georgia only support minor schemes mostly related to media monitoring or media advocacy and training. There is continuing reticence of international agencies and organisations in Georgia to invest heavily in the sphere of the media following the elections of 2012-14. This reality has been reflected in the proposed project design and its accompanying justification.

2. Presentation and justification of the programme

2.1. Existing support and identified needs

With the focusing of the future Danish Neighbourhood Programme on Ukraine and Georgia, it was decided that the identification of new democratisation programmes in the two countries to try and establish a similar portfolio in both countries in order to explore possibly synergies.

Denmark has since 2008 supported democratisations programmes in Ukraine with Council of Europe as the implementing partner:

- “Good Governance Programme in Georgia”, 2008-2010 (DKK 15 Mill).
- “Promotion of Judicial Reforms, Human and Minority Rights of Georgia 2010-2013 (DKK 20 Mill).
- “Strengthening the Independence and Efficiency of the Justice System in Georgia”, 2014 – 2015 (DKK 4.5 Mill)

The exploration of the relevance and feasibility of a Danish funded media and civil society programme in Georgia is the first step in establishing a larger portfolio within the objective to

strengthen democracy and human rights. This concept note is based on the conclusions from the desk review and analysis and field visits with consultations with key stakeholders.

It is important to point out at the outset that there are no existing partnerships within media and civil society support between DANIDA and actors operating in Georgia to draw on. Furthermore, DANIDA has no physical presence in the country¹, which has called for an identification of a partner fit and trustworthy enough for delegated cooperation. For this reason, it has been assessed most productive to engage with programmes and projects in relevant areas still underway and already implemented by others in Georgia itself.

The donor landscape in Georgia is rich and varied, and includes organisations with which DANIDA had already had positive cooperation under either previous programmes (also in other countries) such as CoE and UNDP, or current ones outside Georgia. Other major players in the country include the EU Delegation, USAID, IREX, SIDA, as well as EF and Open Society Foundation. It has to be stressed that donor coordination mechanisms are well developed in Georgia, and there is high awareness of who is doing or planning what, and efforts are consistently made to avoid duplication or clashes, and to make sure there are no obvious programming gaps.

Civil Society Sphere. The identification process found that previous programmes emanating from the Action for Georgia 2013-15, have had a strong emphasis on co-operating with governmental institutions and public bodies and much less focus on civic engagement, regional activities and grass-roots approaches. These and other similar projects seemed to fail in addressing major issue; namely the persistent imbalance between Tbilisi-based, well-established and fully institutionalised CSOs and their regional and rural counterparts which suffer from insufficient support and lack of funds. This is reinforced by the relative unwillingness of Tbilisi-centric organisation to conduct unglamorous, organic work in the regions in a systematic fashion rather than in one-off projects and interventions.

Civil Society is for all intents and purposes the main emphasis for future programming in Georgia, and a top priority is to export its capabilities and impact outside Tbilisi in meaningful and well-targeted regional and community projects such as empowerment of women and youth through employability, self-government initiatives, or increasing social mobility. Such projects should have physical outcomes such as opening village nurseries to enable women to work, or community action placements for young people to increase their active engagement at local level as well as employability and related soft-skills. Improved outreach and increased public trust in CSO's and their activities was a recurring need expressed throughout the entire identification mission. All these elements are expressly present in programmatic proposals extended by EF and already approved by SIDA.

The Media Sphere. During the identification process it became clear that a general decrease in the level of engagement with the media there by international donors has taken place. There are not many significant or sizeable media-related projects underway in Georgia, and no major future

¹ The Danish Embassy in Ukraine is covering Georgia.

opportunities were identified planned by major actors that would be relevant for DANIDA's sectoral and thematic objectives.

A closer examination of the state of the Georgian public service broadcaster, the GPB, revealed that its reform and modernisation aspirations and plans were not supported by a viable or realistic business model or implementation strategy at this stage and could expose a donor to a significant risk. Finally, an examination of the state of democracy-oriented media advocacy actors showed fragmentation and limited coordination. Media Advocacy Coalition previously seen as a future consolidated platform to act on the national level has suffered from internal splits and withdrawals of members.

Many interlocutors mentioned media literacy as an important component in the media sphere, but few articulated structured ideas about how to go about it or how to incorporate it in their general media strategy and link it to other media related activities.

Given the considerations above, the most constructive approach to addressing media issues in the context of human rights and democracy would be to bind them to civil society programmes and incorporate into core funding with EF.

2.2. Relevance

The programme is in line with the global discussion on the crucial role of citizens' participation and importance of community development in the process of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and falls within DANIDA's strategic aim to develop democratic societies with accountable authorities and vibrant civil societies as part of its efforts to strengthen democracy and human rights. The programme is well in line with the draft strategy for Denmark's development and humanitarian cooperation (2016) where supporting democratisation, human rights, gender equality, and youth are important factors in creating societies with checks and balances on the executive, a strong civil society and a free media, and where people participate actively and take on responsibility for the development of society.

In addition, the programme follows the priorities mentioned in the Danish's Neighbourhood Strategy (2013-2017) which expresses the Danish commitment to assist the neighbouring countries to integrating further with EU and Europe.

The proposed programme responds through its focus to the priorities articulated in the EU current roadmap (2014-17) for engagement with the Georgian civil society. When mapped against the current Georgian government's aspirations reflected in the country's human rights strategy for the next five years (2014-20), and its associated democracy and governance documents, the suggested Danish programme fits in with several other actors' strategies already on the scene in a seamless manner.

2.3. Theory of Change

If Civil Society (CSOs and active citizens) capacity and sustainability in addressing citizens' societal needs is strengthened, *then* citizens will take more responsibility for their own social and economic prosperity. With a demand-driven approach civil society actors can better determine

and achieve outcomes of enduring benefit to themselves and their communities. This consequently would increase CSOs' accountability and citizens' trust towards them.

Important *assumptions* in this theory of change are that all partners remain committed to this goal; CSOs especially the implementation partners, remain fully engaged and transparent; and that no outer political and social crisis derail the process.

2.3. Programme Objectives

Out of major implementers in Georgia, EF, has been found to be ready and willing to engage with regional CSOs on a systemic level within a defined programmatic framework addressing local issues related to democracy and human rights. EF a well-known player in the Georgian CSO sphere, has a strong focus on engagement, institutional support and capacity building, while implementing programmes based on research and evidence. The organisation has already conducted significant work in the regions dedicated to strengthening and capacity building of local CSOs. They conduct activities in developing socio-economic rights as part of their human rights activities as well as promote social entrepreneurship as a transformative experience for many people.

The overall objective of the planned programme is in line with EF's Theory of Change:

To improve Civil Society's capacity and sustainability to address societal needs at regional and local level covering neglected or marginalised areas and communities.

Objective 1:

To raise the capacity of regional and local CSOs to empower and mobilise local communities and to improve their long-term impact and sustainability

With particular focus on CSO capacity development this objective will be achieved through 4 tailored programmes covering a range of areas including support to Civil society's to improve their influence on public decision making process and their contribution to participatory decision making; ensuring that CSOs are increasingly utilizing the Social Enterprise concept as one of the ways of attaining their long-term sustainability so as to address the needs of their vulnerable constituencies, and contributing to improved civil society capacity and longer-term sustainability to address societal needs.

The main activities will be:

- Grant support to CSOs (including grassroots) in various areas including civic monitoring and advocacy, identifying and addressing local needs through demand driven projects developed by local CSOs and civic activists, institutional development;
- Promotion of civic participation in the process of Georgia's integration into the EU through dialogue and information

- Promotion of the Social Enterprise concept and supporting CSOs in diversifying their funding
- Development of regional resource centres and provision of organizational development support
- Training and mentoring of CSO representatives and active citizens in a wide range of areas including participative and evidence based policy making, project management cycle, strategic planning, audits, monitoring, ethics and integrity, fundraising, communication/awareness-raising and campaigning.

The main results will be:

- Civil society influence on public decision making process is enhanced,
- Civil society is engaged in and contributes to participatory decision making to achieve convergence to European standards and practices,
- Concept of social enterprise is put on a policy agenda and is increasingly utilized as a way of attaining long-term CSO sustainability to address the needs of their vulnerable constituencies
- Targeted CSOs are effective in addressing the needs of their constituencies.

Objective 2:

To increase participation of young people, women and disadvantaged members of communities in the democratic and economic life and self-governance on the local level.

With particular focus on CSO capacity development this objective will be achieved through a tailored programme supporting underserved youth, women and disadvantaged members of communities to build their leadership capacity and enhance female and male youth volunteerism and civic engagement to address their own communities' needs.

The main activities will be:

- Training at local level in Youth Bank² (YB) methodology and providing youth, women and disadvantaged members of communities with small grants to support micro projects developed by their peers for responding to community needs.
- Extending the number of already created Youth Banks (YB) to more municipalities throughout Georgia and widening the scope to more target groups in the regions
- Fostering network building and supporting cross-community initiatives

² One of EF's primary targets is youth with small and micro projects funding schemes (Youth Bank) to make young people implement small projects themselves.

- Engaging with “graduated” YB members and train them in becoming mentors and multiplications
- Enhancing public-private-NGO partnerships by targeting local businesses for providing support to the YBs of their choice.

The main result will be:

- participation of young people, women and disadvantaged members of communities in the democratic and economic life and self-governance on the local level is increased and sustained.

The Media Sub-component. The further programming process will look at attaching relevant media strands to each civil society sub-project implemented by a given grantee. Given the importance of media literacy programmes in rural areas and the regions, efforts will be made to equip each such project with an appropriate media instruments. The choice of these tools and possible other support areas for media will be discussed and decided during formulation stage. An overriding objective of the media subcomponent will be:

- *to equip members of local communities with instruments to distinguish between fact and comment, accurate information and propaganda, journalism and public relations;*
- *to empower them and make their actions more effective by training them in digital media skills and the ability to exploit the power of the media in their social and civic activism.*

The possibilities for public diplomacy and communication initiatives in the programme in Georgia and Denmark will also be elaborated during the implementation.

3. Management set-up

EF will be responsible for the implementation of the activities against the benchmarks agreed with SIDA. To this aim EF will establish an internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the programme and elaborate regular progress reports and final reports. Consequently, Denmark will receive reporting from SIDA on the whole programme.

SIDA/Georgia has acceded to the idea of jointly coordinating programming and implementing efforts with DANIDA. SIDA’s ongoing support for EF based on programme-related core-funding will continue until July 2019.

Denmark will consider being represented in mid-term review of the programme, however, conducting separate M&E/review exercises is not foreseen unless irregularities are observed. Denmark will have a regular dialogue with SIDA on the programme and during visits to Georgia have meetings with EF and SIDA on the progress of the programme will be held.

Brief descriptions of the implementing partners and possible key beneficiaries are attached in Annex A.

4. Tentative budget allocations

The overall Danish programme budget (30 DKK million for 60 months) is planned to be committed in Q2 of 2017. The funds will be provided to EF as “core” funding in a delegated cooperation with possible earmarking for activities. Due the fact that EF currently receives from SIDA annual core funding of approximately 9.3 SEK million until June 2019, it is suggested that the DANIDA’s contribution will be disbursed as indicated below. The distribution between the two components and the media sub-component might change during the formulation.

Development engagement	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Component 1 & 2	1	1	6.5	8	8	24
Sub-component -media	1	1	1	1	1	5
Review /M&E			0.5			0.5
Total in DKK	2	2	8	9	9	30

6. Programmatic and external risks and their mitigation

In the framework of the proposed delegated co-operation with SIDA and core funding for EF, programmatic risk management requirements are reduced and as it is part of SIDA’s quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation procedures. Given the collaborative nature of the support, the actual risk mitigation strategy applied in Georgia will be a joint effort partly subject to further negotiation with the partners in the formulation stage.

Pleased find more in the attached Risk Matrix (Annex E).

PROCESS ACTION PLAN FOR
Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme
2017-2021
30 Million DKK

Activity	Responsible	Date
Identification		
Tender Invitation (TOR for identification and formulation)	EUN	Mid-April
Selection of consultancy	EUN/HMC	Late May
Identification Mission (two teams: Ukraine and Georgia)	External consultants and EUN	June/July
Draft Identification Reports, Concept Notes (including annexes), revised PAP and ToR	Consultants	Mid-September (concept notes in the beginning of September)
Programme Committee		
Agenda notification to Programme Committee	EUN	7 weeks before meeting
Submission of Concept Note	EUN	17 working days before the meeting
Programme Committee Meeting	EUN	13 October
Formulation		
Formulation Mission(s) to Georgia and Ukraine – two teams	Consultants	Late October
Draft Programme Documents, including annexes	Consultants	Mid November
Approval by Minister	EUN	January 2017
Signing of Agreement with Impl. Partner	EUN	January/February 2017
Programme Start	Impl. Partner/EF	March/April 2017

Annex I

Profiles of the selected partners

Europe Foundation. EF (formerly Eurasia Partnership Foundation) has the most comprehensive array of attributes as an implementer and grant maker for the purposes of action planned by DANIDA compared to other purely domestic players in Georgia. With their focus on engagement, institutional support and capacity building, they implement programmes based on research and evidence. They receive core funding from SIDA and also get funds from the EU, USAID, UNDP and several country embassies based in Tbilisi. EF is into its second year of the core funding agreement with SIDA amounting to 38.1 million SEK over a 5-year period running until July 2019. Its remaining funding streams from the EC and other organisations – mostly programmatic – have either been completed or are about to close. Most importantly, they have developed their own ToC philosophy which they apply consistently as evidenced in their programmatic proposal document presented to SIDA.

One of EF's primary targets is youth with small and micro projects funding schemes (Youth Bank) to make young people implement small projects themselves. Quite characteristically, those projects have communication and media elements built in. EF typically tries to find and develop environmental, educational or consumer affairs strands in their projects exploiting and transplanting new formats developed by others in countries such as Northern Ireland (N.I Community Foundation). They actively employ and incorporate theory of change onto their projects and routinely engage the media in the implementation of many projects.

The organisation has already conducted significant work in the regions dedicated to strengthening and capacity building of local CSOs. They conduct activities in developing socio-economic rights as part of their human rights activities as well as promote social entrepreneurship as a transformative experience for many people. They have stated that they implement many projects employing SIDA strategy. They are a strongly established and well known player on the Georgian CSO market.

SIDA

SIDA's focus in Georgia has been mainly in the area of democracy and human rights, which makes them a specialised agency for the purposes of the planned DANIDA engagement. SIDA provides core support to EF which in turn is reflected through its support to a number of women's organisations on the ground in Georgia. One of major foci for SIDA has been women's rights, and work against domestic violence among other things. SIDA invariably looks for cross-cutting projects and joint programming, and places great emphasis on regionalisation and local community initiatives. It is always alert when it comes to innovative ideas and initiatives and has a smart overview of the current political scene, including the Russian influence dimension.

Profiles of other donors and implementers in Georgia

For the sake of due diligence, mini-profiles of other potential partners are included below with a comment that a number of them partner regularly with SIDA or EF in projects either as co-implementers or implementing grantees.

UNDP in Georgia: administers and implements a range of projects in the area of democratic governance with a human rights dimension as well as several media related projects. One of them is a joint project covering CSOs and media and is related to improving public discourse in the media and giving equal access to all voices in society. In the area of human rights, *UNDP* in Georgia is closely cooperating with the Human Rights Secretariat in an attempt to boost their capacity and effectiveness in implementing the national strategy and action plan on human rights. It also works to boost the role of the Public Defender's Office.

Association for Peace and Development (APD): focuses on youth development, empowerment and employability through non-formal education. As a major and independent player in the youth field, their experience and expertise has been recognised by the government since 2007 which has been consulting them on a number of government schemes and policies including the organisation of yearly Youth NGO forums. Their activities include civic education for youth, volunteering and training, as well as capacity building for local youth organisations. They have created and supported youth clubs and initiatives for young IDPs in Georgia. They have been mainly funded by the EU in Georgia.

GYLA and Transparency International Georgia: both work in the area of human rights with a focus on judicial process, law enforcement and elections. An interesting line of their work is legal education among the population via their legal education centres. SIDA provides core funding to support their work. GYLA is considered a political force in its own right in Georgia with a policy advocacy and think-tank capacity often triggering change.

UN Women: has worked hard in recent years in Georgia to cut out a well-defined niche for its activities with a wide human rights and democracy brief. It has fought against what it calls superficial compliance and lip service characteristic of many government positions and actions on human rights and democracy. The agency is closely aligned with the Norwegian Foreign Ministry.

The *Council of Europe (CoE):* a major player in Georgia with an impressive array of programmes under its administration or implementation. Its work on the area of human rights gravitates towards the reform of the judiciary, work with the minorities and support for the Public Defender's Office. This is reflected in CoE's strategic action plan for 2016-2019 which also includes professionalization of the judiciary and work on the elections. The agency points out to the obvious gap in the CSO's ability to reach out to youth and women in the regions and rural communities and their paucity in the regions. Similar observations have been reiterated by the *EU Delegation to Georgia*, which administers several interesting programmes in the area of human rights and democracy. Among them is what it describes as the 'top up' project "Human Rights for All" which feeds into the government human rights national strategy. One of the top

priorities is to design and deliver projects mobilising local communities in developing democracy on the ground.

Open Society in Georgia has been traditionally recognised for its sharp competence and accurate overview of the political and socioeconomic scene in Georgia and for its timely and well formulated programmes in the area of the media and civil society. Interestingly, at present, the foundation has only a limited stable of projects in the media, particularly providing institutional support to 3 newspapers, and it concentrates on programmes to support local democracy – a strong indicator that its idea to put emphasis on local civil society activities and capacity raising is well justified.

Annex B: Results framework

Programme		Georgia - Democratisation Programme 2017-2021	
Programme Objective		<i>To improve Civil Society's capacity and sustainability to address societal needs at regional and local level covering neglected or marginalised areas and communities.</i>	
Impact Indicator		- % of targeted communities noting improved civic participation in public decision making process to address societal needs	
Engagement Title		Georgia Democratisation programme (ACTIVE)	
Outcome		Citizens take more responsibility for their own social and economic prosperity	
Outcome indicator		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - civil society actors achieve outcomes of enduring benefit to themselves and their communities. - increased CSOs' accountability and citizens' trust towards them 	
Baseline	Year	2017	TBD
Target	Year	2021	TBD
Output 1		<i>to raise the capacity of regional and local CSOs and civic activists to empower and mobilise local communities and to improve their long-term impact and sustainability</i>	
Output 1 indicator		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # of changes addressing societal needs brought by efforts of CSOs and civic activists - Level of civic activism in targeted vs. non-targeted communities - # of advocacy initiatives implemented - # of cases of improved legislation and practice identified by CSOs - SE concept is acknowledged in a Government policy document - # CSOs reporting diversified income as a result of establishing SEs - # of community driven development initiatives implemented by grantees and their partners - # cases of replication of CSO interventions addressing local needs - (cross-cutting) # of persons received capacity building support in media literacy 	
Baseline	Year	2017	TBD
Target	Year	2021	TBD
Output 2		<i>to increase participation of young people, women and disadvantaged members of communities in the democratic and economic life and self-governance on the local level.</i>	
Output 2 indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # of volunteers mobilized through youth-led initiatives funded by YBs to engage in community activity (disaggregated by sex, youth/adults, region) - Level of youth volunteerism and civic activism in targeted vs. non-targeted communities - (cross-cutting) # of young people received capacity building support in media literacy 	
Baseline	Year	2016	TBD
Target	Year	2021	TBD

Annex C: HRBA Screening Note

Tool for Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) and Gender Equality Screening

Purpose: The HRBA and Gender Screening Note complement the HRBA Guidance Note and the up-coming Gender Equality Strategy and the Gender Equality Toolbox. The purpose of the note is to facilitate and strengthen the application of the Human Rights Based Approach and mainstreaming of gender equality programming related to Danish development cooperation. It can be used as an inspirational checklist by all staff.

The information in the note should be based on the analysis undertaken as part of the preparation of the Country policy paper and should draw on major Human Rights and gender equality analysis relevant for the country such as UPR-processes, reports and documents from OHCHR, EU HR Strategy, CEDAW-reporting as well as relevant analysis prepared by other major donors. The Screening Note should be attached to the (country) programme concept note, and the questions raised below should be reflected in the (country) programme document. Appraisal of country programmes will include a specific focus on HRBA and Gender Equality.

Basic info

Title	Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme (2017-2021)
Country/ region	Georgia
Budget in DKK million	30
Starting date and duration	Q2 2017, 60 months

Human Rights Based Approach

Assess whether a Human Rights (HR) Based Approach has been applied in the programme:

Human Rights Assessment and Standards			
Issues:	Yes	no	Explain:
Have major HR analysis relevant for the country been consulted (UPR, OHCHR, EU HR Strategy, other relevant donor documents)	X		E.g. donor strategies, UPR, regional and international mechanisms reporting; see Human Rights Framework Overview (below)
Have key international HR standards and/or mechanisms influenced choice and formulation of outcome areas?	x		E.g. Council of Europe and UN treaties ratified, EU Association Agreement, see Human Rights Framework Overview
Where relevant, is application at national level, including major gaps between human	X		As underlining the agenda of increasing civic participation and improving the dialogue

rights in principle vs. human rights in practice, evaluated and identified?			between duty bearers and rights holders.
Are key recommendations from UPR for the thematic programmes and from any treaty bodies, special procedures, INGOs, HNRIs etc. that require follow up at national level considered?	X		Recommendations form part of the justification for all intervention areas
Are rights-holders identified?	X		E.g. Citizens, CSO and community members
Are duty-bearers identified?	X		Key duty bearer institutions within the areas of regional, municipal and local government administration

Assess whether Human Rights Principles have been applied in the preparation and in the design of the programme?

Non-discrimination: Are any groups among rights-holders excluded from access and influence in the thematic programme areas identified?	X		The programme will ensure that gender issues and the needs of disabled persons as well as other vulnerable groups (language, minorities) are included in the programme.
Are disaggregated data available on most vulnerable groups?	X	x	Not to any vast degree, however, the programme will collect gender disaggregated data.
List any key support elements included to promote non-discrimination	X		The programme will ensure that gender issues and the needs of disabled persons as well as other vulnerable groups (language, minorities) are included in the programme.
Participation and inclusion: Are barriers for participation, inclusion and empowerment of rights holders identified?	X		The programme will focus extensively on empowering citizens and community members to tackle their social needs in most inclusive and effective way through divers' measures.
List any key support elements included to promote participation and inclusion	X		E.g. improving citizens' awareness and competences to solve their own societal needs and to engage in policy making
Transparency: Is the extent to which information is accessible to rights holders including marginalised groups assessed? Where relevant, whether information is available in other than official languages of	X		E.g. in relation to processes within the public sector; by promoting equality and through increased participation throughout the country

the country in question should be indicated.			
List any key support elements included to promote transparency	x		E.g. increased focus on planning and transparent reporting
Are key accountability mechanisms in the relevant area – both horizontal and vertical listed?	X		The programme targets specifically right holders in key identified areas and will enhance CSOs accountability mechanisms.
Are obstacles, e.g. capacity and political-economy incentives that duty-bearers and rights holders face to exercise their obligations and rights listed?	X		E.g. needs and challenges of right holders (in particular CSOs, active citizens)
List any key support elements included to promote accountability	X		All programme components, e.g. equipping CSOs and individual civic activists to define and achieve outcomes of enduring benefit to themselves and their communities
Results/Indicators			
List any indicators designed to monitor the realisation of specific human rights		x	
List any indicators designed to monitor the integration of the four principles	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of publications in national and local media and outreach b. Number of citizens aware of their role and those of CSOs in addressing identified needs (transparency) c. Increased accountability of CSOs
List any key indicators chosen to track capacity of key partners (both rights holders and duty bearers)	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of community driven development initiatives. b. Number of advocacy initiatives implemented c. Number of cases of replication of CSO interventions addressing local needs. d. Level of civic activism in targeted vs. non-targeted communities
Dialogue Partners			
Define key dialogue partners (duty bearers)	X		The regional and local authorities (TBD).

to be addressed by the country programme			
Define key alliance partners, including other likeminded donors, multilateral partners and CSO's	X		EUD, Sida, UNDP
State major dilemmas/risks associated with the policy dialogue and proposed mitigation measures (incl. reference to Framework for Risk Assessment)	x		Please refer to Risk Matrix (Annex E)

Gender Screening Tool			
Are key challenges and opportunities for gender equality identified?	X		Yes, the programme will focus on equal opportunities and gender balanced interventions
Are reference made to CEDAW-reporting, UPR, and other relevant gender assessments?	X		In general, Gender-specific challenges will be elicited and addressed in line with UPR recommendation on strengthening the gender-sensitive approach to dealing with poverty as one of the results of crisis.
Identify opportunities/constraints for addressing gender equality issues	X		Including assessment of gender equality within e.g. all participating CSOs, for employees/officials (e.g. promotion opportunities, recruitment), as well as in terms of violation patterns and gender-based violence.
Describe key strategic interventions to promote gender equality within each thematic programme?	X		EF has made commitment to mainstream gender considerations in its grant making and operational activities. Participation of women on equal footing with men has long been tracked in all grants and programs throughout the grants management and reporting cycles.
Explain how gender specific purposes with be reached, which strategic approach, what activities are planned	X		Impact on gender as part of the grant application forms. EF program and grants managers participate in gender trainings at least annually, so as to continue to hone their skills in detecting gender issues within their programs and convey their knowledge

			to EF's grantees, both potential and current. In order to better support potential and current grantees in mainstreaming gender in their project proposals, EF will ask its gender consultant to develop a 2-3 hour training module that EF program managers could deliver as part of monthly NGO Clinic or during separate trainings on gender mainstreaming.
Define expected outputs.	X		Participation in all capacity building activity with partner institutions and other similar activities focus on ensuring fair and equal gender representation among participants and activity (monitoring and reporting, as well as communicative and policy activity), as well as representation, increasingly reflects gender focus.
Identify gender equality indicators aligned with national targets on gender if possible.	X		Increasing recruitment and representation of female staff and volunteers in CSOs. CSOs increasingly reflect in their activities gender effects as well as gender-related violations.

A. Overview of Georgia's legal human rights framework

1) At the global level, Georgia is a party to most of the key human rights instruments, e.g. the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two optional protocols; the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and Optional Protocol; the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography; and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its optional protocol.

However, Georgia has neither signed nor ratified/acceded to the Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance nor the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

Georgia is a party to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)

Georgia is a state party to the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court.

United Nations Human Rights Council, Universal Periodic Review

Georgia underwent its 2nd review at the United Nations Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review (UPR) in 2015. During the UPR Georgia received 203 recommendations from a total of 73 States from all regions of the globe. The country immediately agreed to and accepted 142 of these recommendations,

requested time to contemplate 54 of them, and rejected 7 recommendations, all belonging to the Russian Federation.

Most of the recommendations emphasize the necessity for Georgia to strengthen its institutions, make greater efforts for combat discrimination, violence against women and early marriage, take stronger measures for protecting the rights of religious minorities and the LGBT community, strengthen the process of reforming the law enforcement and the judiciary and ensuring their independence and political neutrality, protect the rights of persons with disabilities, and so forth.

2) At the regional level, Georgia is a member of Council of Europe, and a party to several key human rights instruments with particular on regional/European level: e.g. the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms; the European Convention on the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the European Charter for regional or Minority Languages (Committed but has not signed yet); the Framework Convention Protecting National Minorities; and the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.

A list of all 86 CoE treaties to which Georgia is a party to can be find here:

http://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/country/GEO?p_auth=HYF0cFcl

In terms of cases brought before the European Court of Human Rights, the Court dealt with 201 applications concerning Georgia in 2015, of which 197 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 4 judgments (concerning 4 applications), 2 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Noteworthy cases of most recent judgments delivered include the alleged existence of an administrative practice involving the arrest, detention and collective expulsion of Georgian nationals from the Russian Federation in the autumn of 2006; Georgian authorities' inability to provide effective treatment to a prisoner suffering from multi-drug resistant tuberculosis; the death of a young man, allegedly at the hands of representatives of the Ministry of the Interior, and the complaint that no effective investigation was carried out into it; a peaceful demonstration in Tbilisi in May 2012 to mark the International Day against Homophobia, which was violently disrupted by counter-demonstrators outnumbering the marchers; severe harassment of a large number of Jehovah's Witnesses in Georgia in the years 2000-2001; pre-trial detention of the former the chairperson of the Civil Aviation Agency (CAA) of Georgia and his criminal conviction of abuse of power; pre-trial detention of a former Prime Minister of Georgia.

Georgia is a member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and therefore has accepted its human rights commitments. Georgia cooperates closely with the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of OSCE in strengthening its human rights standards at the national level.

The European Union

The signing of the Association Agreement with the European Union by Georgia in June 2014 brings into application a comprehensive framework of more than 720 pages, addressing a wide variety of areas where reform and initiatives will be needed for Georgia to conform to the standards of the EU. Human Rights relevant issues and agreements have been highlighted under several titles and articles of the document. To name a few:

Under "General principles" (Title 1), art. 2 specifically states that "Respect for the democratic principles, human rights and fundamental freedoms, as proclaimed in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and as defined in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and

Fundamental Freedoms of 1950, the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Charter of Paris for a New Europe of 1990 shall form the basis of the domestic and external policies of the Parties and constitutes an essential element of this Agreement. Countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, related materials and their means of delivery also constitute essential elements of this Agreement”.

Article 3 under “Political Dialogue” (Title 2) highlights that The aim of political dialogue shall be: “to strengthen respect for democratic principles, the rule of law and good governance, human rights and fundamental freedoms, including media freedom and the rights of persons belonging to minorities, and to contribute to consolidating domestic political reforms”;

Under the same title, Article 13 “Fighting against terrorism” the parties agree that “the fight against terrorism must be conducted with full respect for the rule of law and in full conformity with international law including international human rights law, international refugee law and international humanitarian law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and all relevant international counter-terrorism related instruments.

Particularly the title 3, dealing with freedom, security and justice dedicates one whole article (Article 13) to Rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

3) At the national level, Georgia has an advanced system for human rights protection, composed of multiple institutions engaged in a constant process of societal dialogue for maximizing their efficiency. Its national human rights institution, the Office of the Public Defender, is a class A accredited body in full compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles). Besides the general procedures of access to justice and judicial review, several other bodies with special mandates operate to ensure stronger safeguards within their areas of protection. The Office of the Personal Data Protection Inspector, operational since 2013, is the most recent example of Georgia’s commitment to responding promptly to newly emerging challenges in specific areas of human rights protection.

The policy of the Government of Georgia on human rights is well reflected in the recently adopted National Human Rights Strategy and the related action plan. The National Human Rights Strategy (2014-2020) was adopted by the Parliament of Georgia in March 2014. The Strategy had been developed by a human rights inter-agency coordination council, consisting of representatives of the Government and NGOs. The goal of the Strategy is to define the unified Government policy. For seven years, this strategy will serve as the main document defining the core human rights priorities and strategic directions of the Government. The first Action Plan of the Government of Georgia on the Protection of Human Rights 2014-2016 was adopted in July 2014. The Action Plan sets out detailed commitments of Georgian authorities in order to implement the Strategy in 2014 and 2015. The Action Plan covers, inter alia, the following sectors: gender equality, domestic violence and efforts to combat human trafficking. Updates on its implementation are regularly presented to civil society organizations through a monthly series of meetings between representatives of the Government and NGOs.

B. Rights areas addressed by the proposed Development Engagements (DE) for the programme

Good governance, human rights, and gender equality will be directly targeted cross-cutting issues. Decentralisation/regional policies are per se cross-cutting and multi-sectoral. Successful contribution and engagement of CSOs and local communities into Regional Policy making and reform will help to improve governance, fight corruption and solve conflicts of interests across all sectors. Through the support to the development of concrete regional and local actions, various cross-cutting issues are likely to be tackled, including environmental sustainability, gender equality, and good governance.

In addition, special attention will be paid to: gender responsive budgeting. The implementation partner is

committed to the principle of gender equality and therefore promotes the use of gender mainstreaming in the design, implementation and evaluation of all operational programs and grant-funded projects.

Basic Information	
Programme title:	Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme (2017-2021)
Country/region:	Georgia
Estimated allocation:	30 Million DKK
Brief description of the Programme support:	<p><i>The international community's interventions in Georgia in the past few years targeted cooperation with state institutions and government agencies, with the activities concentrated in the capital, Tbilisi, and major cities. There is a growing need to revert to more grassroots approach of targeting civil society and regions outside Tbilisi in the future – something identified early and being put into practice by Europe Foundation (henceforth referred to as EF) with SIDA's consistent support. DANIDA will lock into this effort with a programme of delegated cooperation with SIDA and core support for its long-term partner, EF. It will dedicate 30-mln DKK over five years to programmes managed and administered by SIDA in-country, and implemented on the ground by EF through its local partners.</i></p> <p><i>The overall objective of the programme is to improve Civil Society's capacity and sustainability to address societal needs at regional and local level covering neglected or marginalised areas and communities. More specifically, the programme will have the following targeted objectives:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• to raise the capacity of regional and local CSOs to empower and mobilise local communities and to improve their long-term impact and sustainability</i> <i>• to increase participation of young people, women and disadvantaged members of communities in the democratic and economic life and self-governance on the local level</i> <p><i>A special feature of the proposed programme is to subordinate the media component of the overall intervention to the wider civil society action as an empowerment tool enabling local beneficiaries to use media and digital skills, increased media literacy and community media outlets in order to increase impact and outreach of civil society organisations' activities in their communities</i></p>
Dates (expected):	Programme committee: October, 2016 Appraisal: N/A

³ This annex has not been filled out as it has been assessed that the relevance of climate change and green growth for the program is limited.

Climate change screening			
Assess the status of policies and strategies to respond to climate change in the country and sector. If the issue is inadequately dealt with (indicated by a tick in the “no” box), please add comments and assess the potential impact on the program (see also “next steps” section, below).			
<i>Issue:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments and further work to be done:</i>
1. Are the processes and impacts of climate change documented (e.g. in national communications to the UNFCCC)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
2. Is there a national climate change policy or strategy , including estimates of the economic costs of adaptation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
3. Have nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) and or Low Carbon Development Plans been identified (e.g. targets for renewable energy production)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
4. Has a national adaptation programme of action (NAPA) been approved identifying key sectors where adaptation is required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
5. Are there effective and operational meteorological and disaster preparedness organizations ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Summarize the overall assessment of climate change impacts and responses:			
N/A			
Screening of Country Green Growth Framework			
Assess the status of policies and strategies for green growth and the procedures for environmental impact assessment in the country and sector. If an issue is inadequately dealt with (indicated by a tick in the “no” box), please add comments and indicate further work to be undertaken (see also “next steps” section, below).			
<i>Issue:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments and further work to be done:</i>
1. Do national procedures and legislation for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) exist?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
2. Are there operational Green Growth Strategies/actions plans and/or National Environmental Action plans ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
3. Are there regularly updated state of the environment reports and green growth monitoring systems with indicators ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
4. Is there sufficient institutional and human capacity for green growth and environmental management in the sector concerned?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Summarize the overall impression of the Country Green Growth Framework:			
N/A			

Climate change and Green Growth opportunities and risks of programme			
Assess how climate change and environmental opportunities and risks will arise through the programme:			
<i>Will the programme ...</i>	Opportunity:	Risk:	None:
1. ... support green growth initiatives including livelihood improvements and resource efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
2. ... support the creation of decent and green job ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
3. ... contribute to effective management and efficient use of natural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
4. ... have direct or indirect impact on climate change (e.g. through increasing or reducing emissions of greenhouse gases)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
5. ... have direct or indirect impact on occupational health and safety ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
6. ... lead to changes in land and resource tenure and access rights, including the rights of indigenous peoples ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
7. ... include activities within or adjacent to protected or environmentally sensitive areas ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
8. ... have direct or indirect impact on the resilience of communities in the face of natural disasters ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Summarize and explain climate change and green growth opportunities :			
N/A			
Summarize and explain climate change and green growth risks :			
N/A			
Identify requirements for undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Categories are: [A] Full EIA required; [B] Partial EIA required; [C] No EIA required ⁴ .			
<i>Intervention Name</i>	<i>Category A, B or C:</i>		
1: N/A	Select category:		
2: N/A	Select category:		
3: N/A	Select category:		
Will national regulations and procedures for EIA be applicable to activities of the programme that have potential environmental impacts? – Yes <input type="checkbox"/> - No <input type="checkbox"/>			

⁴ Category A = Intervention is likely to have adverse environmental impacts that may be sensitive, irreversible, and significant in scale/scope; B = Intervention is likely to have negative impacts, but which are less significant, not as sensitive, numerous, major or diverse; C = The environmental risk of the intervention are of little or no concern.

When will the EIA be undertaken?:		
Next Steps – process action plan		
Need for further work during the preparation, appraisal and implementation of the programme arising from the climate change and green growth screening:		
<i>Suggested activity:</i>	<i>Action needed</i>	<i>Comments and elaboration:</i>
1. Assessment of green growth and climate change opportunities in sector development plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
2. Assessment of capacity for green growth and climate change management in the sector/country.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
3. Prepare ToR for and conduct Country Analytical Work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
4. Prepare ToR for and conduct SEA(s) of sector policies or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
5. Prepare ToR for and conduct EIA(s) for programme interventions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
6. Initiate donor harmonisation in the sector on green growth and climate change.	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
7. Other...?		
Signature of Screening Note		
<i>Place and date</i>		
.....		
(name)		
Danish Mission in		

Annex E: Risk Matrix

Contextual Risks					
Context:		Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme (2017-2021)			
File No:		2016-15773			
Risk factor	Likelihood	Background to assessment	Impact	Background to assessment	Risk response if applicable / potential effect on development cooperation in context
C1 Political instability in Georgia	Likely	<p>A vivid political situation in Georgia including experience of frequent change of government through early elections.</p> <p>The government's and public's perception of on-going unresolved conflict provides a climate that enforces executive powers and diminishes dissent, resulting in a negative impact on democratic development.</p>	Low	<p>Political developments in the country and in the region could impact the Georgian Government's willingness to engage with civil society organizations, hindering the impact of EF's and EF's grantees work.</p>	<p>Monitor the situation closely and maintain flexibility in engagements to be able to make possible changes in close cooperation with likeminded development partners, in particular EU.</p> <p>EF's international governing board, on which serve a number of former ambassadors, has political clout and direct links to current diplomatic missions. Locally, the advisory committee is composed of high profile businessmen, media analysts, and academics, and can rally behind EF and grantees on issues of importance.</p>
C2 Deterioration of human rights situation	Likely	<p>Human rights are a challenge. Violations occur relating to i.e. political violence and lesser degree gender based violence. Key oversight institutions are still weak.</p>	Minor	<p>Respect for human rights is an underlying principle for development cooperation and a significant worsening of the situation could impact the programme</p>	<p>Dialogue with the government on human rights issues and support to human rights activities - in close cooperation with likeminded development partners. Monitor the situation closely.</p>

C3	Financial mismanagement and corruption	Likely	Corruption is not widespread in Georgia with the country ranked 48 of 168 on the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index. However, there is always a risk of corruption or financial mismanagement to emerge, especially among the grantees that have less experience in this area.	Low	If discovered in relation to programme partners, this is likely to jeopardize the collaboration with the partner in question.	<p>Assessment of internal control procedures through SIDA and the capacity of the partners financed by the programme.</p> <p>Firm financial control through a strict hierarchy in financial transaction authorities, a system of checks and balances built into grant-making systems, and a strong internal audit function.</p>
----	--	---------------	--	------------	---	---

Programmatic and Institutional Risks						
Title:	Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme (2017-2021)					
File No:	2016-15773					
Programmatic Risks						
Risk factor	Likelihood	Background to assessment of likelihood	Impact	Background to assessment to potential impact	Risk response	Combined residual risk

P1	<p>Mismanagement of funds and corruption in grant making and project implementation in rural regions where a less skilled and experienced set of CSO partners will carry a greater risk of project failure</p>	Rare	<p>Previous audits of support through SIDA have not identified or experienced this as an issue, primarily because project-based financial management systems are used and financial controls are firm.</p>	Minor	<p>Zero tolerance policy mean's that diversion of fund, mismanagement or theft is intolerable and damaging to credibility and ability to continue funding at engagement level. Incidences would be isolated however and not affect engagements other than those involved.</p>	<p>EF will manage this risk both structurally and procedurally. Structurally, EF will be able to internally manage any high-risk start up or capacity building activities necessary for specific initiatives. Risk mitigation strategies include trainings (EF conducts the NGO clinic monthly to address any questions or issues raised by both grantees and non-grantees), mentoring (EF links more experienced CSOs with newly emerged CSOs), and targeted trainings (EF funds trainings of trainers to provide local resources for civic activists). Procedurally, EF can and will adjust review procedures, reporting requirements, site visit schedules, or other requirements on an as needed basis to provide adequate control and support to newer grantees and contractors</p>	Minor
P2	<p>Lack of competence and capacity of IPs</p>	Likely	<p>EF and SIDA have repeatedly selected IPs for different types of projects successfully</p>	Minor	<p>Medium to High – the lack of fully professional local partners or implementers may seriously impact on the quality of activities and the expected results</p>	<p>applying the strategy of reserve partners and alternative IP scenarios</p>	Minor

P3	Unwillingness of IPs to work in the regions and remote areas	Unlikely	EF and SIDA have already implemented similar programmes in the regions and have developed a range of relationships there	High	the lack of local partners or implementers may seriously delay implementation or put activities on hold	transferring some activities to more amenable areas and regions and organising some activities in major cities	High
P4	Hostility of local authorities to regional and community project activities	Likely	Generally, local government institutions may show resilience when pushed too much by CSOs to take active role in policy making and implementation.	Minor	local CSOs and activists may be deterred and withdraw from activities	Altering the profile of the activities in a given location to make them less adversarial to the local power breakers	Minor
Institutional Risks							
	Risk factor	Likelihood	Background to assessment of likelihood	Impact	Background to assessment of potential impact	Risk response	Combined residual risk
I1	Delegated coordination and joint undertakings loose viability because of political, rights based and/or corruption where commonly held diplomatic positions and development assistance responses are not agreed.	Unlikely	The recent history of development partnerships indicates strong resilience to this. However, differences of opinion can occur.	Minor	If likeminded development partners were no longer able to cooperate closely, it would have a negative impact on the credibility of the programme and shared priorities.	Maintain a strong presence in donor fora and lobby for harmonised approaches through this programme	Minor
Deviations and follow-up							
	Title:	Georgia Democratisation (Media and Civil Society) Programme (2017-2021)					

File No:

2016-15773