



**EVALUATION OF THE UN JOINT PROGRAMME TO
ENHANCE GENDER EQUALITY IN GEORGIA**
FINAL REPORT

25 May 2015
Indevelop AB

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents..... 1**
- Abbreviations and acronyms 2**
- Preface 4**
- Executive Summary 5**
- 1. Introduction 12**
 - 1.1 The UNJP's context..... 12
 - 1.2 Key parameters of the evaluated programme..... 15
 - 1.3 The assignment..... 19
 - 1.4 Methodology..... 19
 - 1.5 Limitations 20
- 2. Findings 21**
 - 2.1 Relevance..... 21
 - 2.2 Effectiveness 23
 - 2.3 Efficiency 37
 - 2.4 Sustainability 38
- 3. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations 40**
- Annex 1 – Inception Report (incl. evaluation framework and document list) 44**

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACT	Analysis and Consulting Team
AVNG	Anti-Violence Network of Georgia
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CP	Country Programme
DRR	Deputy Resident Representative
DV	Domestic Violence
EYP	European Youth Parliament Georgia
GASW	Georgian Association of Social Workers
GBA	Georgian Bar Association
GE	Gender Equality
GEC	Gender Equality Council of Georgia
GEOSTAT	Georgian State Statistics Office
GRU	Georgian Rugby Union
IACEW	International Advisory Centre for the Education of Women
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
IP	Implementing Partner
IPS	Institute for Policy Studies
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MoES	Ministry for Education and Science
MoLHSA	Ministry for Labour, Health, Social Affairs
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
NAP	National Action Plan
PDO	Public Defender's Office
RR	Resident Representative
SRH and RR	Sexual Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights
Sida	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
STI	Sexually Transmitted Diseases
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund

UNSCR	United Nation Security Council Resolution
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programme
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VAWG	Violence against Women and Girls
WEPD	Women for Equality, Peace and Development in Georgia (UN Women Project)
WHO	World Health Organisation

Preface

The Evaluation of the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia was commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) together with UN Women and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Indevelop Sweden AB (<http://www.indevelop.se/>) undertook the evaluation between December 2014 and March 2015. It was finalised after feedback from UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA on the draft report.

Indevelop's independent evaluation team consisted of international experts Dr. Ulf Färnsveden and Dr. Kateryna Shalayeva, and national expert Nargiza Arjevanidze. Administrative and logistical support was provided by Ana Dekanosidze. The team was led by Vera Devine.

Quality assurance of the evaluation methodology and reports has been provided by Dr. Ian Christoplos. The Project Manager at Indevelop for this evaluation, Sarah Gharbi, was responsible for ensuring compliance with Indevelop's QA system throughout the process, and providing backstopping and coordination.

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an end-of-programme evaluation commissioned, in December 2014, by the United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) “Enhancing Gender Equality in Georgia”. The UNJP is, with approximately USD 5 Million, solely funded by the government of Sweden. The programme—implemented as the first joint effort in Georgia *on a significant scale* by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); UN Women; and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)—started in January 2012 and is expected to end in April 2015.

The UNJP aims to promote a comprehensive approach to advancing gender equality in Georgia. The emphasis of the programme is on equality between men and women, as opposed to pursuing a more pronounced *gender* agenda that would also encompass targeted work with the LGBT community. The overall goal of the programme is to “promote gender equality and women’s empowerment through strengthening capacities in the government, civil society and communities”. The UNJP consists of three sub-components (“outcomes”), each led by one agency, as follows: Outcome 1 (led by UNDP) aims to work towards “enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment”; Outcome 2 (led by UN Women) aims to work towards “creating an enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence (DV)”; and Outcome 3 (led by UNFPA) aims at advancing “gender equality [...] by creating an enabling environment to realise sexual and reproductive rights of the population”.

The rationale bringing these three outcome areas together is the nexus between violence against women specifically in the domestic area; the lack of awareness on and realisation of sexual and reproductive health and rights; and gender inequality. Domestic violence is understood to be a *result* of gender inequality, and, in turn, represents one of the *key challenges* to achieving gender equality; realising sexual and reproductive rights is linked to the potential for realising economic and political rights, and thus to achieving gender equality in the public and private spheres of life.

Beyond this underlying rationale, the three sub-components are, however, effectively separate projects, and where each of the implementing agencies works on their respective outcome area in accordance with the agency’s specific mandate. The sub-components are held together by the overall administrative framework of the joint programme, which is formally managed by UNDP.

All three sub-components pursue their outcomes through a human rights-based approach: work is being done with duty bearers in central-level institutions to improve the relevant legal and policy framework. In parallel, the programme components work to increase the capacity of key service providers/institutions at central and local levels. Work is also undertaken with rights-holders at the local level in selected geographic locations (Tbilisi; Kakheti; and Samegrelo)—chosen along parameters such as demographic composition (ethnic and religious

minorities), as well as the spread of domestic violence—to create pilot successes of scale. These pilot successes, pursued for example in the area of gender-sensitive budgeting at the municipal level, are then to be used as advocacy tools with central-level policy and decision-makers with the expectation that those decision-makers initiate their country-wide roll-out. A considerable emphasis of the work with rights-holders is to raise awareness on gender stereotypes; on the causes of and zero tolerance towards domestic violence and the services available to victims of domestic violence; and on sexual and reproductive health and rights.

The UNJP delivers a significant share of activities through a dense network of contracted partners at various levels. In addition to the work with the relevant institutions at national level, the programme partners with numerous NGOs that fulfil various service provision functions, such as delivering the work in the pilot regions, including activities involving municipal authorities; or administering sub-grants for specific activities to groups at the grassroots level. Partnerships include those with organisations that can potentially reach out to wide audiences (such as UNFPA's work with the Georgian Orthodox Patriarchy's radio station), or which can multiply knowledge and skills across entire stakeholder groups (such as UN Women's work with the Georgian Bar Association's training provider).

While serving both accountability and learning purposes, the **main focus of the evaluation is learning**: while there is an agreement, in principle, that Sweden will fund a second phase of the programme, the UNJP wishes to inform the design of this next phase through an outside analysis and discussion of lessons learned of the current phase of implementation. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation specify two main directions of inquiry: first, the evaluation is to assess the level of the achievement of the UNJP's stipulated objectives; second, it is to assess the success of the joint programme model of delivery.

With regards to the first direction of inquiry, i.e. the level of achievement of the UNJP's objectives, the evaluators come to the following conclusions:

The UNJP remains highly **relevant** for the context of Georgia—women's access to participation in politics and the labour market remains limited, and the pay gap between men and women significant; 2014 has seen a record number of femicides; awareness on sexual and reproductive health and rights is low and subject to taboo; and sex selective abortions and early marriages present considerable problems affecting women, in particular in rural locations and among religious minorities.

The UNJP's human rights-based approach and pursuit of working with all national/central-level institutions and actors that have a stake in the gender equality and anti-domestic violence agenda is clear - the programme has identified and engaged with relevant, highly competent partners to deliver services at the local level for the purpose of achieving the objectives of this phase of the programme. The prime target groups identified to benefit from the UNJP—Georgian society as a whole, but women in particular—are relevant; while, work with ethnic, religious and sexual minorities as stipulated in the programme document appears to have been undertaken, although somewhat unsystematically. Some tensions would seem to

exist with regards to the choice of the Georgian Patriarchy; while it is a relevant vector for reaching out to a wide number of people, as an institution, it could be said to actually oppose the gender equality agenda in Georgia.

With regards to **effectiveness**, the rationale underpinning the programme is sound where it makes the causal link between gender inequality; the lack of economic and political empowerment; domestic violence; and the lack of realisation of sexual and reproductive rights. However, the overall theory of change, as well as the rationale for the joint approach should have been made more explicit, together with a clearer shared understanding between the agencies as well as among national partners on why a joint approach would be more effective than three individual projects.

Key results of the UNJP include:

1. The strengthening of the policy framework and institutional set up of the gender equality and anti-domestic violence structure in Georgia; in particular the enshrining of gender mainstreaming principles across a number of policy areas through the new 2014-2016 National Action Plan on Gender Equality, the National Action Plan on Domestic Violence 2013-2015, and the National Youth Policy of Georgia; and bringing Georgian legislation in line with international standards and commitments;
2. Keeping gender equality on the agenda of the government and the parliament of Georgia;
3. Successful joint advocacy of the three UNJP agencies on the establishment of a gender equality function within the executive branch of government, and the establishment of a dedicated Gender Equality Department in the Public Defender's Office of Georgia;
4. The generation of original baseline data on gender stereotypes (UNDP); attitudes and prevalence of domestic violence (UN Women); and pre-birth sex selection and men and gender relations (UNFPA);
5. Instigating highly recognisable public awareness campaigns on gender stereotypes (UNDP) and against domestic violence (UN Women) informed by baseline data obtained from original research, as well as a campaign addressing the perceptions and roles of men as well as a campaign addressing the role of fathers in bringing up their children (UNFPA);
6. Successfully demonstrating the need to involve men in the gender equality debate in Georgia and piloting successful initiatives to this effect (UN Women and UNFPA);
7. Institutionalising of training on gender equality legislation; domestic and gender-based violence, sexual and reproductive health and rights through work with training institutions on mandatory curricula for relevant target groups (police; judges; journalists);
8. Initiating the process of gender mainstreaming in the education system through a systematic review of gender stereotypes in the existing official textbooks; and initiating a process of incorporating education on sexual and reproductive health and rights to become mandatory part of the curriculum in Georgian schools;

9. Strengthening NGOs, CSOs and national institutions through lasting partnerships with existing partners and expanding the pool of partners that can competently deliver services (advice, training, etc.) on gender-based violence, domestic violence, and sexual and reproductive health and rights;
10. The generation of data by the law enforcement authorities documenting the extent of domestic violence and on the prosecutions in cases of domestic violence, which can form the basis for monitoring, over time, of developments in this area, and which can inform responses to domestic violence (such as the needs for emergency centres; shelters etc.). (UN Women);
11. The development, maintenance, and regular updating of gender-disaggregated key statistical indicators by GEOSTAT (UNDP).

These key results include a number that had not been initially planned for, but where the UNJP used opportunities emerging from specific activities, such as the work with the Ministry of Education on the development of a curriculum on sexual and reproductive health and rights, as well as working on the elimination of gender stereotypes in textbooks across subjects.

The effectiveness of the programme's **pilot approach** within the sub-components is marred by a number of problems. For example for the sub-component led by UNDP, the evaluators were unable to independently corroborate/triangulate that the work on gender-based budgeting will go beyond the municipalities concerned, although the Ministry of Finance appears to have formally agreed to a set of activities as part of the ongoing, 2014-2016 National Action Plan on Gender Equality. UN Women's work with the establishment of crisis centres for victims of domestic violence has demonstrated the need for such centres as an emergency point of call for affected women; however, without UNJP and the resources it offers this model approach is not being replicated by the state structures. In contrast, the UNFPA pilot approach pursued through the "My Rights" campaign has proved successful in advocating with the Ministry of Education for the need for the inclusion of sexual and reproductive health and rights into the school curriculum.

In terms of **efficiency**, the evaluators consider that most of the individual outputs that they have been able to study in more detail represent value-for-money; there is, however, some scope for being more strategic about some outputs, such as trainings for journalists—something that UNJP is now planning for a future phase of the programme where the three agencies will work together on the development of joint curricula for journalist training institutions in six universities across Georgia. There are also important lessons learned on the cost of awareness raising activities, which, in case of the UNDP campaign, have considerably exceeded the initial forecasts. The need to finance *regional* activities in the framework of the South Caucasus Youth Forum from the budget of this programme remains questionable as it would seem to be in tension with Swedish development cooperation priorities which do not extend, at present, to Azerbaijan and Armenia.

With regards to **sustainability**, the evaluators have found convincing evidence to suggest that the legal and policy framework is likely to remain in place, as well as the institutions that have been created including as a result of the UNJP and previous advocacy work of the UN agencies. Prospects of sustainability are also high where the programme has worked on institutionalising training to become part of training institutions' curricula; and while work with the Ministry of Education on removing gender stereotypes from textbooks and on introducing education on sexual and reproductive health and rights as part of the mainstream curriculum is at its early stages, the results of this work also have the potential to become sustainable.

At the same time, sustainability is also the greatest point of concern for the results achieved by the UNJP in this phase of the programme, and across all sub-components. Staff turnover at all levels of government continues to be a concern beyond the UNJP's control. The level of dependency of all stakeholders involved on the resources provided through UNJP is considerable. For example, the parliamentary Gender Equality Council (one of the key interlocutors of UNDP) relies heavily on day-to-day operational level support from the programme, as does the Inter-Agency Domestic Violence Council of the government of Georgia (UN Women and UNFPA counterparts). The fulfilment of strategic and policy documents on gender equality, such as the 2014-2016 National Action Plan on Gender Equality, hinges on the government making available resources for its implementation. And while some progress has been made on the state's financing of key service delivery structures for the victims of domestic violence (4 out of 5 shelters for victims of domestic violence are now financed by the state), the dependence of other parts of the service delivery system on the resources provided by the programme and other international donors is alarming. The evaluators are also concerned by the fact that there is a clear consensus from stakeholders that the future of the gender equality agenda in Georgia is under threat should the UN not carry this issue forward.

With regards to the second direction of enquiry, i.e. the **merits of the joint approach**, the evaluators have encountered surprisingly scarce evidence from stakeholders outside the UN staff involved that the programme is recognised as an effort involving three agencies in one joint programmatic framework working on inter-related concerns to advance the gender equality agenda in Georgia. UN agency staff themselves seem to have taken some time to buy into the joint programme approach, and there has been anecdotal evidence that the framework has resulted in the loss of efficiency and flexibility in operations. The evaluators note that even among participating staff there is a certain lack of clarity on how the three components really form a single logical whole.

The evaluators have identified evidence of the three agencies working together, such as the 2014 – 2016 National Action Plan on Gender Equality, which incorporates measures from across the UNJP's sub-components. UNDP, UNFPA, and UN Women have also joined forces for the training of judges, as well as the training of journalists and the development of gender-sensitive and ethical reporting curriculum for BA journalism programmes of six Georgian universities. Successful joint advocacy for a Gender Equality function within the government

of Georgia is another case in point, as is advocacy for the establishment of a Gender Equality Department inside the Public Defender's Office.

However, the evaluators have also identified a number of instances where the components could have worked together better; these include exploring how the contact with grassroots groups in the pilot regions could be maximised to advance the economic and political empowerment, and the anti-domestic violence agendas; the combination of research efforts; and joint monitoring and evaluation to increase efficiency and coherence of programme delivery.

Recommendations to the UNJP participating agencies:

1. A future UNJP should be more explicit on the theory of change bringing the components together, and the potential of the joint approach needs to be spelled out clearer; all staff needs to buy into the joint approach. As part of building domestic ownership and the capacity of the national institutions participating in the Steering Committee, the next UNJP needs to involve the Georgian counterparts actively into the programme design phase, including in the formulation of the theory of change underpinning the programme.
2. There needs to be a clearer strategic approach on how to involve ethnic and religious minorities in a future UNJP and how to account for their involvement beyond a formal commitment in the Programme Document;
3. A future UNJP should make clear its position on "gender", and be clear on how it focuses explicitly on certain target groups, while pursuing the work with other groups in a more implicit manner, for example the work with the LGBT community;
4. The "pilot approach" to outputs and activities within outputs needs to be more clearly thought through. Guiding parameters have to be whether and how pilots created are really of a critical scale and are likely to generate sufficient ownership to serve as examples for replication country-wide;
5. A future project should consider consolidation of activities as opposed to the currently considered extension to other regions of Georgia. This concerns in particular the economic empowerment activities within the UNDP sub-component of the UNJP. The UN should explore where they can best add value, which might be *normative* concerns such as property rights issues that affect women, or advocacy for gender mainstreaming in existing national programmes for economic development, including such programmes that provide access to credit for women. Existing networks should be used to spread awareness about and to create demand for the opportunities available. The economic empowerment activities need to be examined critically to avoid gender stereotyping.

6. All sub-components must work towards diminishing the dependence of their partners, including NGOs that are providing services, on UNJP resources. UN Women in particular is aware that it needs to continue its advocacy work to ensure that UNJP resources do not continue to fund services that should be paid out of the state budget;
7. With limited resources available, all parts of the UNJP should be strategic, and the need to fund individual events and one-off activities should be re-appraised in a future phase of the programme;
8. UNJP should review its partnerships and open up to potentially new domestic actors in Georgia who could carry the gender equality debate forward independently of the UN;
9. Given that the groundwork is laid with regards to data collection on instances of domestic violence, the UNJP should build the authorities' capacities to use this data to inform the design of domestic responses and policies;
10. Consider making aspects of the UNJP more efficient, for example through the introduction of a joint monitoring and evaluation function, which should be included in the funding proposal for the next phase of the programme. Monitoring and evaluation should involve the collection of evidence on key programme assumptions, such as that greater awareness indeed leads to increased realisation of the individual's rights;
11. The UNJP should consider a more integrated approach to reporting, and which would consolidate reflection (and learning) on the achievements at programme level, as opposed to the current reporting at sub-component level.

Recommendations to the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia

1. Consider supporting a second phase of the UNJP for the whole period of the cooperation strategy until 2020; this second phase must have a clear outlook on how to ensure sustainability of results by the end of the programme;
2. An expansion to include more UN agencies is not recommended.

1. Introduction

1.1 THE UNJP'S CONTEXT

In 1994, the Georgian Parliament ratified the UN Convention on the “Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women” (CEDAW). The 2010 Law of Georgia on Gender Equality “determines the main directions and guarantees for the provision of equal rights, freedoms and opportunities for men and women provided by the Georgian Constitution”. It also defines “legal mechanisms and conditions for their implementation” and its purpose is to “ensure inadmissibility of discrimination in all spheres of public life, creation of proper conditions for the enjoyment of equal rights, freedoms and opportunities by men and women, support eradication and mitigation of all forms of gender discrimination”. Even though the scope of the law only includes public life, it does, at the same time define “gender equality” as a concept referring to “all spheres of personal and public life”.

The 2010 Law on Gender Equality addresses direct discrimination (treating a person less favourably on the basis of sex, based on a normative act, programme or other public policy) and indirect discrimination (a normative act, programme or other public policy which is not directly discriminating but the implementation of which would have discriminatory outcomes), and points out guarantees for ensuring gender equality. Among these are individual rights; access to education; equal rights of spouses and in relation to children; combating violence in family and society; freedom of choice of and right to hold professional positions; equal opportunities for the protection of health; and access to information. The Law also states that relevant official statistics shall contain gender disaggregated data and the right to equal participation in elections and representative bodies. Different responsibilities for ensuring gender equality are placed on the Parliament of Georgia and in particular through the creation of the Gender Equality Council (GEC); on local self-government bodies and on the Public Defender of Georgia (PDO).

Chapter 3 of the Law covers the establishment of institutional mechanisms for the supervision over the enforcement of the Gender Equality Law. According to the Law, the Georgian Parliament and the Gender Equality Council (established by the parliament) represent the key entities ensuring compliance with the provisions of the Gender Equality Law. The Gender Equality Council is the key agency authorised to “ensure coordination and monitoring of implementation of the Action Plan for Gender Equality; perform analysis of the legislation and draft proposals for overcoming gender inequalities existing in the legislation; elaborate and plan activities to achieve gender equality; ensure enforcement of equal rights of women and men, elaborate and implement the monitoring and evaluation system of activities targeted at ensuring gender equality (Article 12).”

According to the Article 14 of the Georgian Law on Gender Equality, the Public Defender of Georgia is authorised to monitor enforcement of the Law, and to take relevant measures when violations occur.

In 2013, a new position of Human Rights and Gender Equality Advisor of the Prime Minister was created in the executive branch of the Government, as part of a broader inter-agency coordination effort at the Executive level on gender equality and women's empowerment.

The Law of Georgia on Gender Equality was followed by the “2011-2013 National Action Plan (NAP) for the Implementation of Gender Equality” (Resolution of the Parliament Georgia on Approving the “2011-2013 Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality”). The NAP has specific goals, targets, activities, indicators, time frames and funding sources. It covers enhancing gender equality institutions and procedures, education and increasing public awareness, economics, statistics, women’s political participation, security and peace building, and health and social protection.

The Parliament of Georgia adopted a new “2014-2016 National Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality”. The Plan has eight main directions, namely elaboration of the National Policy on Gender Equality and promotion of its implementation; education and awareness raising; securing gender equality in the economic field; health and social protection sphere; enhancing gender equality at local self-governance level; women and politics, gender equality in the field of environment protection; gender equality in law-enforcement and penitentiary spheres.

The Law of Georgia on the Elimination of Domestic Violence, Protection and Support of Victims of Domestic Violence was first adopted in 2006 and has thereafter been revised and complemented. The scope of the Law is to define “a set of actions which characterise domestic violence, legal and organisational grounds for detecting and eliminating domestic violence” and to guarantee “legal protection and support for victims of domestic violence”. The law aims to guarantee effective legislative mechanisms, including justice for victims and ensure collaboration between institutions, and to provide protection and rehabilitation for victims, and to support rehabilitation for abusers. It defines domestic violence as the “violation of constitutional rights and freedoms of one family member by another family member through neglect and/or physical, psychological, economic, sexual violence or coercion”.

The Law on Elimination of Domestic Violence prescribes mechanisms for the prevention of domestic violence, including analysis of “factors that cause” violence; implementation of legal measures; statistics; awareness raising campaigns; support for victims and abusers; and programmes in relevant institutions. It also identifies mechanisms for identification and elimination of domestic violence, i.e. criminal, civil and administrative law, and particularly points at protective and restraining orders as a temporary measure. The Law also defines specific measures for protecting minors from violence; peculiarities of proceedings on facts of domestic violence and rights; social and labour guarantees for victims of domestic violence, as well as rehabilitation measures for abusers. Stakeholders in different parts of the implementation of the Law are identified as the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs; the Ministry of Internal Affairs; the Ministry of Education and Science; the Prosecutor's Office and judicial bodies of Georgia.

The 2011 “Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Violence against Women and Domestic Violence” (Istanbul Convention), was signed by Georgia in 2014, but has not, yet, been ratified. On its website, in 2014 the Ministry of Internal Affairs stated that the fight against domestic violence is a top priority for the Georgian government, and the implementation of the law is guided by the National Action Plan.

Georgia also has a National Action Plan for the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 on women, peace and security, which was adopted in 2012 (Resolution of the Georgian Parliament. On approval of 2012-2015 National Action Plan for implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions ## 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 on “Women, Peace and Security” 2012). The National Action Plan is in line with Article 6.1.1 of the “2011-2013 Action Plan on Ensuring Gender Equality” and follows the three main themes of the UNSCR 1325: participation of women at decision-making level in conflict elimination, prevention and management processes; prevention defined as consideration of women’s needs in conflict prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against women, especially sexual and gender based violence; and the protection of conflict affected women’s human rights ensuring their physical, social, economic and political security. Under these themes the plan has, like the National Action Plan on Gender Equality, precise objectives; activities; implementing agencies; deadlines and source of funding; something which in international policy discussions and research is pointed out as a prerequisite for successful implementation of National Action Plans on the UNSCR 1325.

In May 2014, the Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination was adopted. The Law covers discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, sexual orientation and gender identity and expression, along with race, citizenship, ethnic or social origin, religion etc. The Law states that all forms of discrimination should be prohibited in Georgia, and as in the Law on Gender Equality, this applies to direct as well as indirect discrimination. The responsibility for monitoring, reporting, receiving complaints and suspending proceedings is placed on the Public Defender of Georgia.

According to the Human Rights House in Tbilisi, the anti-discrimination bill was preceded by heated discussions and resistance, particularly from the Orthodox Church. The resistance concerned a demand from the Church and other groups to remove “sexual orientation” from the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination. The law was, however, eventually passed close to unanimously, 115 to one. Under Article 5, “Interpretation and Scope of the Law”, it states that no provision of the Law may be interpreted as contradicting “the Constitution of Georgia and the Constitutional Agreement between the State and the Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church of Georgia”.

In the latest annual report, the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia identifies domestic violence as a field in which the programme has contributed to improvement of national laws in line with international commitments. Based on the analysis of the Istanbul Convention, UNJP has further supported the “Inter-agency Council Implementing

Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence” to, among other things, eradicate legislative gaps and reflect the principles of the Istanbul Convention in local legislation and policies. UNJP has also been advocating for the Georgian ratification of the Istanbul Convention (signed in 2014), in cooperation with the Gender Equality Council; the Domestic Violence Council; and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Among other measures, UNJP supported the Domestic Violence Council in developing the Domestic Violence National Action Plan for 2013-2015.

With regard to Georgia’s fulfilment of national gender policies and international obligations, the 2013 CEDAW report calls for further action in relation to the Non-Discrimination Law, and for updated information about the mandate of the Gender Equality Council; its human and financial resources; and the establishment of gender focal points. It also calls for examples of temporary measures established by law to promote equality between women and men in areas where women are disadvantaged.

Furthermore, the CEDAW report shows that although the Law on Gender Equality” states equal treatment in the evaluation of work quality, there is a 40% difference in salaries between women and men. In relation to the same Law, the report also notes a lack of information about measures taken to protect women from sexual harassment. A draft National Strategy for the Prevention of Violence is currently being debated.

Another important new national policy, and where UNJP has contributed to, is the April 2014 National Youth Policy of Georgia, into which gender equality and SRH&R have been integrated.

Perceptions and attitudes towards the concept of gender equality, as well as any gender-related issues, have to be taken into account. A 2013 study by the Analysis and Consulting Team (ACT) found that “traditional views on gender roles remain strong: a woman’s main function is to take care of and raise children and take care of the household – in other words household chores; while a man’s function is to support the family financially.”

The findings of the study also revealed that the financially independent woman is not well-accepted by the patriarchal society, and this happens in a setting where more than 30 percent of women are the main breadwinners of their families: “If finances allow, it is better for women to stay at home or take an easier job – ‘more appropriate work for a woman’ – if necessary.”

The authors conclude that results are similar to those of previous studies: “All of them suggest that Georgia is still a masculine, patriarchal country where men occupy a dominant position. Research reveals that men justify this dominant position more than women. Women know that they have a sub-ordinate role and that they have to make concessions; for instance, by tolerating domestic violence and infidelity.”

1.2 KEY PARAMETERS OF THE EVALUATED PROGRAMME

The evaluated programme is a joint effort by UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA in Georgia.

The UNJP is—with approximately USD 5 Million—entirely funded by the government of Sweden, which has been the main donor (including to UN agencies) on gender issues in Georgia since at least 2007. The UNJP as a joint effort is a result of the Swedish insistence on coordination and coherence between the UN agencies.¹

The programme’s overall goal is to “promote gender equality and women’s empowerment through strengthening capacities in the government, civil society and communities”.² The UNJP is the first effort on a substantial scale to combine the three participating UN agencies’ respective mandates to advance gender equality in Georgia.

The programme, which started in January 2012 and is expected to end in April 2015, is designed around three interlinked “outcomes“. The rationale bringing these three outcome areas together is the nexus between gender inequality; violence against women specifically in the domestic area; and the lack of awareness on and realisation of sexual and reproductive health and rights. Domestic violence is understood to be a *result* of gender inequality (including economic and political inequality, as well as a lack of opportunity for women to realise their sexual and reproductive rights), and, in turn, represents one of the *key challenges* to achieving gender equality; realising sexual and reproductive rights is linked to the potential for realising economic and political rights, and thus to achieving gender equality in the public and private spheres of life.

In implementation terms, the outcomes are programme sub-components, with UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA, respectively, in the lead. Each outcome/sub-component is further broken down into outputs, as follows:

UNDP Outcome 1	Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment
Output 1.1	Improved policy and institutional framework for advancing gender equality agenda
Output 1.2	Gender responsive policies applied by key national and local authorities

¹See also Inception Report.

²Joint Programme document, page 14.

Output 1.3	Local women empowered economically and politically through better opportunities for income generation and political participation
UN Women Outcome 2	Creating an enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence (DV)
Output 2.1	National laws and policies on domestic violence improved in line with international commitments (CEDAW, Beijing Platform for Action)
Output 2.2	Capacity of key policy and service delivery institutions strengthened to promote and protect women's human rights to life free from violence, especially from DV
Output 2.3	Public awareness raised to support prevention and disclosure of instances of GBV and DV
UNFPA Outcome 3	Gender Equality advanced by creating an enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of the population
Output 3.1	Enhanced capacity of policy makers to integrate Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH&R) into the Population policies and national development frameworks with particular focus on Youth
Output 3.2	Strengthened SRH&R strategies and services to address health system response to DV
Output 3.3	Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment

The UNJP works at the **national level** with key institutions (ministries; relevant executive and parliamentary structures etc.), and in **selected regions** of Georgia. All three agencies work in Tbilisi, as well as Kakheti/Eastern Georgia, and both UNDP and UN Women also work in Samegrelo-Svaneti/Western Georgia. Due to the unequal budget distribution (with approximately USD 2.1 Million for UNDP and UN Women each, and approximately USD 0.7 Million for UNFPA), UNFPA does not work in Samegrelo-Svaneti.

The **locations** were **chosen** based on previous programme or project experience (i.e. where the agencies had already worked in the past, and thus had established partnerships and networks of contact); and a number of parameters including the prevalence of **internally displaced persons (IDPs), and ethnic and religious minorities**. Crucially, locations were se-

lected based on the **severity of the problems** to be addressed by the programme. For example, the Kakheti region, according to 2010 research carried out by the Anti-Violence Network of Georgia (and referred to in the Joint Programme document) was identified as one of the Georgian regions where domestic violence was most widespread at the time of the design of the programme.

The initial programme document also set out, although in very general terms, to explore how the UNJP could benefit members of the LGBT community in Georgia.

The UNJP's justifies its working but in Tbilisi and two (of the six) regions of Georgia strategically: the aim is to create **pilot success stories** that could then be used to lobby at the national/central level, bringing policy-/decision makers to roll these successes out to all regions.

The programme applies a complex partnership approach. At the **regional/sub-national level**, the UNJP contracts NGOs to deliver activities at the grassroots level, and to work with selected municipal authorities. In a number of cases, these are partnerships that pre-date the current UNJP, i.e. involve partners that the three agencies have worked with in the past; UNDP and UNFPA have also expanded their range of partner organisations in the course of the UNJP. Depending on the specific activities, partner NGOs then can also sub-contract smaller initiatives on the ground, or administer small grant schemes.

The programme also works **strategically** with organisations that serve specific relevant stakeholders, and where these organisations can serve as multipliers. For example, UN Women works through the Georgian Bar Association's training provider in order to disseminate legal knowledge on relevant legislation affecting victims of domestic violence; other examples include the Police Academy of the Ministry of Interior of Georgia through which institutionalised training is provided to future police officers; and the High School of Justice of Georgia which provides trainings to sitting and future judges. UNFPA involves youth organisations to carry out awareness raising on sexual and reproductive health and rights among younger people in the pilot regions, thus taking advantage of the potential provided by peer education on a traditionally taboo issue.

The basis for UNJP's internal monitoring and evaluation is the programme's logframe and the indicators for measurement established therein ("Indicator-based Performance Assessment"). Internal monitoring is done at the sub-component level, i.e. there are effectively three separate monitoring functions at present. The programme follows an annual reporting routine to the Steering Committee and the donor (with the length of the report being capped at 50 pages), and the log-frame indicators (quantitative and qualitative) are systematically being reported against, although the suitability of many of the quantitative indicators is problematic, and at the minimum illustrates the challenges faced during the planning process of the programme. For example, in a number of cases, the target indicators have been exceeded by a multitude (in some cases up to 1000%). In other cases, it is not clear whether the target figures reflect an estimate of the needs (for example on shelters for the victims of DV; the increase in legal aid; the increase in budget allocations; trainings; etc.), or whether they are a reflection of what is

estimated can realistically be achieved during the programme.

The Annual Report, while formally a UNJP document, presents the reports of the three individual sub-components almost separately, and an overall assessment of the results overall is at present very limited.

1.3 THE ASSIGNMENT

This is a **formative** evaluation which serves both accountability and learning purposes, and where the **key emphasis** (as confirmed during the inception phase with the three agencies participating in the UNJP) **is on learning**. Having been extended by four months, the current UNJP will come to an end on 30 April 2015. The three agencies have, in principle, agreed with the Swedish Embassy in Georgia on a continuation of the funding, and have submitted an initial concept paper outlining the design of a second phase of the programme.

The evaluators understand that the results of the evaluation will not be decisive with regards to further funding, but that they will feed into the design of the second phase of the programme.

The Terms of Reference (ToR – Annex 1) for the assignment set two main directions of inquiry. First, the evaluation was to yield insight into the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and prospects for sustainability of the UNJP. Looking at the initially proposed questions in the ToR, the greater emphasis was, however, to be on the lessons learned from the programme as the first significant joint effort of the three agencies in Georgia.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was conducted between December 2014 and March 2015 by a team of four (three international and one national) evaluators. The initial allocation of tasks among the team was reassigned during the evaluation process between the international evaluators, to reflect the need for greater evaluation experience during the assignment. The final evaluation report was submitted on 3 March 2015 after incorporating comments from the three UN agencies. However, there was another round of comments from the UNJP, which were submitted to Indvelop AB on 6 May 2015, i.e. some 3 months after the data collection in Georgia had been concluded by the team.

The work consisted of an initial desk review of a considerable amount (300 +) of UNJP documents made available by the three sub-components. During the inception phase, the evaluation team drafted, in coordination with UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA, an initial stakeholder map which aimed to assure that the in-country work would cover most stakeholders relevant for the task in hand. The inception phase also reflected on and regrouped a small number of the evaluation questions proposed in the ToR; overall, the initial evaluation questions as stipulated by the UNJP's ToR have remained, as has the focus on the specific evaluation criteria and where there was an emphasis on the effectiveness criterion, which, too, follows the ToR.

In-country data collection was carried out between 12 January and 24 January 2015. The evaluators, using semi-structured interview questionnaires, met with around 185 individuals during 88 meetings in Tbilisi, as well as in Kakheti and Samegrelo. In addition to extensive repeat meetings with the UNJP sub-component staff and senior management of the three agencies, these meetings involved representatives of UNJP partner institutions; partner organisations and grantees; contractors; the donor; as well as non-stakeholder experts (organisations/individuals who knew of the programme without being directly involved in it). A detailed schedule of the meetings is attached in Annex 3 of this report. The in-country work was substantially facilitated by the evaluated programme, i.e. the UNJP, itself – a reflection of the complexity of the UNJP and the multitude of stakeholders involved. The evaluation team also listened to all radio emissions produced in the framework of the UNFPA sub-component with the Patriarchy’s radio station “Iveria”.

The evidence base for the report are thus the programme documents submitted by UNJP, as well as interviews with a considerable number of individuals. In accordance with evaluation practice, the interviews were held on the basis of non-attribution. Findings have been consistently triangulated, and thus, never reflect the statement of just one individual.

The evaluators de-briefed UNJP staff as well as senior management of the three agencies at the end of the in-country work. During these de-briefings, the evaluators flagged key issues of concern that would be reflected in the evaluation report. However, due to the complexity of the UNJP—effectively an umbrella for three individual projects of considerable size— and the timing of the debriefing which came at the end of an intense 12-day data collection phase without the evaluators having been able to analyse all of the information, they were not able to capture, present, and discuss all of these issues in detail during this meeting.

A first deliverable – the Inception Report—was submitted on 23 December 2014, and approved on 30 January 2015. The Inception Report can be found in Annex 2. The draft evaluation report was submitted on 13 February 2015, and comments were received by UNFPA on 16 February 2015. As a result of the latter, the evaluators conducted another round of interviews in order to collect more evidence in particular on outcome area 3. General comments were received from the UNJP on 20 February 2015, and the final report was submitted on 3 March 2015.

1.5 LIMITATIONS

A number of limitations affected the evaluation. In terms of the organisation of the work, the timing of the exercise was somewhat problematic, as the evaluation coincided with the end-of-year holidays first in Western Europe, and subsequently in Georgia. In terms of the organisation of logistical aspects of the in-country work, this meant that the meeting schedule had to be finalised on a day-to-day basis after the arrival of the evaluators in Georgia, something that would not normally be the case in similar exercises. The evaluators would like to acknowledge that UNJP staff has gone out of their way to facilitate the in-country work and to

make sure that the timing did not hamper the exercise. An initial over-representation, in the interview schedule, of stakeholders that had directly participated in the UNJP was addressed by adding more non-stakeholder experts towards the end of the in-country work of the international evaluators, while a number of interviews with other donors was added towards the end of the data collection process.

An initial limitation, spelled out in the Inception Report, was posed by the reporting requirements UNJP follows. This resulted—for evaluation purposes—in an initial tension between the lack of detail at the programme level and a surplus of detail at the activity level. This limitation was overcome through setting aside considerable time with the sub-component managers/staff so that the evaluators gained a sound understanding of the sub-components prior to the start of the formal interviews with stakeholders.

In terms of the outcome of the evaluation related to the two main directions of inquiry as outlined above—and a finding in itself—a key limitation is that only one of the stakeholders interviewed (in addition to current and previous UNJP participating agencies staff and the donor) was able to discuss the value-added/benefit of the programme being a joint effort of the three UN agencies. Surprisingly, even where stakeholders had been involved in the design process of the UNJP, they were unable to recall or distinguish the rationale of this approach from other/previous projects or programmes. In other words, stakeholders were overwhelmingly able to relate to the sub-component/project of the UNJP that they had been directly involved with, but were unable to clearly identify or discuss it as a whole.

In particular for the output area 3 under the UNDP sub-component, the quality of the data obtained during the interview process was problematic. This is likely to be a function of cultural factors, and where stakeholders in the more remote locations are possibly not used to sharing information openly with outsiders/strangers. Loss of information due to language barriers might also have influenced the data the evaluators were able to solicit from women's groups on the ground. It is specifically in this output area that the evaluators have not been able to corroborate some of the results reported by UNDP; this concerns in particular the level of mobilisation that was achieved at community level, and where the written reports could not be reconciled with the data obtained during the interviews.

2. Findings

2.1 RELEVANCE

The UNJP remains highly **relevant** for the context of Georgia—women's access to participation in politics and the labour market remains limited, and the pay gap between men and women significant; 2014 has seen a record number of femicides; awareness on sexual and reproductive health and rights is low and the subject is taboo, and sex selective abortions and early marriages present considerable problems affecting women, in particular in rural loca-

tions and among religious minorities. Education on sexual and reproductive rights does not exist in schools, and is in general a widespread taboo.

The focus on geographic locations with a high representation of IDPs as well as religious minorities is in principle relevant, given that these areas have been identified, during research, as areas where domestic violence is high, and awareness on SRH&R as well as on economic and political rights is low. However, it is not clear across all UNJP components how systematic these groups have been targeted through the output areas.

As mentioned above, the programme had, in principle, pledged to explore opportunities to work with the LGBT community, and while maybe not pursued systematically, a number of output areas, in particular in the UNFPA sub-component, have involved LGBT representatives (for example through peer education campaigns). The evaluators have not come to a conclusive assessment on whether or not the UNJP should have pursued this work more explicitly and systematically, as there are a number of arguments for and against the approach taken. The argument in favour is that LGBT issues are part of the gender equality debate, and thus, would have a place in the programme. However, there would seem to be potent arguments to suggest a more nuanced approach. Several stakeholders have pointed out that LGBT issues are perceived, by society, as “imported” or “foreign” issues. Advocating for LGBT issues through the UNJP, i.e. through the international community, was seen by those stakeholders as potentially doing more harm than good. Those same stakeholders convincingly argued that the issue be best advanced through advocacy by local LGBT-rights groups, and separate funding streams should be made available for these groups. This does not preclude for the UN in Georgia to declare support at the political level for LGBT rights; it is rather an argument in favour of pursuing these outside the channels of a future UNJP.

The UN as a whole is widely recognised as pivotal to driving the gender equality agenda in Georgia, for example through the Gender Theme Group that brings international and national stakeholders together on a regular basis and in the framework of which joint policy directions are being agreed upon among stakeholders. The competence of the three agencies is undisputed, and the evaluators had overwhelming evidence suggesting the high level of competence, professional and personal integrity, and commitment of the individual staff of the agencies. Stakeholders have, however, also raised concerns about the extent to which the UN is driving the process, and the dependence of the national institutions on the UNJP has been highlighted as being problematic.

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation asked specifically for an assessment of the relevance of the joint programme approach. With regards to the question about the “extent [to which] the joint programme was conceptualized, planned and designed jointly to respond to international, regional and national commitments on gender equality and women’s empowerment”, as well as to what extent the programme’s design reflected a strategic approach to capitalising on each agency’s strength, the evaluators come to an overall ambiguous assessment. Both the actual programme document as well as evidence from the stakeholder interviews

suggest that while the programme is formally a joint one, it has remained by-and-large a set of three separate projects. The evaluators came across various examples of where UNJP participating staff were not able to clearly explain how the three sub-components related to one another, and the underlying rationale of the project described above was reconstructed by the evaluators. It was, not, however, as such articulated explicitly by staff. UNJP reporting is another case in point, as it reports separately on the three sub-components, not, however, substantially on the programme as a whole.

There have, however, been instances of joint work identified by the evaluators where working collaboratively has led to the shaping of national policies on gender equality. This includes joint advocacy of the three agencies to establish a gender equality function within the executive branch of government, and joint work on the 2014-2016 National Action Plan on Gender Equality. There is also evidence of the three agencies’ learning through the process, for example on the potential value offered by working together on research, as well as on a joint approach to training of different stakeholder groups, and which the agencies report will be clearer reflected in the programming for the next phase of the UNJP. The section on “Effectiveness” below will discuss the extent to which the various sub-components have contributed to the strengthening of the legal framework on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Overall, the lack of awareness on the part of the national stakeholders, including those that have been involved in designing the programme, about the relevance of the joint approach is notable. In part, this would seem due to the fact that turnover of staff in the Georgian institutions is considerable, resulting in a loss of institutional memory, including for the UNJP. It also raises important questions as to the issue of ownership among the UNJP’s partner institutions. This is not to imply that individual activities across the sub-components (such as the development of national policies) are not needed or welcome by national counterparts. The concern is rather as to how much the national institutions are driving the process, and how much UNJP is pushing key processes.

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS

The following section will discuss the achievement of the objectives of the three UNJP sub-components, as well as the programme overall.

UNDP Outcome 1: Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment
Output 1.1 Improved policy and institutional framework for advancing gender equality agenda
Output 1.2 Gender responsive policies applied by key national and local authorities
Output 1.3

Local women empowered economically and politically through better opportunities for income generation and political participation

One of the key results that UNJP overall and UNDP in particular has been credited with is that gender equality has been successfully kept on the agenda of the government and the parliament of Georgia. Good progress was thus made on the achievement of Output 1, in particular with regards to the improved policy environment and specifically, the adoption, by the Parliament of Georgia and under the auspices of the Gender Equality Council (GEC), of the new National Action Plan (NAP) on Gender Equality for the period of 2014 to 2016, which replaces the previous, 2011 – 2013 NAP. Stakeholders have stressed that the process of elaboration of the NAP was led by the GEC, which is an important improvement on the drafting process of the 2011-2013 NAP, which was seen to have been largely driven by NGOs. Stakeholders have also pointed out that the quality of the new NAP is considerably improved compared to the predecessor document; specifically, the reflection, in the NAP, of the need to find funding for many of the proposed measures from within the state budget has been highlighted as progress. However, there is also widespread scepticism among stakeholders as to how effective the GEC will be in advocating for the funding to be made available, and there is concern that the implementation is still to a great extent contingent on donor assistance.

The GEC is UNDP's most important partner (the partnership precedes the current UNJP), and is the main institution in charge of overseeing the implementation of the 2010 Gender Equality Law, and the monitoring of the implementation of the respective NAPs. The GEC has no dedicated resources of its own to fulfil its functions, and relies heavily on the UNJP's assistance—technical expertise³ and input as well as material resources—for its work. Despite the fact that the GEC has been established by law and the fact that each new parliament will have to elect its members, this dependence on UNDP/UNJP (and which is clearly visible/identifiable for outside stakeholders) represents an area of considerable concern in terms of the ownership of the gender equality agenda within the legislative function of Georgia.

Another key result under this output area is UNDP's successful advocacy, together with UN Women and UNFPA, for a gender equality function in the executive, which has contributed to the establishment, in 2013, of the position of the Human Rights and Gender Equality Advisor of the Prime Minister. While locating a Gender Equality function at this level of government

³ The UNJP's Annual Reports account for extensive capacity building activities and technical expertise provided by UNDP to the GEC which cannot be individually assessed in the framework of this exercise.

is an achievement in its own right and goes some way towards meeting the requirements of the Beijing Platform for Action, there is concern as to the a) conflation of the human rights and the gender equality functions, which should be clearer separated reflecting the fact that gender equality goes beyond human rights concerns and b) the creation of this function possibly signalling a proliferation of structures; at the minimum it is opening new challenges for coordination between functions. Depending on how clearly the gender equality function under the Prime Minister will emerge, this structure might become a more important counterpart in a future phase of the programme.

Under this output, UNDP (as well as the other two sub-components) has engaged in extensive public awareness activities. The underpinning rationale of engaging in public awareness raising is the forging, among citizens, of an understanding for the need for change, and for raising the public's expectations towards politicians for change. The evaluators find the strengths of the awareness campaigns to be in the combination of research into public perceptions and attitudes with innovative approaches as witnessed in the highly talked about gender stereotypes campaign "Change your Mind" in 2013. With regards to the latter (and acknowledged by UNDP), the campaign was primarily targeted at the urban population of Tbilisi, Zugdidi and Telavi.

A very early ambition for the campaign to cause a wave of activism was abandoned as unrealistic, and represents a valuable lesson learned for framing the objectives of future awareness raising work. In fact, a repeat survey on public perceptions and attitudes conducted in the framework of the project in 2013 ("Public Perceptions on Gender Equality in Politics and Business") has found marginal change in the public's view on gender roles in Georgia from the first survey conducted in 2009, proving the difficulty of dislodging stereotypes and the long-term nature of changing public expectations.

Some progress has been made on Output 1.2.; which is primarily concerned with gender mainstreaming at the national and local governance levels. The evaluators were able to independently corroborate the results from UNDP's work with GEOSTAT on developing, maintaining, and regularly updating gender disaggregated key statistical indicators, which is a key achievement. Gender mainstreaming is also clearly reflected in the new NAP. The evaluators have uncovered insufficient evidence regarding the results of the specific gender-based budgeting activities undertaken as part of this output area to draw verifiable conclusions beyond taking note of the fact that the Ministry of Finance has formally agreed to a set of activities in this area. The issue of concern here is that gender-based budgeting has been reported by various donors and implementing organisations as an area where programmes and projects have provided technical assistance, including training, at central and local levels for many years and where the results are considered to be negligible. On the other hand, the evaluators have heard repeated requests from stakeholders for such trainings. In part, and as mentioned in the discussion on Output 1.1., this is a result of the substantial turnover of staff at all levels of government in Georgia following elections. Based on this information it is difficult to come to

the conclusion that capacity-building has had any tangible effects so far; more importantly, the evaluators cannot, at this stage, reach the conclusion that the UNJP has created a real momentum through its pilot activities at the local level to have gender-based budgeting approaches rolled out systematically across Georgia. The evaluators take note of the fact, reported by UNDP, that the Ministry of Finance has declared its will to move ahead on gender-budgeting; they were, however, not able to assess the level of this commitment through a direct stakeholder meeting or information provided by third party experts.

Output 1.3 would seem the most difficult output area for this sub-component. The evaluators find that while the potential causal links between income generation and empowerment are well understood and sound, the programme is trying to address issues that are of such a scale that it is questionable how a pilot approach in select locations is going to contribute to resolving deep-seated structural problems of the Georgian economy. The programme has expanded previous partnerships with VET training centres in Kakheti and Samegrelo to train women in agricultural skills, but also to provide them with qualifications in IT and skills employable in the hotel/tourism sector. In general, the evaluators found that training was stereotyped, e.g. welding (only men); construction (only men); wine production (only men) production of fruit preservers (only women); cooking classes; hairdressing classes; and sewing classes (only women), and that important aspects were missing from the training, such as consideration of markets and distribution channels for products. Evidence exists that the VET institution in Poti systematically pursued integration into the labour market of those trained, while the VET institutions in Senaki and Kachreti pursued agricultural training (improvement of skills and techniques of farmers) and where formal employment was not expected in the first place. By the end of 2013, 350 people had been trained. The evaluators have not been able to verify that the income generation training overall had resulted in actual increased income. Some specific examples raise cause for concern. One partner organisation worked with a women's group on a business plan only to find that the hurdles (posed by excessive interest rates) in order to access micro-credits were too high; there are also questions as to how gender stereotyped the business ideas are.

Under this output area, the project supported the establishment of an Association of Women's Farmers of Kakheti. The evaluators have concerns over the viability of the Association—although it is membership-based, it is not fee-based, despite counting a number of very successful businesswomen among the members and who could arguably contribute a fee. There has not been a clear picture on what the medium- to long-term strategy for the Association

will look like,⁴ and members have pointed out that without the continued support from UNJP, it will not survive.

With regards to the “Community Mobilisation for Economic Empowerment of Local Women” component under this output, the evaluators have evidence as to the multitude of individual projects that were co-financed as a result of the community engagement of local women, and which address a considerable variety of issues from improving the quality of childcare facilities, to local road infrastructure; street-lighting, and access to regular public transport. UNJP reports that by March 2014, 82 issues identified by local women’s groups that had been part of the activities had become part of the State Programme for Village support (an increase by 74 compared to the initially foreseen number in the Programme), with a financial allocation of approximately 6,232,620 GEL. Women interviewed for the purposes of the evaluation showed considerable pride and reported an increase in self-esteem as a result of their participation in the project. However, from the stakeholder interviews held and given the timing of the evaluation, the evaluators lack sufficient evidence to assess how many of the women included in the activities will continue to be active in the local community in the medium and long term.

One observation relates to this Output area, and that concern the “jointness” of the UNJP. There appears to be scope to more systematically exploit the contacts at the local community level to advance work done in the other two sub-components. A successful example is the mobilisation of the members of the Association of Farmer Women to participate in the 26 November “Day against Domestic Violence”. However, the evaluators had evidence from more than one location visited and where local initiatives had been conducted and where interlocutors denied that domestic violence was an issue in their village. There is overall a question mark how similar the work on community mobilisation done by UNDP under this sub-component is to the work done by UN Women through a Norwegian-funded project, and whether there would be a benefit from some streamlining in a future phase of the programme, thereby exploiting expertise and experience in implementation of this kind of initiative at the local level.

A further area of improvement that needs to be looked into is how the local partners in the VET institutions can become partners for change—there was little evidence to suggest that

⁴ UNDP reports to support the transition of the association, in the long-term, to a fee-based organisation, however, this was not corroborated by stakeholders interviewed.

they had fully understood the gender equality rationale of the project, which would appear to be a missed opportunity.

UN Women Outcome 2: Creating an enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence (DV)
<p>Output 2.1</p> <p>National laws and policies on domestic violence improved in line with international commitments (CEDAW, Beijing Platform for Action).</p>
<p>Output 2.2</p> <p>Capacity of key policy and service delivery institutions strengthened to promote and protect women's human rights to life free from violence, especially from DV.</p>
<p>Output 2.3</p> <p>Public awareness raised to support prevention and disclosure of instances of GBV and DV.</p>

UN Women is recognised by a wide range of stakeholders as the lead agency in Georgia on domestic violence. Its role in convening and chairing regular meetings of the Gender Thematic Group (GTG) is considered pivotal in keeping gender on the agenda of the government of Georgia. Along with UNDP and UNFPA, UN Women has successfully advocated for a commitment of the government elected in 2012 to create a structure under the Prime Minister that would have responsibility for gender equality issues. As discussed above, this has not played out as initially anticipated, with the appointed advisor having a wider than initially advocated for mandate, including human rights along with gender equality rather than having a dedicated gender equality function; the appointee is also chairing the Inter-Agency Council on Domestic Violence.

Progress has been made on Output 2.1. Following intense advocacy work by UN Women, the Government of Georgia has signed the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention) and has committed to its ratification within the 2013 – 2015 National Action Plan (NAP) on Domestic Violence. In 2014, a package of legislative changes aimed at harmonising domestic legislation with the requirements of the Istanbul Convention has been adopted by parliament, through substantial advocacy as well as technical/drafting support by UNJP/UN Women, with further amendments being worked on at the moment.

UN Women supports a number of key institutions in the anti-domestic violence architecture in Georgia, including the Inter-Agency Council Implementing Measures to Eradicate Domestic Violence (Domestic Violence Council) overseen by the government of Georgia, and which, due to changes as a result of the 2013 elections, had not been operational for a period of around 6 months, and which has been re-established with support from UNJP. The sub-

component has supported the Council in organising and leading the development of the 2013-2015 NAP on Domestic Violence in an inclusive and participatory process. This DV NAP is part of the 2013-2020 Human Rights Strategy of the government of Georgia. UN Women worked on revising the procedures of identification of victims of domestic violence - a precondition for being admitted to one of the currently 4 operational state-run shelters.⁵ At the time of the evaluation, various stakeholders confirmed that the process was not working at present, resulting in potentially a substantial number of victims of domestic violence not having access to the shelters.

A number of important policy recommendations have been developed as part of the sub-component, although they have not yet been adopted (nor were they expected to be adopted within the current UNJP). This includes guidelines for social workers to recognise instances of domestic violence, and a policy concept for the socio-economic rehabilitation of victims of domestic violence.

In a new development, the government of Georgia has commenced the process of developing a National Strategy against Violence, which would also cover domestic violence. The conflation of the issue of domestic violence with other forms of violence in one policy document is problematic, and UN Women and UNFPA are acutely aware that there is a need for continued advocacy to ring-fence domestic violence as an issue deserving separate attention and institutional structures.

Overall, as is the case with Outcome area 1 led by UNDP, the support provided by the programme through UN Women is substantial. It consists of considerable input into the technical aspects of the work of the Domestic Violence Council, as well as providing hands-on day-to-day organisational/administrative support. For example, a dedicated Working Group was set up under the umbrella of the Domestic Violence Council to elaborate the package of legislative amendments to bring Georgian legislation in line with the standards of the Istanbul Convention (see above). Similar to the relationship between the GEC and UNDP, UN Women can be said to be the one structure in Georgia preserving the institutional memory of the temporarily dysfunctional Domestic Violence Council in Georgia. A wide range of stakeholders stated that without UN Women, the Domestic Violence Council would not have the capacity

⁵ The procedure is also important as it is a precondition for the issuance of a restrictive or protective order or being acknowledge as a victim in a criminal case under the domestic violence crime articles of the Criminal Code of Georgia.

(human and technical) to move legislative and policy changes forward independently. Stakeholders also stated that there is a lack of capacity among responsible institutions to comply with the reporting requirements under the various international commitments (e.g. the CEDAW reports) entered by Georgia. The concern of the evaluators overall is that without the contribution through the UNJP, the issues above might not be worked on by the government or the existing institutions/structures.

Output 2.2 has delivered a number of results. UN Women works closely with the State Fund for the Protection and Assistance to the Victims of Human Trafficking and Domestic Violence under the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Assistance. Domestic violence as one of the areas of responsibility of the State Fund was formally added in 2009 as a result of advocacy from UN Women, while in 2013, its mandate was extended to include responsibility for victims/survivors of sexual violence outside the family, including sexual violence during armed conflict. Over the period of the UNJP, UN Women has financed the procurement and repair of two buildings (one more than planned as a result of leftover funds); the programme has also funded part of the personnel and running costs of one of the shelters. Arguably the most significant result from this output area is the **transition of these two shelters into state funding**, from 2015 onwards.

As mentioned above, in the framework of the programme, UN Women established and ran a model crisis centre, and developed operating principles and procedures for such centres through one of its NGO partners in the programme. The model centre in Tbilisi—which during its lifetime accommodated 71 victims of domestic violence and provided other services to 208 additional victims—was fully funded through UNJP and closed in December 2014, as programme funding ran out and as the government was not able to provide support from its own budgetary resources. The need for these crises centres appears to be understood in principle by those institutions working in the anti-domestic violence system in Georgia: the centres would serve as a point of first call for affected women, offering the possibility for emergency accommodation, but also a set of crucially important services including psychological and legal aid for victims. However, there is no indication at the time of the evaluation that funding on a significant scale for these crises centres will be provided in the near future. It is the understanding of the evaluators that most of the specific help to victims of domestic violence is done by domestic NGOs specialised in this area, and which act as auxiliary service providers to the state structures—a model used in numerous countries. However, the extent to which these NGOs are funded by international donors (including through the UNJP) and not by the state gives cause for concern.

UN Women/UNJP is working closely with the Public Defender's Office (PDO), as a result of which the PDO has adopted a 2014-2016 Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and Action Plan, as well as a methodology to monitor the work of the state-run shelters for victims of domestic violence, and a methodology to ensure that the PDO can track and monitor the enforcement of restrictive and protective orders for victims of domestic violence. As a result of advocacy

from UN Women, the PDO has, as the first and so far only state institution, established a dedicated gender equality department. The evaluators understand that UNJP/UN Women funds one staff position in the PDO, and this works in a secondment set up, i.e., while the person physically works in the PDO, she formally reports to UN Women. Stakeholders interviewed in the framework of this exercise have confirmed that the capacity of the PDO to deal with gender issues has increased over the course of the UNJP implementation, and this increase is in part attributed to the UNJP.

The evaluators find that the sub-components work with multipliers is well thought through and has the potential to be effective, i.e. to reach out to a considerable number of representatives of those structures that deal with domestic violence issues. For example, the programme has worked with the Georgian Bar Association's legal training centre on the development of a training module on domestic violence, and which has become part of the compulsory training curriculum for members of the Bar. Other examples include work with the Police Academy; with the Law Faculty and the professional development unit of the Chief Prosecutor and the High School of Judges. In each case, the approach taken is to institutionalise training on domestic violence into curricula of these structures. The evaluators have had scattered evidence of the training being applied systematically across those structures. A considerable amount of training has been delivered through the police academy, with a reported 1176 (of approximately 2555) police officers trained and were, due to the absence of on-the-job training, the development of training manuals and the delivery of part of the training was delivered through one of UN Women's partners, the Anti-Violence Network of Georgia (AVNG). The evaluators understand that given that the work with the police academy has been going on for a substantial period of time, UN Women considers that the Police Academy should now be in a position to carry on this work without support from the programme.

This output area includes a component dealing with the integration of victims of domestic violence that are being accommodated in shelters into the workspace, and UN Women report that during its lifetime, 178 survivors of domestic violence found employment, of which 60% continue to be employed. The evaluators have not been able to form a conclusive assessment, specifically when it comes to the implementation aspect of this component. While the need for integration and facilitation of survivors' of domestic violence economic independence is undisputed, the evaluators were concerned that the activities were not necessarily structured and systematic. The current way of working—which the evaluators found somewhat ad hoc and taking a case-by-case approach—might actually be the only possible way, however.

Output area 2.3 is concerned with raising awareness to support to the prevention of instances of domestic violence. Both activity areas—public awareness campaigns as well as the establishment of data collection methods that capture instances of domestic violence—under this output have had considerable success. The Office of the Chief Prosecutor of Georgia has been systematically collecting data on the respective articles (11 and 126) of the Criminal Code of Georgia, and this data is publicly available. Data is now also being systematically collected in

the number of restrictive and protective orders for victims of domestic violence, as well as data on initiated criminal investigations, prosecutions, and convictions. The availability of this data is a success in its own right, and will pave the way for monitoring developments in the area of domestic violence in the future. At the time of the evaluation, none of the stakeholders interviewed was able to give a confident estimate of the number of emergency centres or shelters needed countrywide, or other important parameters, such as where these shelters should be located. The availability of data, collected regularly and over longer periods of time has the potential to change the understanding about the needs for structures to assist victims/survivors of domestic violence.

UN Women has done considerable work on raising public awareness about domestic violence in what has to be one of the most recognisable public campaigns in Georgia. The partnership between UN Women and the Georgian National Rugby Association precedes the UNJP, with its origins coming from the UN Secretary General's "UNiTE to end violence against Women" campaign. UN Women continued its partnership during the UNJP with billboards promoting the hotline for victims of domestic violence, numerous TV shows and media coverage between 2012 and 2014. UN Women has involved members of the National Rugby team not only to be the public face of the billboard campaigns, but also used them to reach out to boys and young men in the rural locations of Georgia, thereby acknowledging the need to be working with men on the prevention of domestic violence. An unintended positive result of this engagement with boys and young men was that the Rugby Union has started to open rugby schools in some of the locations that were part of the activities – filling what is often a considerable vacuum of things to do for young people in these locations. The campaign has also developed some traction among other sports celebrities in Georgia, and there is a surge in interest to be involved in this campaign. Recently, the Georgian martial arts world champion has joined the campaign, and since November 2014, the Georgian Football Union is part of it. As a direct result of the campaign promoting the domestic violence hotline, there has been a documented surge (an almost fourfold increase from 2012 to 2013) in the number of callers contacting the hotline. Under this output area, UN Women reports the results of a 2013 survey and from which changes in the perceptions and awareness of violence against women and girls and domestic violence in Tbilisi, Kakheti, and Samegrelo regions can be inferred compared to 2009,⁶ and which shows clear changes in attitudes towards domestic violence as a family matter (while in 2009, 78.3% of respondents believed that domestic violence was a

⁶ UN Women has pointed out that these were not repeat surveys, but that nevertheless, changes in attitude can be extrapolated by comparing both surveys.

family issue, this number had changed to 25% in 2013) the same survey showed that only 17% of respondents in 2013 believed that domestic violence was acceptable, down from 34.9% in 2009.

Overall, this outcome area has seen a considerable number of results. An overarching issue is the relative emphasis, within this sub-component on working at the central level as opposed to working at the local levels, and in particular in rural locations, where the local structures are largely ill-equipped to respond to instances of domestic violence. It would seem that this deserves specific attention in a future phase of the programme, but UN Women would have to be very strategic about the design of such work, given that resources are likely to be limited and that they will not be able to cover the whole of Georgia.

UNFPA Outcome 3: Gender Equality advanced by creating an enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of the population
Output 3.1 Enhanced capacity of policy makers to integrate Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH&R) into the Population policies and national development frameworks with particular focus on Youth
Output 3.2 Strengthened SRH&R strategies and services to address health system response to DV
Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment

This Outcome area has received USD 0.7 Million, making it the smallest of the three components.

The **main result** of Output 3.1 has been the development, by the Ministry of Youth and Sports, of the **National Youth Policy and a six-year (2014-2020) Action Plan** to implement this policy. The policy was adopted in 2014, and is fully gender mainstreamed. As with other UNJP areas of support to policy making processes, the programme’s input into the process has been significant both in terms of the logistical support as well as on technical/substantive questions. A study tour to Scotland was organised in 2013 which aimed at familiarising policy drafters with one possible approach to designing and implementing gender-sensitive youth policies. UNFPA reports that under this activity, input from young people into the drafting process was actively solicited through a website (and which is now discontinued) created for that purpose, as well as two large-scale youth conferences to review the draft Youth Policy and to generate recommendations.

UNJP/UNFPA has sought ways of identifying and engaging in public debates of young activists and organisations, and has worked with the European Youth Parliament (EYP) Section of Georgia in order to raise awareness among young people of sexual and reproductive health and rights. Stakeholders reported the event to being very useful, not least as a possibility to create lasting networks of local youth groups, as well as because of the considerable number of young people that were reached as a result of the activities. The EYP has expressed interest to become involved in future UNFPA-led activities. The evaluators had some evidence during the data collection phase about the South Caucasus and Turkey Youth Forum (a regional platform existing since 2007 to create a momentum, at regional level, for policies including gender-sensitive youth policies and youth SRH&R issues) that this was useful for participants to share experience on SRH&H as well as participation in policy developments. Even though the activities around the South Caucasus and Turkey Youth Forum have been part of the programme document, for the evaluators a question remains with regards to why this activity should be financed from what is an already stretched budget, given that neither Azerbaijan nor Armenia are priority countries for Swedish development cooperation.

Another key result under this output area has been the development, in cooperation with the World Bank, of original, ground-breaking research called “Gender-biased sex selection in Georgia-Context, Evidence, and Implications”. While there has been an acknowledgement of sex-selective births as a problem for some time in the country, there had not been any evidence-based research to fully capture the scale of the problem, on the basis of which policy recommendations could be elaborated.

At the time of the evaluation, under Output 3.2 the project had delivered a policy document on Recommendations on Revealing, Referring, and Documenting the Cases of Physical, Sexual and Psychological Violence against Women and Children – a response to an identified gap inside the existing National Referral Mechanism on Domestic Violence. Although the Recommendations have undergone various stages of consultations with the responsible Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs of Georgia, as well as with the Inter-Agency Council on Domestic Violence, they have not, yet, been adopted. UNJP/UNFPA continues to work with the responsible structures towards an official approval of the document.

Under Output 3.3, UNFPA partnered through the “My Rights“ initiative with a local NGO to pilot a series of training sessions for 15-17 year olds in Tbilisi and in Kakheti/Eastern Georgia. The training covered issues such as gender-based and domestic violence; gender equality; and sexual and reproductive health and rights. At the moment, education exists, for 9th to 11th graders on issues including HIV/AIDS and STI’s (other topics are drugs and alcohol and early pregnancy); however, it is not mandatory and does not include the topics dealt with in the trainings. The rationale behind the initiative was to successfully prove the need and demand in pilot locations for mandatory curricula and that would include gender-based and domestic violence; gender equality and SRHR. UNJP/UNFPA worked, through the Ministry of Education and Science, with a number of schools at school principal level, and introduced them to

specifically designed brochures and a curriculum. The response UNJP/UNFPA had to the “My Rights“ pilot initiative demonstrates both the pressing need and the challenges associated with introducing sexual and reproductive health and rights as a legitimate and needed subject of discussion. The evaluators heard from various stakeholders that there were physical protests by school principals and teachers in some schools to the brochures/training material, and that in one instance, the material was publicly burned by a school head; this illustrates the considerable challenges UNFPA is facing on this issue. Nonetheless, the reaction to trainings was overall positive, with UNFPA receiving requests for repeat trainings in other locations. As an unintended, positive result, UNFPA has been able to generate interest and political will, at the level of the Ministry of Education and Science, to introduce sexual and reproductive health and rights education into the mandatory school curriculum, and UNFPA is going to continue to work on this with the Ministry in the next phase of the programme. Embedding SRH&R into a curriculum embracing wider issues is seen by UNFPA to be the more effective way of bringing changes about than to approach the Ministry with a demand for explicit SRH&R education in schools, give the widespread taboo surrounding this issue. At the time of the evaluation, a curriculum had been drafted by the Ministry of Education in close collaboration with UNFPA, to be introduced in 2016, and which includes topics such as healthy lifestyle; gender issues; reproductive health issues; infectious diseases, and which will become mandatory. This is a completely new development in Georgia, and a considerable achievement of the programme.

As another unintended, positive result, UNJP/UNFPA has also managed to start a process, with the Ministry of Education on a formal review of all accredited textbooks of Georgia for gender stereotyping, and a Working Group for this has been set up.

The evaluators gathered data from participants of small grants schemes in Kakheti regions that were organised to promote sexual and reproductive health and rights and gender equality principles at the grassroots level. The design of the grants scheme was considered to be very useful, as it involved public awareness work, peer education, and various advocacy initiatives. UNFPA has, under this output, also supported a number of other activities, including youth festivals and peer education. The rationale behind these activities is twofold, i.e. facilitating youth empowerment on the one hand, and multiplying information on the other hand. An overall concern is how to ensure that awareness raising on SRH&R turns into the realisation of these rights by individuals, and this would seem to be an area that deserves closer attention in a future programme.

Similar questions about the strategic nature of the activities arise with regards to UNFPA’s work on training journalists. While journalists have been rightly identified as one of the key vectors for how the public debate is shaped in particular in the way gender issues, including domestic violence, are being covered, the question is how much impact can be expected from individual training sessions involving limited numbers of media representatives. As mentioned elsewhere in the report, the three agencies are now combining efforts to approach train-

ing jointly, and through institutionalising contents in the media training institutions' core curricula.

Under this output area, UNJP/UNFPA has produced another set of original data that is part of the sub-component's more comprehensive engagement with men and boys to support SRH&R and to combat gender-based violence. Namely, a 2013 survey on Men and Gender Relations was the first of its kind in the country, and provides original baseline data on the role of men. The rationale for commissioning the survey was to obtain data that could feed into UNFPA's advocacy and policy-making work, as well as in general to raise public awareness based on research findings. UNFPA has also supported Men-Talking-to-Men training sessions,⁷ and has been trying to roll this out by training-of-trainers. This has been an overall important initiative, and demand exists for a continuation, for example the Ministry of Defence has expressed interest in this type of training. Key issues identified by stakeholders—and reflected in current UNFPA thinking—relate to the scale of the initial pilot activity; stakeholders convincingly argued that this activity should be more substantial in terms of resources, including time, to produce sustainable results.

UNJP/UNFPA has tried to work strategically through cooperation with radio stations, such as Tbilisi-based Radio GIPA (26 radio programmes were produced with support through UNJP, aired twice, and made available as podcasts on GIPA's website); Kakheti regional radio "Hereti" (39 radio programmes, aired 117 times) and the Georgian Patriarchy's Radio Station "Iveria". According to stakeholders, both the "Hereti" and the radio GIPA awareness campaign have been very popular with audiences. More importantly, the GIPA campaign has also had an unintended positive result, in that journalists involved in the campaign took it further and developed their own campaign under the title of "Daddy, Read Me a Book". This campaign, which has received considerable public interest, attempts to create affirmative messages around the role of men in raising children, and thereby trying to contribute to shift perceptions of traditional role distributions in families. The campaign has successfully continued beyond the initial UNFPA support/involvement, for example through debates in various TV shows.

Similar to its approach in connection with the "My Rights" project, UNFPA chooses to embed important messages inside wider debates considered less controversial around family relations

⁷ This is another area where UN Women and UNFPA have worked together, as sportsmen participating in UN Women's domestic violence awareness campaign were trained as part of the Men-talking-to-Men trainings.

etc. The evaluators acknowledge the validity of this approach and find that UNFPA is arguing it convincingly.

There are risks, however, regarding the coherence of the UNJP as a programme that explicitly aims to advance gender equality in Georgia—an agenda that many would agree is not shared by the Georgian Orthodox Church, and were the programme might support and maintain patriarchal norms. The evaluators have found a number of the radio programmes to convey messages that would seem directly opposed to promoting gender equality, and which is a problem. This is an issue that deserves some debate among the agencies in a next phase of the programme, i.e., is the partnering with the most conservative institution in Georgia possibly compromising the reputation of the UN's programme with an explicit emphasis on advancing gender equality. Should the cooperation with the Patriarchy continue, then there also needs to be a much stricter monitoring of the results of this engagement to accurately compare credibility and inclusiveness costs and benefits. At present, there is, for example, no information available on how many people were reached through the broadcasts by radio "Iveria".

2.3 EFFICIENCY

The ToR requested the evaluation to assess whether the UNJP had led to "improved efficiency in the management of resources and what has been the relationship between increased/decreased efficiency and UNJP's results". The evaluators highlighted in the Inception Report that this assessment could not be provided in the framework of the assignment, given the lack of comparative data that would allow for a sound assessment. The evaluation has noted anecdotal evidence from UN staff, however, that the joint programming framework has added an additional layer of bureaucracy, and that it could therefore be seen to have resulted in a loss of efficiency and flexibility, and which was not outweighed by very limited perceived advantages from the joint approach.

Time constraints have not allowed for an in-depth, detailed look into efficiency aspects, all the more that this is a challenging undertaking for anybody from outside not only the UN system, but also the individual agencies to fully appraise and assess the respective budgets. The evaluators would, however, like make the point that the budgets were made available to them for this exercise.

However, there are a few general observations in answer to the evaluation questions agreed in the inception phase, as follows:

The budget has overrun significantly with regards to UNDP's awareness raising campaigns. The evaluators consider the UNDP campaign as having been effective. However, overall lessons learned need to be drawn from the current programme in terms of the costs that such campaigns carry if they are expected to be of high quality and with an innovative value. The costs of UN Women's engagement with the Georgian Rugby Union appear to be minimal, covering mainly the expenses of sportsmen involved, and, to a small extent, the loss of advertisement space during matches when these are used to promote anti-domestic violence messages. From the evaluators' point of view, this appears to be very good value-for-money.

Expenditures have overrun elsewhere, too, for example on study tours. There are also several examples where activities have been under-budgeted (UNFPA Output areas 3.2 and 3.3), and where this would suggest that there is scope for improvement in budget planning.

A general concern across the three components—and echoing previous sections of the report—is the degree of involvement of the UNJP in supporting their partner institutions. In many instances, the support goes beyond technical assistance and includes a considerable amount of administrative support and even direct engagement in mundane office management. The evaluators judge that this cannot be considered to be efficient use of funds. This is an issue that needs to be addressed urgently in a next phase of the programme.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

As has been touched upon in previous sections, sustainability emerges clearly as the key challenge for the programme.

Across the UNJP, turnover of personnel is a key concern in terms of continuity of work of the institutions, as well as continuity of the results of the UNJP. Both the GEC (and the parliament as a whole) and the new Human Rights and Gender Equality Advisor of the Prime Minister have seen changes during the lifetime of the UNJP, including as the result of the 2012 elections, creating challenges not merely to rebuild relations with the new appointees, but also to re-start with capacity-building work with the new counterparts. It would appear that the UNDP sub-component of the UNJP is, at the moment, the institutional memory of the GEC (a situation witnessed also in other parts of the UNJP), and UN Women faced a similar situation with respect to the Domestic Violence Council which had been non-operational for a considerable period of time following the 2012 elections.

Arguably, the legal and, to some extent the institutional framework, will likely be lasting results from the programme, though from today's perspective, implementation might be less vigorous in the absence of funding than it is now.

The evaluators identify the challenge of ensuring domestic ownership of the debates that have been successfully instigated by all three components of the UNJP. At present, it would seem that the public awareness campaigns have been, and are seen to have been, driven by the UN in Georgia. A key task ahead is to ensure that the discussion will be carried forward by domestic stakeholders, and to identify who these stakeholders are. UNJP currently works with a

dense network of highly competent local organisations. The question is, though, to what extent these organisations are also vectors of changes, i.e. to what extent they are able to carry forward the debate on domestic violence in society, and to become part of a genuinely Georgian movement for change.

A further key concern with regards to sustainability is the extent to which all parts of the anti-domestic violence system depend on funding provided through the UNJP (as well as from other international donors). Service provision clearly is not happening without international funding, which is an area of urgent concern. With regards to ensuring sustainability of the awareness raising on SRH&H carried out as part of the UNFPA sub-component, it would be important to actually collect data that demonstrate a change between raised awareness and an increased level of realisation of rights. At this point, the evaluators lack a baseline against which to assess the sustainability of this output area.

For the UNDP component, a major challenge is the transfer of the results into local ownership, including budgetary allocations from the Georgian institutions. A key adjustment that need to be reflected in the design of a second phase of the programme is how to ensure pilots of scale, and whether in particular for the economic empowerment of women, a greater focus of the programme should not be directed to advocacy work on normative concerns for policy reforms at the central level – any similar programme, even with a considerably bigger budget will struggle to generate sustainable results in the economic environment of Georgia.

UNDP/UNJP should direct its advocacy work towards having gender considerations included into key economic development policies in Georgia—at present, there are two agricultural development programmes that would be of relevance to women in rural areas, and there is a national enterprise support programme—none of which has specific gender provisions. At the grassroots level, UNDP/UNJP could, through its network of local contacts, increase awareness of these opportunities, as well as creating demand.

In sum, the evaluators consider that where legislation and policies have been adopted, and government structures been set up, there is a considerable prospect of those being part of future outcomes beyond the duration of the programme. However, implementation of the policies, application of the laws, as well as meaningful work of the institutions will, in the medium to long-term, need to be funded by the state budget. At present, the UNJP resources make up for the lack of government funding in practically all areas the programme works with. This does not suggest that funding should be rapidly withdrawn, so as to pressure the state budget to step in, as it seems likely that most of the work currently underway would then collapse.

Provisions to ensure sustainability of policies and legislation and their implementation, as well as the work of institutionalisation and the provision of services must be the key focus of the next phase of the UNJP. This would seem to require the setting of precise timelines, including for a staggered increase in the Georgian contribution to the functioning of the gender equality infrastructure in the country.

3. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

Conclusions

The following conclusions, in a very early form, were discussed during a feedback workshop with UNJP staff in the immediate aftermath of the in-country data collection at the end of January 2015.

The evaluation has identified a considerable number of results the UNJP has achieved since its start in early 2012, across all the three sub-components. This range from the improvement of the legal and institutional framework to address gender equality; mainstreaming of gender into key national policies; raising public awareness on gender stereotypes; domestic violence; and sexual and reproductive health and rights; to piloting potential models for the provision of services to victims/survivors of domestic violence, as well as work on the introduction of SRH&R education in the mandatory curriculum in schools.

The holistic approach to gender equality taken by the programme is sound —looking at political and economic rights and sexual and reproductive rights. If women are able to decide when to have children (SRHR), i.e. when they realise their reproductive rights, this is a precondition to be in a position to realise other rights, including economic and political rights. Also, if at the normative level, women are not in a position to realise property rights (ownership and inheritance), they are also not able to invest, meaning that they are unable to make other important decisions for themselves.

There is uncertainty regarding a number of outcomes, which is a result of uncertain domestic ownership of parts of the gender equality agenda, this is reflected in the lack of funding from the state budget for the implementation of policies and the funding of institutional mechanisms as well as key services for victims/survivors of domestic violence. Uncertainty also surrounds the outcomes of the pilot activities on community mobilisation, economic empowerment, and activities that presume a linear link between raising awareness and the actual realisation of rights as a result of awareness raising.

There are serious concerns with regards to sustainability of some of the key institutions that the UNJP is working with, which are a result of what would appear is too direct a support to day-to-day management of these institutions.

An overall added value of the joint approach exists in particular where it combines joint advocacy work, and where the potential offered through joint activities is tapped into.

Lessons Learned

The experience of implementation of the UNJP offers the opportunity to draw a few broader lessons learned that should inform future programme design. The evaluators identify the following:

Joint programming has provided benefits, as reported by the three participating agencies; particularly in regards to early identification of joint advocacy efforts.

The UNJP experience indicates that it is essential to critically assess pilot projects or initiatives in regards to the real influence they might have and the validity of some of the key assumptions, such as that community mobilisation will lead to widespread political participation. Presumed synergies between pilots and programmes directed at central level normative changes have to be continuously questioned, in particular in terms of hard questions that pilots will either be scaled up or inform broader policy areas.

An important lesson from the programme is that support for women's economic empowerment has to be selective and strategic, framed within a broader assessment of markets for products and labour and the macro-level barriers to this empowerment.

Experience indicates that there has to be a reflection process on what the parameters are to generate sustainable public engagement around the gender equality issues pursued by the UNJP, building on the success stories of public awareness campaigns, and bearing in mind that the debate on gender equality in all its facets needs to transition into domestic, Georgian ownership.

A key insight from the programme is also the importance of the link between awareness/access to information and the realisation of one's rights being demonstrated, as well as an appraisal of whether and under what circumstances greater awareness indeed leads to a greater level of realisation of rights, and how this can be captured and demonstrated.

The UNJP experience also shows the efficacy of embedding more difficult messages inside less controversial ones. At programme level, and in the context of Georgia, it might be easier to talk about political and economic rights than to talk overtly about SRH&R, while messages about the latter can be embedded within wider messages that are not perceived as controversial. However, the experience also highlights the potential limits that may be imposed when embedding messages in the work of strategic partners that do not share broad commitments to gender equality (e.g., the Patriarchy).

Finally, a critical piece of learning is that it is important to, from the start, focus attention on how to generate financial commitments for reform agendas at the national level if sustainability is to be fostered. A fundamental consensus has to be present regarding the division of responsibilities between the international community on the one hand, and the state.

Recommendations to the UNJP participating agencies:

The following recommendations were, in a very early form, discussed during a feedback workshop with UNJP staff in the immediate aftermath of the in-country data collection at the end of January 2015.

1. A future UNJP should be more explicit on the theory of change bringing the components together, and the potential of the joint approach needs to be spelled out clearer; all staff needs to buy into the joint approach. As part of building domestic ownership and the capacity of the national institutions participating in the Steering Committee, the next UNJP needs to involve the Georgian counterparts actively into the programme design phase, including in the formulation of the theory of change underpinning the programme.
2. There needs to be a clearer strategic approach on how to involve ethnic and religious minorities in a future UNJP and how to account for their involvement beyond a formal commitment in the Programme Document.
3. A future UNJP should make clear its position on “gender”, and be clear on how it focuses explicitly on certain target groups, while pursuing the work with other groups in a more implicit manner, for example the work with the LGBT community.
4. The “pilot approach” to outputs and activities within outputs needs to be more clearly thought through. Guiding parameters have to be whether and how pilots created could eventually be scaled-up, are likely to generate sufficient ownership to serve as examples for replication country-wide, and could inform policy-makers. Local pilots should only be undertaken if they create genuine replicable models for employment country-wide, or are linked to clear pathways to inform and advocate for normative changes (access to credit and specific state-run employment creation or economic development programmes; reform of legislation affecting women’s property rights).
5. A future project should consider consolidation of activities as opposed to the currently considered extension to other regions of Georgia. This concerns in particular the economic empowerment activities within the UNDP sub-component of the UNJP. The UN should explore where they can best add value, which might be *normative* concerns such as property rights issues that affect women, or advocacy for gender mainstreaming in existing national programmes for economic development, including such programmes that provide access to credit for women. Existing networks should be used to spread awareness about and to create demand for the opportunities available. The economic empowerment activities need to be examined critically to avoid gender stereotyping.
6. All sub-components must work towards diminishing the dependence of their partners, including the NGOs providing services, on UNJP resources. UN Women in particular is aware that it needs to continue its advocacy work to ensure that UNJP resources do not continue to fund services that should be financed from the state budget.
7. With limited resources available, all parts of the UNJP should be strategic, and the need to fund individual events and one-off activities should be re-appraised in a future phase of the programme.

8. UNJP should review its partnerships and open up to new domestic actors in Georgia who could carry the gender equality debate forward independently of the UN.
9. Given that the groundwork has been laid with regards to data collection on instances of domestic violence, the UNJP should build the authorities' capacities to use this data to inform the design of domestic responses and policies.
10. Consider making aspects of the UNJP more efficient, for example through the introduction of a joint monitoring and evaluation function, which should be included in the funding proposal for the next phase of the programme. Monitoring and evaluation should involve the collection of evidence on key programme assumptions, such as that greater awareness indeed leads to increased realisation of the individual's rights.
11. The UNJP should consider a more integrated approach to reporting, and which would consolidate reflection (and learning) on the achievements at programme level, as opposed to the current reporting at sub-component level.

Recommendations to the Embassy of Sweden in Georgia

1. Consider supporting a second phase of the UNJP for the whole period of the cooperation strategy until 2020; this second phase must have a clear outlook on how to ensure sustainability of results by the end of the programme.
2. An expansion to include more UN agencies is not recommended.

Annex 1 – Inception Report (incl. evaluation framework and document list)

*The Inception Report includes the **evaluation framework and document listing** as annexes at the end of the report.*

Executive Summary

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) together with UN Women and UNFPA commissioned Indevelop AB in December 2014 to conduct an evaluation of the “UN Joint Programme (UNJP) to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia” which is implemented by three UN agencies – UNDP, UN Women, and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and funded, with about USD 5 Million over the period of initially 36 months by the Swedish government. The project has subsequently been extended to last for a total of 40 months, and is coming to a close in the first quarter of 2015.

This end-of-programme external evaluation is primarily to serve **learning purposes** – the three agencies are planning to submit a joint funding application to the Swedish government for a second phase of the programme, from spring 2015 onwards. The Swedish government has suggested that this application be preceded and informed by an in-depth assessment of the ongoing programme; however, the evaluators understand that the funding decision does not depend on the outcome of the evaluation, and that the next phase of financing has been agreed on in principle.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation set the overall objective of the evaluation to assess the progress made towards the achievement of the goal and outcomes of the UNJP. Specifically, the ToR provide a number of preliminary evaluation questions focussing on the assessment of the UNJP’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. In addition to these OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, the ToR include a specific requirement for the evaluation to assess coordination aspects – a reflection of the programme being the first large scale *joint* effort of several UN agencies to work together on gender equality in Georgia.

A short informal Skype discussion was held between the Team Leader and the UNJP managers at the start of the inception phase. The report has been primarily drafted based on a desk review of documents made available to the evaluators by the UN, i.e., no formal interviews have been conducted during this stage of the evaluation. The purpose of this Inception Report is to ensure that the two prime stakeholders of the evaluation—the three agencies implementing the UNJP on the one hand, and the Indevelop evaluation team on the other hand—are in agreement with the interpretation and operationalisation of the evaluation (based on the ToR). The report highlights challenges and data gaps at the end of the inception phase, and is a tool to clarify expectations between the evaluators and the users of the evaluation.

The Inception Report first provides the context and background to the evaluated programme, and goes on to define the scope of the evaluation and then assesses the evaluability of the evaluation questions suggested in the ToR, and based on the initial implementation proposal submitted by Indevelop AB in the tender for this assignment. Finally, the report elaborates on evaluation approach and methodology.

Assessment of the scope of the evaluation

THE UNJP'S CONTEXT

In 1994, the Georgian Parliament ratified the UN Convention on the “Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women” (CEDAW). The 2010 Law of Georgia on Gender Equality” determines the main directions and guarantees for the provision of equal rights, freedoms and opportunities for men and women provided by the Georgian Constitution”. It also defines “legal mechanisms and conditions for their implementation” and its purpose is to “ensure inadmissibility of discrimination in all spheres of public life, creation of proper conditions for the enjoyment of equal rights, freedoms and opportunities by men and women, support eradication and mitigation of all forms of gender discrimination”. Even though the scope of the law only includes public life, it does, at the same time define “gender equality” as a concept referring to “all spheres of personal and public life”.

The 2010 Law on Gender Equality addresses direct discrimination (treating a person less favourably on the basis of sex, based on a normative act, programme or other public policy) and indirect discrimination (a normative act, programme or other public policy which is not directly discriminating but the implementation of which would have discriminatory outcomes), and points out guarantees for ensuring gender equality. Among these are individual rights; access to education; equal rights of spouses and in relation to children; combating violence in family and society; freedom of choice of and right to hold professional positions; equal opportunities for the protection of health; and access to information. The Law also states that relevant official statistics shall contain gender disaggregated data and the right to equal participation in elections and representative bodies. Different responsibilities for ensuring gender equality are placed on the Parliament of Georgia and in particular through the creation of the Gender Equality Council (GEC); on local self-government bodies and on the Public Defender of Georgia (PDO).

Chapter 3 of the Law covers the establishment of institutional mechanisms for the supervision over the enforcement of the Gender Equality Law. According to the Law, the Georgian Parliament and the Gender Equality Council (established by the parliament) represent the key entities ensuring compliance with the provisions of the Gender Equality Law. The Gender Equality Council is the key agency authorised to “ensure coordination and monitoring of implementation of the Action Plan for Gender Equality; perform analysis of the legislation and draft proposals for overcoming gender inequalities existing in the legislation; elaborate and

plan activities to achieve gender equality; ensure enforcement of equal rights of women and men, elaborate and implement the monitoring and evaluation system of activities targeted at ensuring gender equality (Article 12).”

According to the Article 14 of the Georgian Law on Gender Equality, the Public Defender of Georgia is authorised to monitor enforcement of the Law, and to take relevant measures when violations occur.

In 2013, a new position of Human Rights and Gender Equality Advisor of the Prime Minister was created⁸ in the executive branch of the Government, as part of a broader inter-agency coordination effort at the Executive level on gender equality and women's empowerment.⁹

The Law of Georgia on Gender Equality was followed by the “2011-2013 National Action Plan (NAP) for the Implementation of Gender Equality” (Resolution of the Parliament Georgia on Approving the “2011-2013 Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality”). The NAP has specific goals, targets, activities, indicators, time frames and funding sources. It covers enhancing gender equality institutions and procedures, education and increasing public awareness, economics, statistics, women’s political participation, security and peace building, and health and social protection.

The Parliament of Georgia adopted a new “2014-2016 National Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality”. The Plan has eight main directions, namely elaboration of the National Policy on Gender Equality and promotion of its implementation; education and awareness raising; securing gender equality in the economic field; health and social protection sphere; enhancing gender equality at local self-governance level; women and politics, gender equality in the field of environment protection; gender equality in law-enforcement and penitentiary spheres.

The Law of Georgia on the Elimination of Domestic Violence, Protection and Support of Victims of Domestic Violence was first adopted in 2006 and has thereafter been revised and complemented. The scope of the Law is to define “a set of actions which characterise domestic violence, legal and organisational grounds for detecting and eliminating domestic violence” and to guarantee “legal protection and support for victims of domestic violence”. The

⁸Statement by the First Deputy Minister of Education and Science of Georgia, at the 58th Commission on the Status of Women
<http://papersmart.unmeetings.org/media2/2261356/georgia.pdf>

⁹Examination of the combined 4th and 5th Periodic Reports of Georgia on implementation of the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women ; http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/GEO/INT_CEDAW_STA_GEO_17612_E.pdf

law aims to guarantee effective legislative mechanisms, including justice for victims and ensure collaboration between institutions, and to provide protection and rehabilitation for victims, and to support rehabilitation for abusers. It defines domestic violence as the “violation of constitutional rights and freedoms of one family member by another family member through neglect and/or physical, psychological, economic, sexual violence or coercion”.

The Law on Elimination of Domestic Violence prescribes mechanisms for the prevention of domestic violence, including analysis of “factors that cause” violence; implementation of legal measures; statistics; awareness raising campaigns; support for victims and abusers; and programmes in relevant institutions. It also identifies mechanisms for identification and elimination of domestic violence, i.e. criminal, civil and administrative law, and particularly points at protective and restraining orders as a temporary measure. The Law also defines specific measures for protecting minors from violence; peculiarities of proceedings on facts of domestic violence and rights; social and labour guarantees for victims of domestic violence, as well as rehabilitation measures for abusers. Stakeholders in different parts of the implementation of the Law are identified as the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs; the Ministry of Internal Affairs; the Ministry of Education and Science; the Prosecutor's Office and judicial bodies of Georgia.

The 2011 “Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Violence against Women and Domestic Violence” (Istanbul Convention), was signed by Georgia in 2014, but has not, yet, been ratified. On its website, in 2014 the Ministry of Internal Affairs stated that the fight against domestic violence is a top priority for the Georgian government, and the implementation of the law is guided by the National Action Plan.

Georgia also has a National Action Plan for the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 on women, peace and security, which was adopted in 2012 (Resolution of the Georgian Parliament. On approval of 2012-2015 National Action Plan for implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions ## 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 on “Women, Peace and Security” 2012). The National Action Plan is in line with Article 6.1.1 of the “2011-2013 Action Plan on Ensuring Gender Equality” and follows the three main themes of the UNSCR 1325: *participation* of women at decision-making level in conflict elimination, prevention and management processes; *prevention* defined as consideration of women's needs in conflict prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against women, especially sexual and gender based violence; and the *protection* of conflict affected women's human rights ensuring their physical, social, economic and political security. Under these themes the plan has, like the National Action Plan on Gender Equality, precise objectives; activities; implementing agencies; deadlines and source of funding; something which in international policy discussions and research is pointed out as a prerequisite for successful implementation of National Action Plans on the UNSCR 1325.

In May 2014, the Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination was adopted. The Law covers discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, sexual orientation and gender

identity and expression, along with race, citizenship, ethnic or social origin, religion etc. The Law states that all forms of discrimination should be prohibited in Georgia, and as in the Law on Gender Equality, this applies to direct as well as indirect discrimination. The responsibility for monitoring, reporting, receiving complaints and suspending proceedings is placed on the Public Defender of Georgia.

According to the Human Rights House in Tbilisi, the anti-discrimination bill was preceded by heated discussions and resistance, particularly from the Orthodox Church. The resistance concerned a demand from the Church and other groups to remove “sexual orientation” from the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination. The law was, however, eventually passed close to unanimously, 115 to one. Under Article 5, “Interpretation and Scope of the Law”, it states that no provision of the Law may be interpreted as contradicting “the Constitution of Georgia and the Constitutional Agreement between the State and the Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church of Georgia”.

In the latest annual report, the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia identifies domestic violence as a field in which the programme has contributed to improvement of national laws in line with international commitments. Based on the analysis of the Istanbul Convention, UNJP has further supported the “Inter-agency Council Implementing Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence” to, among other things, eradicate legislative gaps and reflect the principles of the Istanbul Convention in local legislation and policies. UNJP has also been advocating for the Georgian ratification of the Istanbul Convention (signed in 2014), in cooperation with the Gender Equality Council; the Domestic Violence Council; and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Among other measures, UNJP supported the Domestic Violence Council in developing the Domestic Violence National Action Plan for 2013-2015.

With regard to Georgia’s fulfilment of national gender policies and international obligations, the 2013¹⁰ CEDAW report calls for further action in relation to the Non-Discrimination Law, and for updated information about the mandate of the Gender Equality Council; its human and financial resources; and the establishment of gender focal points. It also calls for examples of temporary measures established by law to promote equality between women and men in areas where women are disadvantaged.

¹⁰List of issues and questions in relation to the combined fourth and fifth periodic reports of Georgia. CEDAW/C/GEO/Q/4-5, 28 October 2013
(http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2FGEO%2FQ%2F4-5&Lang=en) Accessed 10 Dec 2014.

Furthermore, the CEDAW report shows that although the Law on Gender Equality” states equal treatment in the evaluation of work quality, there is a 40% difference in salaries between women and men. In relation to the same Law, the report also notes a lack of information about measures taken to protect women from sexual harassment. A draft National Strategy for the Prevention of Violence is currently being debated.¹¹

Another important new national policy, and where UNJP has contributed to, is the April 2014 National Youth Policy of Georgia, into which gender equality and SRH&R have been integrated.

Perceptions and attitudes towards the concept of gender equality, as well as any gender-related issues, have to be taken into account. A 2013 study by the Analysis and Consulting Team (ACT) found that “traditional views on gender roles remain strong: a woman’s main function is to take care of and raise children and take care of the household – in other words household chores; while a man’s function is to support the family financially.”

The findings of the study also revealed that the financially independent woman is not well-accepted by the patriarchal society, and this happens in a setting where more than 30 percent of women are the main breadwinners of their families: “If finances allow, it is better for women to stay at home or take an easier job – ‘more appropriate work for a woman’ – if necessary.”

The authors conclude that results are similar to those of previous studies: “All of them suggest that Georgia is still a masculine, patriarchal country where men occupy a dominant position. Research reveals that men justify this dominant position more than women. Women know that they have a sub-ordinate role and that they have to make concessions; for instance, by tolerating domestic violence and infidelity.”¹²

¹¹<http://www.noodls.com/view/9ECF9C24E69BCC47764ABB4ED07A6F3CFBEE5DF9?2488xxx1416826711>. At the end of the inception phase, the evaluators had not seen this draft.

¹²ACT research report, 2013: Public Perceptions on Gender Equality and in Politics and Business, prepared within the UN Joint Project

THE EVALUATED PROGRAMME – BACKGROUND AND KEY PARAMETERS

The UNJP “directly supports the further realisation of the women’s rights and gender equality commitments undertaken by Georgia at international as well as national levels” (see “Context” section above). These commitments both form the basis for the programme, and are crucial for the long-term success of its aims to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment in Georgia.

The UNJP to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia is a joint effort by UNDP, UN Women, and UNFPA, and funded entirely by the Swedish government. Its overall goal is to “promote gender equality and women’s empowerment through strengthening capacities in the government, civil society and communities.”

The target population of the programme, as identified in the programme document is “Georgian society at large”, and in particular vulnerable groups including IDPs and conflict-affected ethnic and religious minorities and persons with disabilities; women who are heads of households and in the low-middle income groups, live in rural areas or are victims/survivors of domestic violence. The programme document also pledged to target “gender-related” concerns of LGBT groups.

1. Outcome 1 – UNDP: Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment (Outcome 1 - UNDP), with the following output areas:

Output 1.1: Improved policy and institutional framework for advancing gender equality agenda.

Output 1.2: Gender responsive policies applied by key national and local authorities.

Output 1.3: Local women empowered economically and politically through better opportunities for income generation and political participation.

2. Outcome 2 – UN Women: Creating an enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence (DV), with the following output areas:

Output 2.1: National laws and policies on domestic violence improved in line with international commitments (CEDAW, Beijing Platform for Action).

Output 2.2: Capacity of key policy and service delivery institutions strengthened to promote and protect women's human rights to life free from violence, especially from DV.

Output 2.3: Public awareness raised to support prevention and disclosure of the instances of GBV and DV.

3. Outcome 3 – UNFPA: Gender Equality advanced by creating an enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of the population, with the following output areas:

Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of policy makers to integrate Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH&R) into the Population policies and national development frameworks with particular focus on Youth.

Output 3.2: Strengthened SRH&R strategies and services to address health system response to DV.

Output 3.3: Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment.

The Joint Programme was linked to national priorities as outlined in the National Action Plan on Gender Equality (2011-2013), and pursued a human-rights based approach, working with duty bearers and rights holders, at the following levels:

1. Policy and decision-making level (advocacy on streamlining national legislation and policies related to gender equality; facilitation of a dialogue among stakeholders at national and grassroots levels)
2. National and local institutions (capacity-building at national and local government levels to use gender sensitive policies and actions)
3. Work with civil society and communities at grassroots level (capacity building and awareness raising on gender equality and women's empowerment).

A Programme Steering Committee (SC) was set up, co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and the Chair of the Parliamentary Council for Gender Equality; other members in the SC are the three participating UN agencies; the All-Party Millennium Development Group at the Parliament of Georgia (which has since been dissolved and thus, is no longer a member of the SC); and the Chair of the Inter-agency Council on Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence. The Swedish Embassy participates in the SC as an observer. The Steering Committee is expected to provide strategic guidance for a coherent and coordinated programme implementation, approves the programme's annual work plans and allocation of funds; reviews progress against set targets, and reviews and approves the periodic progress reports. The Joint Programme Steering Committee meets at least twice a year.

The UNJP started on 1 January 2012 and was initially to last until 31 December 2014; it has now been extended until 30 April 2015. The programme is funded with approximately USD 5 Million by the Swedish government. The UNJP is, according to its component managers, the first such joint effort on a substantial scale in the area of gender equality in Georgia – while there had been coordinated initiatives in the past they were minor by comparison. Although “Delivering as One” has been an approach favoured inside the UN system for some years, the UNJP is, at least in part, the result of the demand by the Swedish government, which has a long history of funding gender equality projects, including such implemented by the organisations from the UN system. The Swedish government wanted the agencies to act in a joint manner, instead of having three separate counterparts to deal with, and the three agencies competing for funding. UNJP programme managers state that this need for coordination and for putting forward a joint programme proposal initially represented a considerable challenge.

THE PROGRAMME'S THEORY OF CHANGE

The inception phase has been used to reflect on and restructure the below described results framework to better understand the implicit theory of change, which will provide the basis of the framework in the course of the evaluation.

Results chain as interpreted by the evaluators	Objectives mentioned in the results framework (reorganised by evaluators)	Comment regarding evaluability
Impact – long term	<p>Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment.</p> <p>Elimination of violence against women, especially Domestic Violence.</p> <p>Increased Gender equality for Sexual and Reproductive Rights of population of Georgia</p>	<p>Attribution to UNJP cannot be made, but possible contributions could be identified.</p>
Impact – medium term	<p>Change in political commitment for gender responsive policies at regional and country level.</p> <p>Improved policy framework and institutional framework advancing the gender equality and women’s rights.</p> <p>Raised public awareness leads to reduced GBV and DV.</p> <p>Women's income generation opportunities have increased in pilot regions.</p> <p>The pay gap has been reduced between men and women.</p> <p>Local women empowered economically and politically in the locations where the UNJP have had interventions.</p> <p>Women are better equipped to claim their rights.</p>	<p>Attribution to UNJP cannot be made, but possible contributions could be identified.</p>
Outcome	<p>National laws and policies on gender equality and specifically domestic violence improved in line with international commitments.</p> <p>Raised public awareness on GE.</p> <p>Women's participation enhanced in economic and political processes (in national and local decision-making).</p> <p>Greater knowledge on DV among the patrol and district police as well as of judges, lawyers and prosecutors.</p>	<p>Partially reliant on the quality of monitoring data, complemented by focus group interviews and individual open ended interviews.</p>

	<p>Promotion of a national-level Youth Policy which fully integrates GE and SRH&H</p> <p>More awareness on Sexual and Reproductive Rights and gender equality among targeted groups of youth, men, and faith-based organisations.</p> <p>Strengthened media capacity and improved visibility of reproductive health and rights and gender issues in the media.</p> <p>Strengthened capacity among service delivery institutions for promoting and protecting women's human rights.</p>	
Output/outcome	<p>Active and sustainable Gender equality council.</p> <p>The NAP effectively implemented with involvement of relevant executives and the new NAP adopted with realistic targets.</p> <p>Institutional mechanisms and capacity developed for a regular production of sex-disaggregated data. Capacity of the DV Council is developed and financial resources are available to effectively coordinate implementation and monitoring of national laws and policies</p> <p>One additional shelter established by the State Fund for DV victims.</p>	<p>Subject to availability of data, written reports and response rate of key informants and focus groups.</p>
Output	<p>MESD have been trained to analyse the impact of their programmes, which in turn leads to an improved implementation and monitoring of the DV NAP 2011-2012 and participatory process of the drafting of the DV NAP 2013-2015.</p> <p>Training on Results Based Management and Monitoring and Evaluation is provided to the national partners both in the public sector and from civil society.</p> <p>UNJP coaching to the MoLHSA to define status and mandate of social workers combating domestic violence.</p>	<p>Related to access and availability of UNJP's systems and documentation, and response rate of key informants and focus groups.</p>

	<p>UNJP has developed a model crisis centre for the victims/survivors of DV, and a model for the provision of socio-economic rehabilitation for the DV victims/survivors established under the overall supervision of the State Fund.</p> <p>Communications strategy developed and implemented on public awareness activities to improve uptake of services established and promote zero tolerance towards GBV and DV.</p> <p>Awareness campaign conducted to promote existing services for the victims/survivors of DV and to promote zero tolerance towards DV in partnership with celebrities from the fields of sport and arts.</p> <p>Knowledge resources produced through conducting in-depth research on SRH&R, gender, youth.</p> <p>A unified electronic database of DV victims/survivors using shelter services created.</p> <p>Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs is supported to coordinate and lead integration of the health system response on DV into the SRH strategies and services.</p> <p>Health care providers (mainly, SRH service providers) are better prepared to apply the DV Guideline and Protocol in practice.</p> <p>Capacity of the PDO Centre for Children and Women's Rights strengthened to provide legal assistance to GBV and DV victims and monitor the enforcement of restrictive and protective orders.</p> <p>Members of the Gender Equality Council (GEC), Parliamentary All-Party Group on MDGs and the Parliamentary Committee on Health and Social Affairs are trained to integrate SRH&R and Gender Equality in the Population policies and frameworks with particular focus on Youth.</p>	
--	--	--

Evaluation Purpose and Scope

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE AND TIME

The evaluation will assess the full duration of the programme (i.e. from 1 January 2012 until now). This covers activities including those in the UNJP pilot regions of Georgia, as follows:

Tbilisi

Kakheti region – Telavi-city, Napareuli, Kartubani; Tsnori; Sagarejo, Ninotsminda, Udabno; Kachreti, Akhmeta/Duisi

Kutaisi

Samegrelo region – Senkaki, Nokalakevi, Pirveli Maisi, Samikao, Zugdidi

Poti

The above locations have been suggested by UNJP component managers as representative for the spectrum of the programme's areas of interventions. According to the programme document, the choice of locations for the UNJP was guided by considerations including the composition of the population representing IDPs and conflict-affected populations, as well as ethnic diversity. A further consideration was to choose such locations where previous programmes had taken place, and where synergies with such previous initiatives could be achieved. The evaluators cannot, at the end of the inception phase, comment on this suggestion of locations, as it has been impossible to infer from the names of the locations alone what specific types of activities have been taken place there, nor what proportion of the programme can be assessed in these locations (see also sections on "Limitations" and "Data Gaps").

TARGET GROUPS

The evaluation will assess the extent to which results have been achieved among the target groups as set out in the project documents, which include (but are not limited to):

1. Vulnerable groups, including IDPs and conflict-affected ethnic and religious minorities and persons with disabilities
2. Women who are heads of house-holds and in the low-middle income groups and who are living in rural areas
3. Women who are victims/survivors of domestic violence
4. Representatives of central and local governments; Members of Parliament
5. Relevant Central Authorities
6. Representatives of the Judiciary
7. Educational institutions, including universities, vocational training institutions, professional training academies, and schools
8. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), professional associations, think tanks, media
9. International organisations

The evaluators have, in compliance with the ToR's list of deliverables, started to draw a map of relevant stakeholders for the purposes of this exercise (see Annex 3), this has been added on to by UNJP component managers, who also have provided indications of the priority of stakeholders to be consulted for the purposes of this evaluation.

USERS AND INTENDED USE OF THE EVALUATION

The main users of the evaluation are the UNJP participating agencies (UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA) who will use the evaluation to:

1. Reflect on the effectiveness of approaches to different target groups
2. Reflect on strengths and weaknesses
3. Inform the development of the outline of a second phase of the UNJP, which is foreseen to be submitted for funding to the government of Sweden in spring 2015

The evaluators will ensure that UNJP is provided with evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions and actionable recommendations based on conclusions. The evaluation will also be an opportunity to provide evidence to the donor (the government of Sweden) and potential other donors of the effectiveness of a joint UN agency approach.

Relevance and evaluability of evaluation questions

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The following is the evaluation team's assessment of the evaluability of the evaluation questions and proposals for modification. These are explained further in the matrix in Annex 1. There is a number of overlapping questions that are presented here in order to ensure that all relevant issues are covered. In the actual evaluation process, we expect to merge and streamline these questions to ensure clarity, brevity and readability.

Relevance, including Value-Added

The ToR propose the following questions for an assessment of the relevance of the UNJP:

1. To what extent was the joint programme conceptualised, planned and designed jointly to respond to international, regional and national commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment?
2. To what extent was the joint programme conceptualised, planned and designed jointly to establish coherence and to capitalise on the comparative advantages of the participating UN agencies?
3. Is there synergy or complementarity between development actors in Georgia regarding gender equality?
4. What is the joint programme's overall relevance for future programming purposes?

After an initial desk review of UNJP documents, we suggest to rephrase these questions as follows:

1. To what extent do the objectives of the UNJP correspond to the identified UNDAF priorities, as well as to international, regional and national commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment?
2. To what extent have the identified objectives been reflected in proposed outcomes and outputs?
3. How have contextual factors been reflected and incorporated in the design of the UNJP?

Answering the above questions in order to assess the "relevance" criterion, we will also want to clarify the core terminology used by the UNJP, i.e. "gender"; "vulnerable groups" "enabling environment"; "sexual and reproductive rights".

The ToR also suggested a set of questions relating to "value-added". Two of these questions have a specific focus on the examination of the "value-added" presented by the programme being implemented as a Joint Programme of three relevant UN agencies:

1. What are the main comparative strengths of the UNJP? Are these strengths a result of UNJP corporate features or are they specific to the separate UN (UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA) agency features?
2. To what extent would the results observed within the UNJP have been achieved without UNJP implementation?

We suggest to retain both questions. A third question in this cluster is phrased as follows:

3. What is the main added value of the UNJP in the country context as perceived by national stakeholders and/or partners, and the UN itself?

We will also treat the questions proposed under the additional criterion of "coordination" under the "relevance" criterion (see below and the Evaluation Matrix in the annex).

Effectiveness

The ToR propose to address the following questions under this evaluation criterion:

1. Has the joint programme achieved its objectives? To what extent?
2. How did the joint programme inputs lead to outputs and outcomes?
3. What were the constraining factors? What were facilitating factors?
4. How much did the changing environment impact on the achievement of results?
5. Was the partnership strategy utilised by the programme appropriate and effective?
6. What influence did the specific country context and circumstances have on operational effectiveness?
7. What influence did the specific country context and circumstances have on the achievement of results?
8. What challenges were encountered during the implementation of the UNJP?

After the team’s initial desk review of programme documents we suggest to retain the questions as proposed.

Efficiency

The ToR specifies the focus of the assessment to be on the “extent to which the UNJP outputs and outcomes have been achieved with the appropriate resources (funds, time, expertise, administrative cost etc.)”; the ToR suggest the following specific question for this criterion:

1. Has the UNJP led to improved efficiency in the management of resources and what has been the relationship between increased/decreased efficiency and UNJP’s results?

As was already highlighted in Indevlop’s initial implementation proposal during the tender process for this assignment, we have some concern at this focus, as it is not clear that the definitions of “appropriate resources” exist, or that data exist within the joint programme, or with other programmes/projects which can be used for comparison in a way that assists in making appropriate judgements. We suggest to look at “efficiency” by answering the following questions:

2. Have outputs and outcomes been achieved in line with the allocated budget?
3. How adequate have management and governance systems and procedures been in relation to achieving outputs and outcomes?
4. What specific strategies and measures were used in planning and implementation to ensure efficient use of resources and how appropriate were these?
5. What reporting processes exist and are they adequate?

In their feedback to the draft Inception Report, UNJP agencies have deprioritised these additional questions, citing the presence of rigid procurement systems and controls inside the UN system that provide built-in safeguards ensuring efficiency. The evaluators have agreed with the UNJP to initially retain these questions, and to reassess their usefulness during the in-country work.

Sustainability

The ToR propose to address the following questions:

1. Is the joint programme likely to have lasting results after its entire implementation?
2. How can these results be translated into future programming?
3. Has the joint programme strengthened national ownership through the participation and inclusion of national government and civil society groups in their programming process and what were the related challenges and opportunities?

After a first review of the programme documents, we suggest to also include the following question:

4. To what extent was the strategic approach and design of the UNJP appropriate to increase the prospect of sustainability of results?

Coordination

The ToR introduced this additional criterion – a reflection of the fact that this is the first joint effort on such a substantial scale by the three UN agencies to work towards gender equality in Georgia and the requirement, by the donor, to draw specific lessons from the experiences of this effort. The ToR specify the questions as follows:

1. To what extent and how has the UNJP led to complementary and synergistic effects on broader UN efforts to achieve GE/WE (e.g. enhanced collaboration and coordination among agencies, improved UN programming GE/WE etc.)?
2. What are the key contributions and added value in terms of short- and long-term, intended and unintended, positive and negative results achieved by the UNJP to date?

The evaluation team suggests to retain these questions proposed in the ToR but will deal with those under the “relevance” criterion above.

LIMITATIONS

The quality of the evidence to assess the evaluation questions depends to a considerable degree on the availability of relevant quantitative and qualitative data, as well as access to key informants and a good response rate.

With regards to quantitative data, it has not yet been possible to obtain a detailed understanding on the existence, use, and adequacy of the baseline data against which change over time has been assessed. The evaluation team will seek to identify other sources of relevant statistical information that could be used to quantify results. Given the resource and time limits for the evaluation, the evaluators will not be able to produce original quantitative information (such as perception surveys); analysis will instead have to rely on existing data. Quantitative data from UNJP will also be needed to make some assessment with regards to the “efficiency” criterion as well as to determine, at least to some extent, the selection of stakeholders for the in-country data collection phase. Given the limitations in terms of resources and time, the evaluators will seek to prioritise those parts of the programme that have also had a significant allocation of resources.

With regards to access to key informants, the evaluators have drawn up a first draft of the stakeholder map, but will rely on UNJP to provide them with most of the actual contact details, as well as for UNJP to facilitate the initial contact with stakeholders (for example through the provision of a letter of introduction). A crucial factor will be gaining access to a representative amount of the actual **target groups** of the programme as identified in the joint programme document, in addition to the implementing partners of the UNJP. From the documentation available we have not been able to ascertain whether implementing partners keep consistent track of the individuals and groups of individuals they work with/have worked with; this is something we will seek to clarify with implementing partners in preparation of the in-country work.

It should be noted that the timing of the evaluation coincides with the end-of-year holiday both in the country of origin of three of the four evaluators, as well as the end-of-year holiday season in Georgia. The holiday period might have an impact on the availability of respondents.

Proposed approach and methodology

GENERAL APPROACH

The evaluation process will follow UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations, and the evaluation team will abide by the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct.

In line with a human rights-based approach to evaluation, we will seek to be as participatory and consultative as possible; in particular (and subject to access) we will seek to involve representatives from the UNJP's target groups in the evaluation process.

We propose to incorporate a mix of several key methods that will allow us to analyse the information in a number of ways. We have identified three primary data collection methods and their respective sources of information:

1. Document review, including UNJP documents as well as national and international legal and policy documents)
2. Primary data analysis (structured interviews via Skype; individual one-to-one stakeholder interviews; focus group discussions);
3. Secondary data analysis (existing opinion polls, surveys, national statistical records, media analysis).

These methods will be used complementarily, to ensure triangulation of data.

Document review and data gaps at the end of the inception phase

The evaluators have received a considerable amount of UNJP documents; many of these were received relatively late in the inception phase. The Dropbox folder created for the purpose of the evaluation at present contains in excess of 320 documents, including micro-level documents such as CVs of individual consultants involved at the sub-output (i.e. individual activity) levels. Considerable time has been spent by the team to sift through these documents and to identify which of them are relevant to gaining an overall understanding of the UNJP. Given the sheer amount of documents to get through, we have not been able, to the extent desired, to conduct an in-depth document review at the time of the submission of the inception report; therefore, the document review will continue beyond the inception phase, and in preparation of the in-country field work.

A significant challenge to a more effective way of reviewing existing programme documents is posed by the fact that the programme reports on results on an aggregate, programme level, on an annual basis; however, there is no separate reporting at the meso-level, i.e. the level of

the sub-programme. This is a considerable gap, which leaves us at this point with only a very fragmented understanding of how the sub-components actually work.

Crucially for two of the deliverables (stakeholder map; detailed field level work plan) expected at the end of the inception phase, the evaluators are unable to infer from the documents what the programme did in the locations that have been suggested by UNJP for inclusion in the field work. As work in the locations outside of Tbilisi will commence on 17 January, we suggest to clarify these issues with UNJP at the beginning of our in-country work in Georgia on 12 January 2015.

As mentioned above, we have also not been able to clearly establish what UNJP-internal monitoring mechanisms are applied to measure progress and claim results (such as those presented in the Annual Report), and will therefore seek statistics/data used by the UNJP to measure progress.

Primary data analysis

Start-up Workshops with UNJP Component Managers

In order to fill the data gap posed by the lack of meso-level reporting on the three sub-components of the UNJP, we suggest to commence the in-country work with mini-workshops involving the managers of the three subcomponents and any other staff from involved in the UNJP that can inform this exercise. The workshops will allow the evaluators to ascertain some of the key parameters of each of the components and thus provide some of the key missing information. It will also be an opportunity to test some of the key concepts and terminology applied in the UNJP (see above – “gender”, “gender equality”, etc.) and how it is translated into the theory of change. We also propose to dedicate part of the workshop to “outcome harvesting” – this will allow us to gain a better understanding of what UNJP managers perceive to be results of “their” part of the UNJP, and that should be more detailed than the aggregate results reported in the annual reports. It will also provide the evaluators with additional input to allow for the refining of data collection instruments at the local level. We have positive experience with such an approach, and have found that it facilitates internal learning.

Primary data analysis:

Interviews with stakeholders, non-stakeholder experts, and representatives of the UNJP’s target groups

The evaluation team will use different interview techniques, depending on the type of information that needs to be collected, although we foresee two main types:

1. Semi-structured one-on-one interviews by face-to-face
2. Focus groups

Interviews will be held with UNJP Component Managers and other relevant UN staff (if there is additional need for this after the proposed start-up mini workshops), national coordinating authorities, implementing partners (institutions and NGOs/think tanks, as well as individual consultants), the Swedish Embassy Tbilisi and the former portfolio manager, now at Sida HQs in Stockholm and other donors of UN projects in the area of gender equality, and non-stakeholder experts (i.e. experts that have not been directly involved in the implementation of the UNJP but can give an informed perspective on its likely achievements). Attention will be paid to ensure giving adequate weight to representatives of the target groups of the UNJP (see above). This will necessitate focus group discussions, while one-to-one semi-structured interviews will be conducted with stakeholders and non-expert stakeholders, using questionnaires.

Interviews with key informants will be conducted in English and in Georgian. During the interviews and especially during the focus groups (particularly with vulnerable groups), the team will aim at the creation of an atmosphere of trust, individual opinions and experiences will be encouraged. In-depth conversations might be conducted by the evaluators when a particular subject matter is “too painful” for a group debate.

All interviews will be informed about the purpose and the use of evaluation results. Each respondent will be asked if she/he is willing or not to identify her/himself in the interview. As a general rule, information gathered during the interview phase will not be attributed in the final evaluation report.

Secondary Data Analysis

We will seek to identify and collect relevant data produced outside the programme, such as opinion polls, surveys, national statistical records, media analysis and will use them to inform the overall analysis.

Evaluation Team Analysis Workshop

When all data has been collected, the evaluation team will meet to jointly analyse the information and insights, and to develop the evaluation findings and recommendations.

Validation workshop with UNJP component managers and relevant UN staff

We suggest to merge the debriefing on the in-country work with a validation workshop with UNJP component managers and possibly, with the core national implementing agencies (SC members). In our view, this is an important part of promoting utilisation; it is also an opportunity to clarify outstanding issues and discuss emerging conclusions and where possible agree on potential recommendations.

SELECTION OF KEY INFORMANTS

The evaluators will strive to solicit views from a wide range of informants, **stakeholders, non-stakeholder experts, and representatives of the UNJP’s target groups:**

Representation from all categories of the target groups of the programme

1. Single mother headed households
2. People with Disabilities
3. IDP's
4. Ethnic and religious minorities
5. LGBT people
6. All Project staff at UNDP, UNFPA and UN Women
7. Donors
8. Governmental, educational, private partners
9. CSOs

The team will base the selection of informants on the following criteria:

1. Representation of various stakeholders groups;
2. A gender balance;
3. Geographic representation (Tbilisi, locations in Kakheti, locations in Samegrelo and Kutaisi);
4. Balanced coverage of all three components per "levels";
5. Relative weight of the involvement in the programme (significant, medium, limited, no involvement (non-stakeholders)).

WORK PLAN

Despite a slight delay in the submission of the Inception Report, the evaluation team will adhere to the initially agreed deadlines. The next steps in the evaluation process are as follows:

1. Finalisation of stakeholder map and preparation of field visit; specific data requests to close information gaps: 23 December 2014 to 9 January 2015
2. Development of interview guides and questionnaires: 2 January to 9 January 2015
3. In-country work: 12 January to 23 January 2015
4. Submission of Draft Final Report: 11 February 2015
5. Submission of Final Report: 28 February 2015

A draft outline of the in-country work in Georgia will be discussed with UNJP in parallel to the submission of the final inception report; given the timing constraints posed by the holiday period, planning in particular for the work in locations in Kakheti and Samegrelo will have to be done during the first week of the team's in-country work. In accordance with comments received, the evaluation team will ensure that more time is set aside for meetings in Tbilisi. As highlighted above, the evaluation team lacks key information that would allow us to understand the extent of the work to be conducted in each location. The work in the various locations in Georgia will be conducted by the Senior Gender Experts; the Team Leader will specifically focus on those areas of the evaluation that are concerned with the "relevance" and "coordination" aspects of the evaluation (see above).

Evaluation Matrix

Questions raised in ToRs	Indicators to be used in Evaluation	Data collection methods	Sources	Availability and Reliability of Data /comments
Relevance				
<p>To what extent do the objectives of the UNJP correspond to the identified UN-DAF priorities, as well as to international, regional and national commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment?</p>	<p>Identification of priorities of national and local governments (duty bearers)</p> <p>Identification of priorities of women's NGOs at national and local levels (rights holders)</p> <p>Identification of the priorities of the UN and the donor</p> <p>Evidence of participation of stakeholders at national and local levels in planning and participation of UNJP</p>	<p>Document review templates</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>	<p>Direct and indirect stakeholders (implementing partners; donor) at national (relevant ministries and institutions) and local levels (local self-government authorities)</p> <p>Representatives of the target audience</p>	
<p>How have contextual factors been reflected and incorporated in the design of the UNJP?</p>	<p>Visibility and treatment of major issues arising related to women's rights, gender equality, and domestic violence by the UNJP, i.e. major contextual factors can be identified by the evaluators</p>	<p>Document review templates</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>	<p>UNJP sub-component managers</p> <p>Direct and indirect stakeholders at national and local levels</p> <p>Non-stakeholder experts</p>	

			International monitoring reports, and other secondary data	
What are the main comparative strengths of the UNJP? Are these strengths a result of UNJP corporate features or are they specific to the separate UN (UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA) agency features?	Stakeholders can provide concrete evidence that distinguishes the joint approach from agency-specific approach Evidence that UNJP provides better results than individual agency's programmes	Document review templates Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers Stakeholders (implementing partners) at national and local levels in select locations in which the UNJP operates and where there is previous experience with UN agencies' programmes	Stakeholders at local level might not always be able to distinguish UN agencies
To what extent would the results observed within the UNJP have been achieved without UNJP implementation?	Evidence that the joint approach facilitated a greater level of results/progress than without the UNJP	Document review templates Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers	Extrapolating this type of evidence would seem hampered by the inherently speculative nature of the question, and the lack of a comparison on which to credibly base findings.
What is the main added value of the UNJP in the coun-	Evidence that UNJP is identified as a unique, novel approach Identification of evidence of	Document review Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component	

<p>try context as perceived by national stakeholders and/or partners, and the UN itself?</p>	<p>positive results from this joint approach, including against the background of previous programme and project experience with individual UN agencies</p>		<p>managers</p> <p>Stakeholders (implementing partners) at national and local levels in select locations in which the UNJP operates</p>	
<p>Effectiveness</p>				
<p>Has the joint programme achieved its objectives? To what extent?</p>	<p>% Progress towards expected results</p> <p>Indicators identified within the three UNJP sub-components as contained in the UNJP logframe</p> <p>Degree of coherence between results achieved and the planned results and overall objectives.</p>	<p>Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work)</p> <p>Interview protocols</p> <p>Observation</p>	<p>Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers</p> <p>Sub-component activity reports</p> <p>Secondary data (surveys, opinion polls, reports on fulfilment by Georgia of relevant international commitments)</p> <p>Stakeholders and direct beneficiaries at all levels of the UNJP, and in select geographic locations where the UNJP</p>	<p>Progress reports at sub-component level are not available</p>

			operates	
How did the joint programme inputs lead to outputs and outcomes?	Coherence in the theory of change and evidence of its consistent translation into activities Validity of the assumptions underpinning the theory of change and the chosen outcomes and outputs	Correct reconstruction of the initial theory of change Analysis of data collected Collective reflection	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers Evaluation team	The evaluation team will need to reflect critically with UNJP on the theory of change Data gap exists on the level of aggregate reporting on sub-component level
What were the constraining factors? What were facilitating factors?	Identification of obstacles and problems in the context, institutions/organisations and implementation methods Identification of context/conditions, methods or activities that have promoted progress towards expected results	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work) Interview protocols	UNJP sub-component managers National and local level stakeholders (implementing partners)	We are referring to contextual factors as external socio-political factors and institutional factors that relate to processes in the national and local stakeholder institutions and organisations.
How much did the changing environment impact on the achievement of results?	Identification of evidence of extraneous factors that could not have been foreseen at the project design stage and that changed specific parameters of the programme and necessitated readjustment in terms of expected results.	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work) Interview protocols	UNJP sub-component managers National and local level stakeholders (implementing partners)	
Was the partnership strategy utilised by the programme appropriate and effective?	Reconstruction of a coherent evidence-based approach underpinning the rationale for the	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers	

	partnership. Evidence of the way in which the strategy has played out during implementation as anticipated	country work) Interview protocols	National and local level stakeholders (implementing partners)	
What influence did the specific country context and circumstances have on operational effectiveness and on the achievement of results?	Identification of how specific country context has been incorporated into design and delivery Identification of evidence/examples where such factors could not have been foreseen/planned for/incorporated in the design and set-up Collection of evidence/examples on how the UNJP dealt with such factors	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work) Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers National and local level stakeholders (implementing partners)	
What challenges were encountered during the implementation of the UNJP?	Identification of evidence of unforeseen circumstances, extraneous, within the UNJP, or within the three UN agencies	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work) Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers National and local level stakeholders (implementing partners)	
Efficiency				
Have outputs and outcomes been achieved in line with the allocated budget?	Establishing of a clear evidence trail of budgetary planning processes and monitoring.	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work)	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers	At the end of the inception phase, a data gap in terms of documentary evidence on planning at

			Budget documentation/reporting	output level remains. The evaluators have no picture about the relative weight, in financial terms of the activities. This also puts a limitation on deciding which parts of this complex programme to prioritise over other parts in the evaluation process.
How adequate have management and governance systems and procedures been in relation to achieving outputs and outcomes?	Written evidence of management and governance systems and procedures; stakeholder evidence confirming that these systems and processes are understood and transparent, and applied.	Document review templates (to be developed prior to in-country work) Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers Stakeholders in particular at national level (SC members)	.
What specific strategies and measures were used in planning and implementation to ensure efficient use of resources and how appropriate were these?	Evidence of clearly established (i.e. in written format) processes to safeguard the use of funds, value-for-money, transparency and accountability in sub-contracting and other procurement processes	Random check/verification of sub-contracting processes/procedures across all stages.	UNJP sub-programme managers.	The UNJP appears to have sub-contracted to a vast variety of stakeholders in the course of its implementation. The evaluators therefore expect that sufficient data is available to demonstrate procedures.
What reporting processes exist and are they adequate?	Comparison of good programme reporting practice, expected re-	Document review Interview protocols	Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component	The evaluators have at the end of the inception phase established a gap at the

	<p>porting, and actual practice</p> <p>Assessment of possible gaps between reporting and the existing results framework and reporting structure</p>		<p>managers</p> <p>Stakeholders, in particular SC members</p> <p>donor</p>	<p>level of reporting at UNJP sub-component level.</p>
Sustainability				
Is the joint programme likely to have lasting results after its entire implementation?	<p>Extent to which stakeholders are prepared to continue/allocate funds to continuation of initiatives facilitated by programme.</p> <p>Evidence of national level/local level leadership on outputs addressed through the UNJP.</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>	<p>Stakeholders at national and local levels.</p>	
How can these results be translated into future programming?		<p>Analysis of all data collected</p> <p>Collective reflection</p>	<p>Validation workshop with UNJP at the end of in-country work.</p>	
Has the joint programme strengthened national ownership through the participation and inclusion of national government and civil society groups in their programming process and what were the related challenges and opportunities?	<p>Evidence of ownership of UNJP results at all levels of intervention (central, local)</p> <p>Evidence of participation of duty bearers and rights holders; evidence of UNJP and stakeholder reflection on the experience from these processes</p> <p>Appraisal/reflection on the quality of participation and the quality of the facilitating role played by UNJP</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>	<p>Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>	

<p>To what extent was the strategic approach and design of the UNJP appropriate to increase the prospect of sustainability of results?</p>	<p>Evidence of the results of the UNJP being integrated into policies at national and local levels</p> <p>Identification of risks that will prevent stakeholders to take results forward</p> <p>Identification of factors that promote the sustained functioning of the structures/initiatives facilitated by the UNJP</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>	<p>Start-up workshops with UNJP sub-component managers</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>	
---	--	---	--	--

List of Documents Received from UNJP

UN Women

DV Study Tour Spain

Authorization letter to communicate with Spanish Authorities

Study Tour on Domestic Violence to Spain (17-21 November 2014) BIOGRAPHIES OF SPANISH AUTHORITIES

Brief on Study Tour

Letter from MOJ by Gocha Lortkipanidze – Deputy Minister

Letter from Member of Gender Equality Council in Parliament - Guguli Maghradze, Head of Delegation

LIST OF DELEGATES with passports, Study Tour on Domestic Violence to Spain (17-22 November 2014)

UN Women Georgia -Study Tour on Domestic Violence to Spain (17-21 November 2014). Spanish institutions – Contact

Mission Report- Study Tour Spain 26 Nov 2014

Study Tour on Domestic Violence to Spain 17-21 November 2014, Provisional Programme TERMS OF REFERENCE, Study Tour on prevention and response to Domestic Violence in Spain under the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia

Meeting Notes

მონაწილეთასია -

საკონსულტაციო შეხვედრასამოქალაქოსაზოგადოებასთანქალთამიმართმალადობის სადაოჯახშიმალადობისსაკითხებზე, 27 ოქტომბერი, 2014

Meeting of the working group members on enhancement of DV related legislation operating under the umbrella of the Inter-Agency Council Implementing Measures to Eliminate DV in Georgia with the representatives of the Parliament of Georgia, Minutes. 11 February, 2014

სოციალური მუშაკის როლი ოჯახში მალადობის შემთხვევებში დამსწრეთასია. 15 ოქტომბერი 2014

Meeting regarding amendments to the procedure of issuing restraining orders and the respective appeal procedure – participant list, 22 October 2014

Meeting with the representatives of NGOs, PDO, State Fund for the Protection and Assistance to the Victims of Human Trafficking - participant list, 6 August 2014

Meeting regarding the procedure for granting DV victim status - participant list, 14 August 2014

Meeting regarding the procedure for granting DV victim status - participant list, 20 August 2014

Meeting of the UN Women responsible parties and partners under the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia, Minutes, 28 February, 2014

შეხვედრისოქმი, 22 ივლისი, 2012 -

საქართველოსსახალხოდამცველსადაგაეროსქალთაორგანიზაციასშორისდადებულ იმემორანდუმითგათვალისწინებულეერთობლივადგანსახორციელებელიღონისძიებები

Working Group on the enhancement of DV related legislation 2013

Sports Federations Working Group Against Gender Violence, 29 January 2013

Mission Reports

Batumi International Beach Rugby Tournament devoted to Combating Violence against Women, organized in the framework of the UN Joint Programme - Irina Japharidze, 9-13 August 2012

Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention and Combatting Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), 2011, at

<http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/convention/Convention%20210%20English.pdf>

Strategic planning session of the Georgian Bar Association in Gudauri - Irina Japharidze , 25-27 January 2012

Extended Gender Theme Group (GTG) retreat in Kazbegi - Irina Japharidze, 23-15 October 2012

Retreat for the semi-finalists (10 script writers) of the script writers' competition on DV issues, Kakheti - Irina Japharidze, 5-8 August 2012

Retreat of the Inter-Agency Council Implementing Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence in Georgia, Kazbegi - Irina Japharidze 25-27 March 2013

Visit the DV shelter building and discuss reconstruction plan, Kutaisi - Irina Japharidze 16-17 August 2012

Inform the local self-government and civil society about launch of the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia, as one of the target regions of the Programme and to seek opportunities for further cooperation for the purposes of efficient programme implementation, Zugdidi - Irina Japharidze, 1-2 August 2012

Attend the Informational-Consultation meeting with the local women on the issues of Gender Equality, Zugdidi - Irina Japharidze 17-18 May 2012

Conduct preparation works for the events to be conducted in the framework of the Gender Week during March 03 – March 9, 2013, Zugdidi & Telavi- Irina Japharidze, February 2013

Present UN Women's experience in using sport as a tool towards ending violence against women in Georgia Thematic Meeting entitled 'Harnessing the Power of Sport to address Gender-based Violence' organized by the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG); Provide inputs to group discussions on using sport as a tool to address Gender-based Violence. Geneva 29.06 – 01.07, 2014

Field visit to Poti - Irina Japharidze, 25-29 July 2014

Study visit in Spain - Build capacity of the inter-agency coordination mechanism within the executive branch of the Government of Georgia (hereinafter the “DV Council”) in the area of elimination and prevention of DV by facilitating exchange of information on the acting legislation and best practices in the prevention and response to domestic violence with the respective government and civil society organizations working on the DV issues in Spain. 26-23 November

Promote zero tolerance towards VAWG and DV as well as existing service for the DV victims/survivors in the framework of the UN Secretary General’s UNiTE to End Violence against Women Campaign, Batumi & Ozurgeti 09-14 Aug 2013

Record four TV Talk shows on broadcasting company “Hereti” and “Tanamgzavri”; Conduct 4 meetings with teenage boys and young men in Sagarejo and Akhmeta, Kakheti on VAWG and DV involving famous Georgian sportsmen; Ensure media coverage of the events, Kakheti 22-25 July 2013

Record four TV Talk shows on broadcasting company 9th Wave in Poti; Conduct 6 meetings with high school boys in Zugdidi and Village Orsantia – Men Talks on VAWG and DV involving famous Georgian sportsmen; Ensure media coverage of the events, Samegrelo 8-12 July 2013

Participate in the international conference entitled “Eliminating Violence against Women in Europe – Intersectoral Approaches and Actions”, Vienna DV Conference, 24- 27 Nov 2013

Field visit to Zugdidi - Plan and resolve organizational issues for the interactive performance “Interior of Violence” to be held in the Poti theatre on July 28, 2014; Conduct a coordination meeting with the community based organization “Nefa” – new UNJP partner in the Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti region. 16-18 June 2014

Monitoring awareness raising work in the Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti region; Coordination with local NGOs in the Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti region – Zugdidi & Anaklia, 11-13 November 2014

Monitoring awareness raising work in the Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti region; Monitoring DV shelter in Kutaisi; Coordination with local NGOs in Kutaisi - Zugdidi City, Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti Region and Kutaisi, Imereti Region of Georgia, 28-29 October 2014

UN Women communications materials

Georgian National Rugby Team UNiTE – videoclip and billboard against domestic violence

Giga Chikadze “Knock Out Domestic Violence” – videoclip and billboard

“Interior of Violence” – An interactive performance on ending violence against women in Georgia, videoclip (2014) (UN Women)

Rugby Outdoor Billboard

World Refugee Day – Pankisi Gorge Rugby videoclip

UN Women partner capacity assessments

Implementing Capacity Assessment for the Georgian Rugby Union (GRU), 26 April 2013

Implementing Capacity Assessment for the NGO “Sakhli”, February 2012

Note to the File regarding the Selection of the Implementing Partners for the UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia, 6 March 2012

UNJP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 5 March 2012

UN Women 2011 Auditor's Report (not relevant for UNJP evaluation)

Implementing Capacity Assessment for the State Fund for the Protection and Assistance to the Victims (Statutory) of Human Trafficking

UN Women responsible parties

Women's Information Centre "Sakhli", Detailed implementation plans 2012, 2013 and 2014

UN Joint Programme to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia, Ant-Violence Network of Georgia, Budget Breakdown 2012, 2013, 2014

Anti-Violence Network of Georgia, Implementation Plan 2012

Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool, Narrative Reports 2012, 2013 and 2014 of the State Fund for the Protection of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking

Project Cooperation Agreement between UN Women and the Anti-Violence Network of Georgia, June 2012

Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool; 2012 Report of the State Fund for the Protection of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking

Women's Information Centre "Sakhli", Budget Breakdown 2012-2014

Women's Consultation Center "Sakhli", Detailed Implementation Plan 2012

Women's Information Centre "Sakhli", Annual Work Plan Monitoring Tool, Narrative Reports for 2012, 2013 and mid-term report 2014

Project Cooperation Agreement between UN Women and the Women's Information Centre "Sakhli", 2012

Budget Breakdown 2012 – 2015 for the State Fund for the Protection of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking (UN Women)

Detailed Implementation Plans 2012, 2013, 2014 for the State Fund for the Protection of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking

The Annual Work Plan (AWP) Monitoring Tool State Fund for Protection and Assistance of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking 2013, 2014

Project Cooperation Agreement between UN Women and the State Fund for the Protection of (Statutory) Victims of Human Trafficking, June 2012

UN Women technical papers

Study of the Perceptions and Attitudes towards Violence against Women and Domestic Violence in Tbilisi, Kakheti and Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, 2013; Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) [page 2 onwards is important as it quotes a previous baseline survey]

The Law of Georgia on the Amendments and Addenda to the Criminal Code of Georgia, 12 June 2012 (unofficial translation)

საქართველოს კანონი - „ოჯახში ძალადობის აღკვეთის, ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლთა დაცვისა და დახმარების შესახებ“

საქართველოს კანონში ცვლილების შეტანის თაობაზე
Analysis of the compliance of the Georgian legislation with the requirements of the Council of Europe Convention on “Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence”, 2012

მონაწილეთა სია -

საკონსულტაციო მხვედრას ამოქალაქოსაზოგადოებასთან ქალთა მიმართ ძალადობის სადა ოჯახში ძალადობის საკითხებზე, 27 ოქტომბერი, 2014

საქართველოს მთავრობის დადგენილება. 2014 წლის 15 ოქტომბერი.
ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლის სტატუსის განმსაზღვრელი ჯგუფის
(მსხვერპლის იდენტიფიცირების ჯგუფის)

მიერ მსხვერპლის იდენტიფიცირებისა და სტატუსის განსაზღვრის წესის დამტკიცების შესახებ

ბრძანება, 2014 წ -

„ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლის იდენტიფიცირების ჯგუფის წევრთა და ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლის სტატუსის დასადგენად საჭირო პროცედურების მწარმოებელ ორგანიზაციების შერჩევის კრიტერიუმების განსაზღვრისა და დამტკიცების შესახებ“

საქართველოს მთავრობის დადგენილება, 25 ნოემბერი 2014 - პირის, ოჯახში ძალადობის აღკვეთის ღონისძიებათა განმახორციელებელ საუწყებო აპარატის ოსაბჭოში წარდგენისა და საბჭოდან გამომწვევის წესის, საბჭოს შემადგენლობისა და საქმიანობის წესის (დებულების) დამტკიცების შესახებ

Draft Concept of the Crisis Centre for Victims/Survivors of Domestic Violence (in Georgian)

Monitoring report, On the Implementation of the National Action Plan for 2011-2012 on the Measures to be Implemented for the Elimination of Domestic Violence and Protection and Assistance to the Victims of Domestic Violence (in Georgian) 2011 – 2013 Action Plan for the Implementation of Gender Equality (unofficial translation))

Draft National Action Plan on the Measures to be Implemented for Combatting Domestic Violence and Protection and Assistance to the Victims/Survivors of Domestic Violence for 2013-2015, in Georgian and English

ოჯახში ძალადობის წინააღმდეგ ბრძოლისა და ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლთა დასაცავად სატარებელ ღონისძიებათა 2013 - 2015 წლების სამოქმედო გეგმა.

დამტკიცებული პრეზიდენტის მიერ.

Training Manual for the Police – Curriculum on the Existing Mechanisms for the Response to Domestic Violence Cases in Accordance with Georgian Legislation (in Georgian, no date)

Draft Mapping of the Existing Services for the Victims/Survivors of Gender Based Violence (in Georgian, no date)

Memorandum of Understanding between UN Women and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia, 29 September 2014

Memorandum of Understanding between UN Women and the Public Defender of Georgia, 2012

გენდერული თანასწორობის სტრატეგია და სამოქმედო გეგმა 2014-2016.

საქართველოს სახალხო დამცველის აპარატი

ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლთა მომსახურების დაწესებულების (თავმესაფრების) მონიტორინგის განხორციელების სახელმძღვანელო პრინციპები

ოჯახში ძალადობის მსხვერპლთა მომსახურების დაწესებულების (თავმესაფრების) ცხელი ხაზის კითხვარები A; B; კითხვარი ადმინისტრაციისთვის

PDO, gender mainstreaming training report 2013

სახელმძღვანელო ოჯახში ძალადობის ფაქტებზე რეაგირებისთვის (რეგიონული ოფისებისთვის)

სოციალური იმუშაკის როლი ოჯახში ძალადობის შემთხვევებზე იმუშაობაში, აპრილი 2014

Proposed amendments and addenda to the Georgian legislation to ensure its compliance with the Council of Europe Convention on “Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence”, 2012, in Georgian

Report on the Capacity Building of Lawyers on DV, 2013

Report on the capacity development of specialised police units on DV and SGBV, 2013

სოციალური იმუშაკის როლი ოჯახში ძალადობის სფეროში,

კონცეფციის სამუშაო ვერსია, saqarTvelos socialur muSakTa asociacia. 2014

ოჯახში ძალადობის შემთხვევებზე რეაგირების პროცედურები, სამუშაო ვერსია saqar. 2014

Terms of reference, Cooperation with the Chief Prosecutor’s Office of Georgia 2014

Training module for lawyers on the elimination of domestic violence and protection and assistance to the victims/survivors of domestic violence 2013 (in Georgian)

9 Plays vs Violence Publication 2012, Kote Marjanishvili Theater

UN Women marks the International Women’s Day with a countrywide series of events

Memorandum of Understanding between UN Women and the Georgian National Film Centre, no date

Report - 16 Days against Gender Violence Campaign 2012

Report - 16 Days against Gender Violence Campaign 2013

Sportsmen UNiTE against Violence against Women in Georgia 2013

ქალის მიმართ ძალადობისა და ოჯახში ძალადობის აღქმა თბილისში, კახეთსა და სამეგრელო-ზემო სვანეთში - ანგარიში 2013

The Interior of Violence Campaign Report 2014

Cooperation Agreement UN Women and Kote Marjanishvili State Drama Theatre to Promote Zero Tolerance Towards the Practice of Violence against Women and in Particular Domestic Violence, 2012

Report on UNiTE – Communications Strategy (?), UN Women Country Office Georgia 2012 – 2014

Domestic Violence Shelters and Nation-wide Hotline Launched in Georgia, 2014, Report

Participatory Gender Audit of the Georgian Parliament, 2014, done in the framework of the “Women for Equality, Peace and Development (WEPD) project” (funded by Norway) (UN Women) [clarify relation with UNJP]

Study on the Perception and Awareness of VAWG, baseline, 2013 (in Georgian) (UN Women)

UNJP Anti-Violence Network of Georgia, Budget 2012 – 2014

Anti-Violence Network of Georgia, Narrative Reports 2012 and 2013 (not narrative reports as such, but these provide indications on how many trainers were trained etc.)

Georgian Bar Association website www.edu.gba.ge

Gender Information Network of the South Caucasus at <http://ginsc.net/>

UNDP

Output 1

Public Perception Study on Gender in Business and Politics, 2013 ACT (?) (UNDP, output 1)

Badashvili, M. “Balancing Work and Family Responsibilities Related to Maternity Protection in Georgia”, 2013 (UNDP, output 1) - reference to joint UNDP ILO initiative on mapping legislation

Report on Communication Campaign on Gender Equality Publicis Zenith Optimedia, 2013 (?)

Information about the work of the Gender Equality Council, annual report 2012

საქართველოსპარლამენტისგენდერულითანასწორობისსაბჭოსსაქმიანობისანგარიში
ინოვაციური 2012 - ივლისი 2013

Final Report of the Project “Modernization of the Gender Informational Network of the South Caucasus”, 2013

UNDP Comments on the draft Labour Code of Georgia, 2013

გენდერულითანასწორობისუზრუნველსაყოფადგანსახორციელებელი 2011–2013
წლებისსამოქმედოგეგმა“ შესრულებისანგარიში

Final Report of the Project “To Facilitate Strengthened Coordination between civil society organisations working on women’s issues and gender equality”, 2014

Report about Gender Week Activities organised by Media House Dekom, 2013

გენდერულითანასწორობისპრინციპებისგათვალისწინებამასწავლებელთაპროფესიულსტანდარტში

Training report for appellate court judges on gender equality and domestic violence issues, Nov 24, 2014 – Dec 15, 2014

„გენდერულითანასწორობისუზრუნველსაყოფადგანსახორციელებელი 2011-2013
წლებისსამოქმედოგეგმის“ შესრულებისანგარიში

ქალთა უფლებების გაძლიერება საქართველოს შრომის კოდექსში
(შესაძლო ინიციატივების მცირე მიმოხილვა /საწყისი დოკუმენტი/)

Presentation on National Action Plan (? In Georgian), Power Point Presentation (UNDP, output 1)

Output 2

გაეროს განვითარების პროგრამა გაეროს ერთობლივი პროგრამა
„გენდერული თანასწორობის ხელშეწყობისთვის საქართველოში“,
საქართველოს სახალხო დამცველის გაძლიერების პროექტი
შეზღუდული შესაძლებლობების მქონე პირთა ცენტრის გაძლიერების კომპონენტი,
საანგარიშო პერიოდი: 07.2013; 03.2013; 06.2013; 10.2013; 11.2013; 12.2013; 02.2014;
03.2014; 04.2014; 05.2014; 07.2014; 08.2014; 09.2014

Project report - Women Can Run the Country: Support for Gender Sensitive Local Governance, May 21, 2013

საქართველოს სახალხო დამცველის შეზღუდული შესაძლებლობის მქონე პირთა უფლებების დაცვის ცენტრის მიერ გაეროს ერთობლივი პროგრამა
„გენდერული თანასწორობის ხელშეწყობისთვის საქართველოში“ -
საქართველოს სახალხო დამცველის გაძლიერების პროექტის ფარგლებში განხორციელებული საქმიანობის შეჯამება

Final Report 2013-2014 - Women Can Run the Country: Support for Gender Sensitive Local Governance

Women Can Run the Country: Support for Gender Sensitive local governance, Comparative Analysis of Kakheti and Samegrelo Municipalities Budget Plans for 2014 (Gender Approach)

National statistics of Georgia (GEOSTAT) Final Report

Leadership School for Elected Officials of Local Governance, June – November, 2013

პროექტი - “გაეროს 2006 წლის კონვენციის (CRPD) მე-6 მუხლის (შშმქალები) იმპლემენტაციის ხელშეწყობა საქართველოში”

The research papers “Implementation of the Rights of IDP Women with Disabilities” and “Legislation Analysis in the Context of the Rights of Women with Disabilities” (small-scale research) conducted within the Public Defender's support component under the UN Joint Program “To Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia”

Gender Dimensions of Municipalities Budgets Priorities for 2013 (Kakheti and Samegrelo Region)

PDO Capacity Building Component, 2013 - strengthen the monitoring of the rights of women (girls) with disabilities by the Centre of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities under the Public Defender of Georgia

Monitoring and evaluation report for project: Women can run the country: support for gender sensitive local governance

სემინარი ბათუმში - გაეროს განვითარების პროგრამა გაეროს ერთობლივი პროგრამა
„გენდერული თანასწორობის ხელშეწყობისთვის საქართველოში“,
საქართველოს სახალხო დამცველის გაძლიერების პროექტი,
შეზღუდული შესაძლებლობების მქონე პირთა ცენტრის გაძლიერების კომპონენტი

Output 3

შრომისბაზრისკვლევაკახეთისრეგიონშიპროფესიებზემოთხოვნისშესწავლა -
ანგარიში 2012

“Empowering Women for Change” Final Narrative Report, I Phase, June 14, 2013 – February 13, 2014

“Empowering Women for Change” Final Narrative Report, February 14 – November 30, 2014

Program “Empowering Women for Change” Micro-projects’ Summary, Sagarejo Municipality, 2014

Georgian Civil Development Association final report 2014

Institutional Development of Association of Women Farmers of Kakheti, Final Report Phase I, Sakobo, Signagi Municipality, 2014

Institutional Development of Association of Women Farmers of Kakheti, Final Report Phase II, Sakobo, Signagi Municipality, 2014

Publications

Research Report – Public Presentation on Gender Equality in Politics and Business, 2013

საქართველოსსაბიუჯეტოსისტემა,
სახელმძღვანელოპარლამენტისწევრებისთვის, 2013

ბიზნესისგამკვლევი,
ბიზნესსაქმიანობასთანდამაკავშირებელიძირითადისაკითხები, 2013

კვლევისანგარიში - „დევილიშეზღუდულიშესაძლებლობებისმქონეკალების
(გოგონების) უფლებებისგანხორციელება“, 2013

კვლევისანგარიში -
„საქართველოსკანონმდებლობისანალიზიშეზღუდულიშესაძლებლობებისმქონეკა-
ლთაუფლებებისჭრილში“, 2013

კვლევისანგარიში -
„შეზღუდულიშესაძლებლობებისმქონეპირთაუფლებებისშესხებგაეროსკონვენციი
სმე-6 მუხლისიმპლემენტაცია: არსებულიგამოწვევებიდაპერსპექტივები“, 2014

UNFPA

Output 3.1 Documents

Capacity Development

Agenda of the Seminar in the Parliament of Georgia on Reproductive Health and Rights, 21
June 2012

სემინარისაქართველოსპარლამენტში,
“რეპროდუქციულიჯანმრთელობადაუფლებები”, 21 ივნისი, 2012

Terms of Reference for NGO Tanadgoma 2012 (UNFPA Output 3.1)

საინფორმაციოწერილი - სემინარისაქართველოსპარლამენტში,
“რეპროდუქციულიჯანმრთელობადაუფლებები”

Hans Rosling Public Lectures

Document with title “Rosling List”, containing names of participants (25 June) [not informative]

List of Attendees of the Hans Rosling Lecture 26 June 2014

South Caucasus Youth Forum

The South Caucasus and Turkey Youth Forum 2013, list of attendees

Statement of Commitment South Caucasus and Turkey Youth Forum, 11 October 2013

Study Tour in Scotland

Study Tour list of participants – not clear to which study tour this relates (presumably to Scotland)

Children in Scotland Study Tour guide (prepared by the Scottish host), 22 – 27 September 2013

Study Tour to Scotland, Terms of Reference

Youth National Forums

Concept Note National and South Caucasus Forums on Youth Reproductive Health and Rights and Development, no date

1st Telavi Regional Session 2013, 18 – 20 May 2013, Georgian participants’ application form Preparation Kit for Telavi

1st Telavi EYP Session 18 – 20 May 2013, Preparation Kit for delegates

1st Telavi EYP General Assembly 18 – 20 May 2013, Resolution Booklet (part. pp. 4)

Cooperation of the European Youth Parliament – Georgia, Terms of Reference EYP 2014

Youth Policy

UNFPA Country Office Consultant’s Thematic ToR for National Consultants, Thematic Group of National Youth Action Plan, 2013 for M. Shengelia, K. Zhvania-Tyson, N. Japardze, T. Karchava, R. Cheishvili, P. Tvaliashvili, M. Tskishvili, G. Gegelashvili (8 documents), 2013 (UNFPA Output 3.1)

Monitoring strategic direction: Participation

Planning strategic direction: Participation, 2013

The Georgian National Youth Policy Document, 2 April 2014

Terms of Reference for the cooperation with the European Youth Parliament 2012 (UNFPA Output 3.1)

Information on the seminar on reproductive health and rights organized for the staff and the members of Parliament on 21 June, 2012. (Organizers: MDG parliament group of Georgia, parliamentary committee on healthcare and social issues, UNFPA and Centre “Tanadgoma”), in Georgian (UNFPA Output 3.1)

Output 3.2 Documents

სახელმძღვანელომითითებები - ქალისადაბავშვისმიმართფიზიკური, ფსიქოლოგიურიდასექსუალურიძალადობისგამოვლენის, მკურნალობისპრინციპებისადარეფერალისსაკითხებზე, 2014

Recruitment of Ms. Irma Manjavidze as a Local Consultant to provide coordination and technical assistance to the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs of Georgia, 8 August, 2012

Recruitment of Local Consultant, Ms. Irma Manjavidze for reviewing and harmonizing the “Minimum Standards for Revealing, Referring and Documenting the Cases of Physical, Sexual and Psychological Violence against Women and Children” with the WHO guideline, 24 July, 2013

Recruitment of Local Consultants, Ms. Rusudan Beriashvili, Ms. Maia Kherkheulidze, Ms. Irma Aladashvili, Ms. Rusudan Pkhakadze for providing support in the process of drafting the guideline Health Care Response to Domestic Violence, 28 January, 2013

Terms of Reference (TOR2) Local Consultant Manjavidze in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia

Terms of Reference (TOR) Local Consultant Aladashvili in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia

Terms of Reference (TOR) Local Consultant Beriashvili in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia Terms of Reference (TOR) Local Consultant Kherkheulidze in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia

Terms of Reference (TOR) Local Consultant Manjavidze in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia

Terms of Reference (TOR) Local Consultant Pkhakadze in the area of the health system response to domestic violence (DV) in Georgia

სამუშაოშედეგადრა, ქალისადაბავშვისმიმართფიზიკური, ფსიქოლოგიურიდასექსუალურიძალადობისგამოვლენის, მკურნალობისპრინციპებისადარეფერალისსაკითხებზე, სახელმძღვანელომითითებებისჯანდაცვისსისტემაშიდანერგვისხელშეწყობა, 16-17 აგვისტო, 2014, კახეთი

Output 3.3 Documents

Brochures

Aids

Aids STI

Drug Addiction

Fertility Regulation

Gender Equality

Pregnancy Labour

Sex Maturity

Daddy Read Me a Book

Expansion of Awareness Raising Campaign “Daddy Read me a Book”, 14 October, 2014

Daddy, Read Me a Book Facebook Page Insights

Expansion of Awareness Raising Campaign “Daddy Read me a Book”, 14 October, 2014.
Scanned with signature

Selection Note, Recruitment of Local Consultants, 3 June, 2014

Terms of Reference

Awareness Raising Campaign

UNFPA within the frameworks of UN Joint Program “To Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia”

FBOs

Conference Agenda: ოჯახი, მოზარდების აღზრდა, თაობებს შორის ურთიერთკავშირი. 30 November, 2012

Cover - ოჯახი, მოზარდების აღზრდა, თაობებს შორის ურთიერთკავშირი.

თბილისის სასულიერო აკადემია-

სემინარიის ადაგაეროს მოსახლეობის ფონდის ერთობლივი კონფერენცია

კონფერენცია: ოჯახი, მოზარდების აღზრდა, თაობებს შორის ურთიერთკავშირი - შიგთავსი

Description of Services and Terms of Reference for UN Joint program “to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia”. 2012

Memorandum of Understanding between UNFPA and NGOs for Strengthening of an Institution. 2012

Terms of reference, Radio Station “IVERIA” 2013

TERMS OF REFERENCE Support to Population Awareness Raising on Gender and Reproductive Health Issues Within the frameworks of the UN Joint Programme “To Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia”

Gender Biased Sex Selection

CV - Irian Badurashvili

CV- Darejan Tsartsidze

Irina Badurashvili's Analysis: 1. Evolution of official demographic statistics in Georgia since independence; 2. Changed official demographic statistics on Georgia for period 1996-2002; 3. Implementing a second statistics of births and deaths; 4. Governmental reforms to improve civil registration in Georgia; 5. Data available for analysis on trends in sex ratio at birth in Georgia and its limitations; 6. Trends in sex ratio at births in Georgia.

Letter – Regional study by WB team, 27 January 2014

Letter of Intent to Christophe Z. Guilmoto, 5 May 2014

Recruitment of Ms. Irina Badurashvili and Ms. Darejan Tsartsidze as Local Consultants for in-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection

Gender-based sex selection in Georgia. Context, Evidence, and Implications. Report Draft 1

Local Consultant on in-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection, Terms of reference Dea Tsartsidze

International Expert on in-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection, Terms of reference Guil-motto

Terms of reference, Research Firm Missing Girls in the South Caucasus, Qualitative Research on Skewed Sex Ratios at Birth: Georgia, December 11, 2013

Local Consultant on in-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection, Terms of reference Irina Badurashvili

UNFPA Guidance Note on Prenatal Sex Selection

UN personal history - Guilmoto Christophe

Financial proposal, Missing Girls in the South Caucasus, Qualitative Research on Skewed Sex Ratios at Birth

Technical proposal, qualitative research on skewed sex ratios at birth in Georgia

Vetting of Consultant for Global consultant Roster - Christophe Guilmoto

Media

AGENDA for Training for Media Professionals Sensitive Reporting – Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, 12-14 September, 2012

Media Training on Sensitive Reporting, September 12-14, 2012, Lopota, Kakheti

Recruitment of team of trainers for the media training, “Sensitive reporting on Gender and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights”

საკითხავი მასალა ჯურნალისტებისთვის - სენსიტიური რეპორტიინგი:
გენდერული თანასწორობა,
სქესობრივი დარეპროდუქციული ჯანმრთელობა და უფლებები

Media Training on Sensitive Reporting, Terms of Reference

მედია ტრენინგი - სენსიტიური რეპორტიინგი: გენდერული თანასწორობა,
სქესობრივი დარეპროდუქციული ჯანმრთელობა და უფლებები, ლოპოტასტა, 13–
14 სექტემბერი, 2012

MTM Trainings

ტრენინგი ტრენინგებისათვის: „მამაკაცურისა უბრები“- პროგრამა, 2012

მოდული - ტრენინგი ტრენინგებისათვის: „მამაკაცურისა უბრები“, 2012

UNFPA marks the International Women’s Day with a TOT session on Men Talking to Men

Signed Memorandum of Understanding between UNFPA and NGOs, 2012

Note for the file – Amendment of the Memorandum of Understanding with Woman’s Information Centre, 29 March, 2013

Description of Services and Terms of Reference. Project: Enhancing Male Support to Advancing GE and SRH & Rights

Terms of Reference, Enhancing Male Support to Advancing GE and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH & R)

სააპლიკაციო ფორმა - ტრენერთა ტრენინგი „მამაკაცურისა უბრები“

My Rights

საინფორმაციო ბროშურა - „ჩემო უფლებები“

Memorandum of Understanding between UNFPA and NGOs

პრე/პოსტტესტი - ტრენინგი

„მოზარდთა უფლებები დარეპროდუქციული ჯანმრთელობა“

Summary of bid evaluation, “Tanadgoma”

Description of Services and Terms of Reference, “Tanadgoma” 2013

Description of Services and Terms of Reference, “Tanadgoma” 2014

შეხვედრის კონცეფცია - მოზარდთა უფლებები დარეპროდუქციული ჯანმრთელობა, 24 მაისი, 2014

Peer Education

Terms of Reference, “Georgian Youth Development and Education Association”, organizing Peer Education Cascade Trainings

Description of services and Terms of Reference, “Georgian Youth Development and Education Association” 2012

Memorandum of Understanding “Georgian Youth Development and Education Association” 2012

Note for file - Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding with “Georgian Youth Development and Education Association” 2013

პრე/პოსტტესტი - სქესობრივად გადადამდები და ავადმდები დასახვა

Small Grants

Applications received for small grants competition & selected for second round, 2013

Small Grants, 18 May, 2013 _ - second round voting of finalists

Note for file - Small Grants competition 2013 Selection

Survey Men and Gender Relations in Georgia

Men and Gender Attitudes in Georgia: Presentation of the Research Main Findings, March 7, 2014

კვლევის ანგარიში: „კაცები და გენდერული ურთიერთობები“

Collection of posters created by Jumpstart Georgia

საქართველოში, ოჯახში საქმის განაწილება ქალებსა და კაცებს შორის

Institute of Social Studies and Analysis PROJECT PROPOSAL – Male Involvement for Gender Equality

Men and Gender Relations in Georgia (video)

მოსაზრებები რეპროდუქციული ჯანმრთელობის და ოჯახური ურთიერთობების შესახებ საქართველოში

Selection Note – Research – Male Involvement for Gender Equality, 7 March, 2013

Men and Gender Relations EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

მამაკაცი და გენდერული ურთიერთობები - შემავაზებელი და სკენა

Terms of Reference – Research – Male Involvement for Gender Equality (scanned)

Terms of Reference – Research – Male Involvement for Gender Equality (pdf)

Youth Festival

თელავის სახალგაზრდული ფესტივალი, 15 სექტემბერი 2013

Media Coverage on TOT Men Talking to Men training, 2013

Media Coverage Chart 2014

UNFPA Country Programme Georgia (2011 – 2015)

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the UNJP

Joint Programme Document (accessed on <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/JGE00>)

Copy of the Initial Programme Logframe

Standard Memorandum of Understanding for the UNJP to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia using Pass-Through Funds Management, November 2011

Standard Administrative Agreement for the UNJP to Enhance Gender Equality in Georgia using Pass-Through Funds Management, November 2011

JP Georgia Gender Equality Financial Reporting on Sources and Uses of Funds for the Period ending 31 December 2013 (accessed on <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/JGE00>)

Consolidated Annual Report on Activities Implemented under the Joint Programme “Enhanced Gender Equality in Georgia”, Report of the Administrative Agent for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2013; 31 May 2014

UNFPA in Georgia <http://www.georgiaunfpa.ge/en/unfpa-in-georgia>

UNJP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 15 April 2013

UNJP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 17 March 2014

საქართველოს პარლამენტის დადგენილება -

„საქართველოს ადამიანის უფლებათა დაცვის ეროვნული სტრატეგიის (2014–2020 წლებისთვის)“ დამტკიცების შესახებ

International and National Legal Instruments/Standards/Policies

2012-2015 National Action Plan of Georgia for the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions ## 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889 and 1960 on “Women, Peace and security” (unofficial translation, accessed through http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/georgia_napdec_27_2011.pdf)

Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), List of Issues and Questions in Relation to the combined fourth and fifth period reviews of Georgia, 28 October 2013

CEDAW Fourth and Fifth Periodic Report by Georgia

Georgia Law on Gender Equality, 26 October 2014 (unofficial translation)

Georgia Law on the Elimination of Domestic Violence, Protection and Support of Victims of Domestic Violence, 25 May 2006 (unofficial translation)

Georgia Law on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination, 2 May 2014 (unofficial translation)

Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention and Combatting Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), 2011, at <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/convention/Convention%20210%20English.pdf>

Decree of the Parliament of Georgia on Approval of the “2014-2016 Action Plan for the Implementation of Gender Equality Policy in Georgia”, unofficial translation,

Association Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the one part, and Georgia, of the other part. Official Journal of the European Union, 30.8.2014

Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, Istanbul, 11.V.2011, Council of Europe Treaty Series - No. 210

Human Rights Strategy Georgia 2013, in Georgian (UN Women)

UNFPA Country Programme Georgia (2011 – 2015)

Draft Stakeholder Map

This map does not incorporate individual suggestions and comments received from the three agencies. These will be reflected in the in-country work schedule.

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Direct Stakeholder	UNDP Georgia	Participating UN Agency Programme Management	Outcome 1 Enhanced women's political and economic empowerment Member of the Steering Committee	Tbilisi	Natia Natsvlishvili, ARR Gigi Bregadze, UNDP Democratic Governance Team Leader Ketevan Makharashvili
Direct Stakeholder	UN Women Georgia	Participating UN Agency Programme	Outcome 2 Enabling environment to eliminate violence against	Tbilisi	Tamar Sabedashvili National Programme Officer UN Women in Georgia

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
		Management	<p>women, especially domestic violence created in Georgia</p> <p>Member of the Steering Committee</p>		Irina Japharidze
Direct Stakeholder	UNFPA Georgia	<p>Participating UN Agency</p> <p>Programme Management</p>	<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Gender Equality advanced by creating enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of population</p> <p>Member of</p>	Tbilisi	<p>Lela Bakradze</p> <p>UNFPA Assistant Representative in Georgia</p> <p>Mariam Bandzeladze</p>

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			the Steering Committee		
Donor organization	Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida)	Bi-lateral Partner	Donor organisation	Embassy in Tbilisi	Eva Smedberg Helena Sancho
	Swedish International Development Cooperation	Bi-lateral partner	Donor organization	Stockholm, Sweden	Peeter Kaaman, <peeter.kaaman@gov.se>
Direct Stakeholder	Parliamentary Council on Gender Equality	National Partner at State Level	Co-chair of the Steering Committee	Kutaisi	Manana Kobakhidze Chair of the Council (GEC)
Direct Stakeholder	Ministry of Education and Science	National partner at State Level		Tbilisi	
Direct Stakeholder	Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs	National partner at State Level	Awareness Raising activities	Tbilisi	Giorgi Nizharadze President

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Direct Stakeholder	State Fund for Protection and Assistance of Victims of Human Trafficking and Domestic Violence	National Partner at State Level	Output 2.2 Opening/functioning shelters for DV victims/survivors	Tbilisi	Mari Meskhi Lia Melashvili
Direct Stakeholder	Georgian Rugby Union	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.3 Initiative “Sportsmen Unite against Violence Against Women”	Tbilisi	
Direct Stakeholder	Ministry of Internal Affairs	National partner at State Level	Output 2.2 Preparation of training manual for the police	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Direct Stakeholder	Police Academy of Georgia	National partner at State Level	Output 2.1 enhancement of DV related legislation	Tbilisi	
Direct Stakeholder	Ministry of Labour, Health, and Social Affairs	National partner at State Level	Output 2.1 Status and mandate of the social workers vis-à-vis combating DV developed through a participatory process;	Tbilisi	
Direct Stakeholder	Chief Prosecutor's Office of Georgia (the Ministry of Justice)	National partner at State Level	Output 2.2 Output 2.1 Training programme	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
)		for practicing prosecutors; Enhancement of DV related legislation		
Direct Stakeholder	Interagency Coordination Council on the Measures to Eliminate Domestic Violence(DV Council)	National Partner at State Level	Output 2.1 DV Legislation amendments, elaboration of DV policy	Tbilisi	Lika Sidamonidze DV Council Coordinator
Direct Stakeholder	Women’s Employment Support Association “Amagdari”	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 Socio-economic rehabilitation of DV victims/survivors; creating inclusive workplaces for women and men.	Tbilisi	Nino Shioshvili

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Direct Stakeholder	NGO Anti-Violence Network of Georgia	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 Training manual for the police; Training of policemen; Establishment of specialized police units on DV issues in Tbilisi, Samegrelo and Kakheti	Tbilisi	Nato Shavlakadze
Direct Stakeholder	Women’s Consultation Center “Sakhli”	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 Elaboration of model of crisis centres	Tbilisi	Annex 1 – Rusudan Pkhakadze Nana Khoshtaria
Direct Stakeholder	Training Centre of the Georgian Bar Associa-	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 Training programme	Tbilisi	Tiko Karseladze

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
	tion		for Lawyers on DV issues; Development of a DV curriculum for Lawyers.		
Direct Stakeholder	Georgian Association of Social Workers	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2. Elaboration of concept on the role of social workers in relation to combating DV.	Tbilisi	Nelly Akobia
Direct Stakeholder	Georgian Bar Association (GBA) – the professional self-regulating union of Georgian lawyers	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 GBA Designed a training programme for lawyers, a comprehensive curriculum has been designed on women's	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			rights and domestic violence, conducted a TOT		
Non-stakeholder expert	Kote Marjanishvili State Drama Theatre	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.3 Awareness raising activities; Promoting Zero Tolerance Towards the Practice of Violence awareness raising activities	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder expert	Georgian National Film Center	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.3 Development of a documentary on VAWG and DV issues	Tbilisi	
Non-stakeholder expert	Institute for Policy Studies	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.2 Baseline study	Tbilisi	
Direct Stakeholders	Local self-governments in Samegrelo Zemo-Svaneti region	National Implementing Partner	Output 2.3	Samegrelo Zemo-Svaneti region	
Non-stakeholder	Community based organization “Nefa”	Implementing partner at a local	Output 2.3	Samegrelo	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
expert		level	Awareness raising activities on DV issues		
Non-stakeholder experts	Poti Theatre	Implementing partner at a local level	Output 2.3 Interactive exhibit and performance "The Interior of Violence"	Poti	Tengiz Khukhia, Director of the Poti theatre; David Mghebrishvili, Art Director of the Poti theatre
Non-stakeholder experts	Broadcasting companies "Hereti" and "Tanamgzavri"	Implementing partner at a local level	Output 2.3 Awareness-raising (talk-shows)	Kakheti (Telavi, Kvareli)	
Non-stakeholder expert	Consultant	National Implementing Part-	Output 1.3 Study on Balancing	Tbilisi	Medea Badashvili

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
		ner	Work and Family		
Non-stakeholder experts	ACT - public opinion research and strategic consulting company	National Implementing Partner	Output 1.3 Research: Public perception study on gender issues in Business	Tbilisi	Rusudan Telia, director Nino Gachechiladze
Non-stakeholder experts	Women's Information Center	National Implementing Partner	Project: modernization of gender information network in south Caucasus	Tbilisi	Elene Rusetskaia
Non-stakeholder	International advisory centre for education of	Implementing	Output 1.2 Project : Facilitate	Tbilisi	Tamar Abramishvili

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
expert	women (IACEW)	Partner (International)	strengthened coordination betw. CSOs working on Gender issues		
Direct Stakeholder	National Statistics Service (GEOSTAT)	National partner at State Level	Output 1.2 Implementation of the project "gender sensitive statistics"	Tbilisi	Tengiz Tsekvava Deputy Director Giorgi Kalakashvili Lia Charekishvili
Direct Stakeholder	Public Defender's Office (PDO)	National partner at State Level	Output 1.2 Project: Capacity building of Centre On The Protection Of Rights Of	Tbilisi	Ucha Nanuashvili – Ombudsman Paata Beltadze - Deputy Natia Pirashvili - PwD Eka Skhiladze – Gender Center

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			Persons With Disabilities		
Non-stakeholder expert	Peoples Harmonious Development Society, NGO	National Implementing Partner	Partnered with IACEW to implement project: Facilitate strengthened coordination between CSOs working on Gender issues	Tbilisi	Nana Nazarova
Non-stakeholder expert	Caucasus Development Group, NGO	Implementing Partner	Partnered with IACEW to imple-		Charita Jashi

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			ment project: Facilitate strengthened coordination betw. CSOs working on Gender issues		
Non-stakeholder expert	Women Political Resource Center, NGO	National Implementing Partner	Partnered with IACEW to implement project: Facilitate strengthened coordination between CSOs working on Gender issues	Tbilisi	Lika Nadaraia
Non-stakeholder	Media House Dekom	National Implementing Partner	Output 1.1	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
expert			Organization of gender week, discussions in Tbilisi, Zugidi, Telavi; Blog about Gender Professions; Talk Show		
	PublicisZenthOptimedia	National Implementing Partner	Output 1.1 Public Awareness campaign	Tbilisi	Rusudan Gigineishvili Keti Chitanava Natia Gigineishvili
Non-stakeholder experts	Georgian Municipal Service Providers' Association (MSPA)	National Implementing Partner	Output 1.1	Tbilisi	Keti Jakeli Lali Sheshelidze

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			<p>Project: women can run the country : support for gender sensitive local governance;</p> <p>Leadership School for Elected Officials of Local Governance</p>		
Non-stakeholder expert	Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (NGO)	National Implementing Partner	<p>Output 1.1</p> <p>Implementation of the project:</p> <p>“Empowering Women for Change”.</p>	Tbilisi	Eka Urushadze Nino Vasadze

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder expert	Georgian Civic Development Association (GCDA)	National Implementing Partner	Output 1.3 Projects implemented through the micro-grant component of the project	Lagodekhi, Kakheti	Tamar Mosiashvili
	Association "Atinati"		1.3 Projects implemented through the micro-grant component of the project	Samegrelo	Gia Khasia
Non-stakeholder expert	Association of Women Farmers of Kakheti	Implementing Partner at a local level	Output 1.3 Capacity building of women farmers: Association estab-	Kakheti, Signagi Municipality, Village Sakobe	Irine Pxovelishvili

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			lished within UNJP to Support the activity of women farmers.		
Stakeholder	Shota Meskhia University	Implementing partner	1.3. VET education	Samegrelo	Teona Khupenia, Rector
Stakeholder	Vocational college “Aisi”	Implementing partner	1.3. VET education	Kakheti	Natela Papunashvili
Stakeholder	Vocational college “Pazisi”	Implementing partner	1.3. VET Education	Samegrelo, Poti	Nino Bakuradze
Non-stakeholder expert	Center for Information and Counselling on Reproductive Health “Tanadgoma	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Awareness raising	Tbilisi, Kakheti (Kvareli, Dedoplistskaro)	Khatuna Khajomia, Archil Rekhviashvili

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			project “My rights” and SRH&R issues (in secondary schools)		
Direct Stakeholder	Health and Social Affairs Committee at the Parliament of Georgia	National Partner at State Level	Output 3.3 Organization of a seminar: Reproductive health and rights in Georgia	Kutaisi	
Direct Stakeholder	Parliamentary All-Party Group on MDGs	National Partner at State Level	Output 3.3 Organization of a seminar: Reproductive health and rights in Georgia	Kutaisi	
Non-stakeholder expert	Women’s Information Center	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Men Talking to Men TOT on SRH&R,	Tbilisi	Elene Rusetskaia

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
			Gender equality, DV in Tbilisi, Kakheti		
Non-stakeholder expert	Youth Development and Education Association (GYDEA)	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Youth related advocacy events: Peer education TOT in Tbilisi, Kakheti; Awareness raising activities on SRH.	Tbilisi, Kakheti (Lagodekhi, Kvareli, Akhmeta, Sagarejo, Signaghi)	
Non-stakeholder expert	Georgian Patriarchy Charitable Foundation “Lazare”	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Awareness-raising activities	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder expert	NGO Children in Scotland	Implementing Partner (International)	Arranged a study tour for decision makers from the government of Georgia in Scotland	Scotland	
Non-stakeholder expert	European Youth Parliament –Georgia (EYP Georgia)	National Implementing Partner	Organization of Youth National and South Caucasus Forums on Youth Reproductive Health & Rights and Development	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder expert	Radio Station “Iveria” under the Georgian Patriarchate	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Awareness –raising Project ‘Support healthy lifestyle’ UNFPA	Tbilisi	
Non-stakeholder experts	Local Consultants	National Implementing Partners	Output 3.3 In-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection	Tbilisi	Irina Badurashvili, Darejan Tsartsidze
Non-stakeholder	International Expert	Implementing Partner	Output 3. 3 Report: Gender-		Christophe Z. Guilmoto

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
expert			biased sex selection in Georgia		
Non-stakeholder expert	Research Firm of international experts	Implementing Partners	Missing Girls in the South Caucasus: Qualitative Research on Skewed Sex Ratios at Birth		Nora Dudwick Giorgia Demarchi Maria Davalos Nistha Sinha
Non-stakeholder expert	Experts in media training: gender specialist, reproductive health and rights, media expert.	Implementing Partners	Output 3.3 Media Training on Sensitive Reporting	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder experts	1. Telavi State University Initiative Group	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	
Non-stakeholder experts	2. Local NGO Village Women for Human Rights	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder experts	3. Center for Civil Activities	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	
Non-stakeholder experts	4. Youth Development Center	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Non-stakeholder experts Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
Non-stakeholder experts	5. Initiative Group 'Women's club'	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	
Non-stakeholder experts	6. Community Development Center 'Aisi'	Local Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Selected Organization in Small Grants competition. Awareness raising activities.	Kakheti	
Non-stakeholder	Institute of Social Studies and Analysis	National Implementing Partner	Output 3.3 Study 'Men and	Tbilisi	

Type of Stakeholder	Name/Organisation	Nature	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)	Location	Contact
expert			Gender Relations in Georgia		

Field work schedules

Date	Time/Meeting with	Location/ Contact	Relating to which part of the Programme (subcomponent; or horizontal)
Sunday, 11 January 2015	Arrival	Tbilisi	
Monday, 12 January 2015	10:00 - Team Meeting	Hotel Demi, 10, Ananuri Str Tbilisi.	
	11:30 –UNDP mini-workshop; <u>Natia Natsvlishvili</u> ,Assistant Resident Representative (ARR); <u>Ketty Makharashvili</u> ; <u>Paata Giorgashvili</u> , Economic Expert	UNJP office – 4 Abashidze street, Tbilisi	Outcome 1 Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment
	13:30 - UNFPA mini-workshop. <u>Lela Bakradze</u> , UNFPA <u>Mariam Bandzeladze</u> , UNFPA Component Manager		Outcome 3 Gender Equality advanced by creating enabling environment to realize Sexual and Reproductive Rights of population
	15:00 - meeting with the Resident Coordinator, <u>Niels Scott</u> (UN RR), <u>Shombi Sharp</u> , <u>Natia Natsvlishvili</u> (UNDP)		
	17:00 – UNW mini-workshop; <u>Irina Japharidze</u> , UNJP UN Women Component Manager; <u>Tamar Sabedashvili</u> , UN Women Programme Specialist		Outcome 2 Enabling environment to eliminate violence against women, especially domestic violence

			created in Georgia
Tuesday, 13 January 2015	11:30 – Natia Natsvlishvili, Assistant Resident Representative (ARR)	UNJP office – 4 Abashidze street, Tbilisi	Outcome 1 Enhanced women’s political and economic empowerment
	13:00 - <u>Nincho Tsereteli, Director; Khatuna Khajomia, Archil Rekhviashvili</u>	Centre for Information and Counselling on Reproductive Health “Tanadgoma”, Tbilisi. 21 A. Kurdiani str	Output 3.3 Awareness raising project “My rights” and SRH&R issues (in secondary schools)
	14:00 - <u>Rusudan Gigineishvili, Ketu Chitanava, Natia Gigineishvili</u>	PublicisZenthOptimedia, Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze St. Ketu Chitanava	Output 1.1 Public Awareness campaign
	14:30 – <u>Edo Demetrashvili, President</u>	Youth Development and Education Association (GYDEA). UN JP Office. 4 Abashidze St.	Output 3.3 Youth related advocacy events: Peer education TOT in Tbilisi, Kakheti; Awareness raising activities on SRH.
	16:00 - <u>Eva Smedberg; Helena Sancho</u>	Swedish Embassy, Tbilisi. 15, Turn Kipshidze	Donor organisation
Wednesday, 14 January 2015	10:00 - <u>Eka Urushadze; Nino Vasadze</u>	Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (NGO). Delisi	Output 1.3 Implementation of the project: “Empowering Women for Change”.

	1st Lane 5a.	
10:00 – <u>Iago Kachkachishvili</u>	Institute of Social Studies and Analysis, Tbilisi. Iago Kachkachishvili – Address: #14 Chavchavadze Tbilisi State University	Output 3.3 Study ‘Men and Gender Relations in Georgia
11:00 – <u>Mariam Jashi</u> , Former Deputy Minister of Labour, Health and Social Affairs.	Tbilisi Address: Administration of Government of Georgia; #7 IngorokvaSt.	Output 2.1 Status and mandate of the social workers vis-à-vis combating DV developed through a participatory process;
12:00 - Gela Mtivlishvili, Center for Civil Activities, Kakheti And RusaJamaspishvili, Programme officer, Broadcasting companies “Hereti”	Address: UN JP office 4 Abashidzest.	Small Grants Competition winners 2013
12:00 – <u>DarejanShengelia</u> , programme coordinator	Radio Station “Iveria” under the Georgian Patriarchate, Tbilisi.	Output 3.3 Awareness –raising Project ‘Support healthy lifestyle’ UNFPA
13:00 –Lunch		
14:00 - <u>Elene Rusetskaia</u> , Chairperson of Organization. Mamuka Gachechiladze, Programme Manager	Women’s Information Center, Tbilisi. Helen (Maia) Rusetsky (Rusetskaia) Venue: #	Project: modernization of gender information network in south Caucasus. Output 3.3 Men Talking to MenTOT on SRH&R, Gender

		40 Tsinamdzgvrishvili Street. WIC office	equality, DV in Tbilisi, Katheti
	14:30 – Irma Manjavidze	Address: UN JP Office. 4 Abashidzest.	Local Expert on Healthcare response
	16:00 – <u>Giga Chikadze</u> ; NodarAndguladze	UNJP Offices, Abashidze 4	Output 2.3 Sportsmen UNiTE to End VAW Awareness raising
Thursday, 15 January 2015	10:00 - <u>Rusudan Pkhakadze, Nana Khoshtaria, Lana Papava</u>	Women’s Consultation Center, “Sakhli”, Tbilisi. 3 Gambashidzest. Rusudan Pkhakadze	Output 2.2 Elaboration of model of crisis centres
	11:30 - <u>Tengiz Tsekvava</u> , Deputy Director; <u>Giorgi Kalakashvili</u> ; <u>Lia Charekishvili</u>	National Statistics Service (GEOSTAT), Tbilisi. Head Office: 30, TsotneDadiani Str.Statistical Bureau Office	Output 1.2 Implementation of the project "gender sensitive statistics”
	12:00 – <u>Rati Bregadze</u> , Deputy Minister of Sports and Youth Affairs. <u>BelaBeridze</u> , Head of Analytical Department, Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs.	Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs	Awareness Raising activities
	13:00 – Lunch		
	14:00 - Rusudan Kervalishvili – Former Chair of the Parliamentary GEC	UNJP office. 4 Abashidzest. Tbilisi	Output 1.1 Former Member of JP Steering Committee

	14:30 - <u>Irina Badurashvili</u> , In-depth analysis on pre-natal sex, local Consultant.	Tbilisi. Irina Badurashvili Address: UN JP office. 4 Abashidzest.	Output 3.3 In-depth analysis on pre-natal sex selection
	16:30 - <u>Mari Meskhi</u> , head of the State Fund; <u>Lia Melashvili</u>	State Fund for Protection and Assistance of Victims of Human Trafficking and Domestic Violence, Tamarashvili str.15a, Tbilisi. Mari Meskhi	Output 2.2 Opening/functioning shelters for DV victims/survivors, DV hotline
Friday, 16 January 2015	10:00 - Keti Jakeli	Georgian Municipal Service Providers' Association (MSPA)	Output 1.2 Project: women can run the country : support for gender sensitive local governance; Leadership School for Elected Officials of Local Governance
	11:30 -- <u>MakaPeradze</u> , Head of the Secretariat of the DV Commission of the Ministry of Internal Affairs; <u>NodarSaakashvili</u> , Head of Patrol Police Training Faculty	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Tbilisi. Kakheti ave. 38 km.	Output 2.2 MOU with UN Women Preparation of training manual for the police Training of policemen; Establishment of specialized police units on DV issues in Tbilisi, Samegrelo and Kakheti

13:00 – Lunch		
14:30 - Nino Shioshvili	Women’s Employment Support Association, “Amagdari” Tbilisi. UNJP offices, Abashidze 4	Output 2.2 Socio-economic rehabilitation of DV victims/survivors; creating inclusive workplaces for women and men.
14:30 – <u>Natia Pirashvili</u> –PwD	UNJP office, 4 Abashidzest. Tbilisi	Output 1.2 Project:Capacity building of Centre On The Protection Of Rights Of Persons With Disabilities
16:00 –Irma Kurtanidze, Gori; MtvarisaDjangidze, Kvareli. Women councillors	UNJP office, 4 Abashidzest. Tbilisi	Output 1.2
16:30 –TatiaVashakidze, Oxfam.	Kipshidzest. 20. 2 nd floor. Tbilisi.	NGO
16:00 - <u>Nana Janelidze</u> , Director	Georgian National Film Center, Tbilisi. Z. Gamsakhurdia coast #4. Building of Ministry of Culture. Entrance from side. Floor 4.	Output 2.3 Development of a documentary on VAWG and DV issues

	17:30 – <u>Lika Jalagonia</u> , Human Rights House. Project “Article 42”.	Article 42.Kavrtariast. 11a. former 2 nd turn.	NGO
Saturday, 17 January 2015	7:00 - Travel to Telavi		
	9:00 – Sakobo	Irine Pkhovelishvili, Chair of the Association	UNDP Association of Women Farmers of Kakheti
	11:00 – Tsnori	Shelter	UNW Output 2.2
	13:00 – Anuki Mosiashvili, Youth Development Center, Kakheti (2013-2014) Tinatin Khanjaliashvili, Kakheti Civil League, Telavi (2014) Gocha Shavgulidze, Local Organization “Ioni” (2014) Maia Mamulashvili, Media Centre Kakheti (2014)	Telavi Centre for Civic Engagement. Address: 3, Vazha-Pshavela St. Telavi	UNFPA
	15:00 – Pshaveli	Levan Rostomashvili – coordinator of CSRDG Telavi Bureau	UNDP Trainings and Consultations for women (educational project)
Sunday, 18 January 2015	09:00 – drive to Akhmeta		
	12:00 - Akhmeta	Kakheti Regional Development Foundation Akhmeta, Cholokashvili str. 52	UNW Output 2.2 Public awareness raising on DV

		Iza Bekauri	
	15:00 – Kachreti	Natela Papunashvili Director	UNDP VET – College “Aisi”
	16:30 – Ninotsminda	Elene Samkhtuashvili – coordinator of community group	UNDP Kindergarten open space
	17:30 – drive to Tbilisi		
Monday, 19 January 2015	10:00 – Marina Tabukashvili	Taso Founda- tion.Rezitabukashvili 15. Former Dzneladzest.	NGO
	13:00 –lunch		
	16:00 –Nato Shavlakadze, Director	NGO Anti-Violence Net- work of Georgia, Zurab Chavchavadze 9 (former Sheroziastr.), Tbilisi.	Output 2.2 Training manual for the police; Training of policemen; Establishment of specialized police units on DV issues in Tbilisi, Samegrelo and Kakheti

	17:30 - <u>Nana Sumbadze</u> , Director	Institute for Policy Studies, Tbilisi. 10, Chavchavadze av.entr.VI. (entrance from Napareuli street) +99532-2200060; +99532-2912743. Cell599580798	Output 2.2 Baseline study Gender Trainings at VETs (output 1.3.1)
Tuesday, 20 January 2015	10:00 - <u>Manana Kobakhidze</u> , Chair of the Council (GEC), <u>Guguli Magradze</u> and <u>Gigla Agulashvili</u>	Parliamentary Council on Gender Equality, Tbilisi. @ Parliament, Rustaveli-Ave.	Co-chair of the Steering Committee
	12:30 – European Youth Parliament Georgia (EYP Georgia)Koka Kapanadze	Tbilisi. Address: UN JP Office 4 Ir. Abashidze	Organization of Youth National and South Caucasus Forums on Youth Reproductive Health & Rights and Development
	14:00 - <u>Nino Bolkvadze</u> , Lawyer; <u>Ana Rekhvashvili</u> , Director	LGBT and Gender Equality organization "Identoba",Tbilisi. Rustaveli 37. Apt.1.	UN Women indirect stakeholder Output 2.1 National laws and policies on domestic violence improved in line with international commitments
	16:00 - <u>Nino Japiashvili</u> , reproductive health and rights, media expert	Address: UN JP office, 4 Ir. Abashidze	Output 3.3 Media Training on Sensitive Reporting

	17:00 - <u>Rusudan Telia</u> , director; Nino Gachechiladze	ACT - public opinion research and strategic consulting company, Tbilisi. RusudanTelia- Sairme Hill	Output 1.3 Research: Public perception study on gender issues in Business
Wednesday, 21 January 2015	10:00 – Ninia Macharashvili, Sopo Datuashvili	UNJP Office. 4 Abashidzesrt. Tbilisi	Radio GIPA journalists. Project: “Daddy read me a book”
	11:30 – <u>Merabi Pachulia</u> , Managing Director, Badri Kutelia	Georgian Opinion Research Business International (GORBI). Tashkent Str. 34	Conducting field work for the research on Skewed Sex Ratio at Birth
	12:45 – <u>Nino Japiashvili</u> , reproductive health and rights, media expert	UNJP office. 4 Abashidzest.	UNFPA
	14:30 – <u>Ucha Nanuashvili</u> – Ombudsman; <u>Paata Beltadze</u> – Deputy; <u>Eka Skhiladze</u> – Gender Equality Department	Public Defender’s Office (PDO), Tbilisi. 6 Nino Ramishvili St.	Output 1.2 Project: Capacity building of Centre On The Protection Of Rights Of Persons With Disabilities Output 2.2 Gender Equality Department Gender Mainstreaming in PDO work

	16:00 –Sopo Japaridze and Natalia Jaliashvili	State Chancellory at 7 Ingorokva street.	UNDP
	17:30 – Tiko Karseladze, Director	Training Centre of the Georgian Bar Association, Tbilisi. Dzmebi Zubalashvilebi str. 33	Output 2.2 Training programme for Lawyers on DV issues; Development of a DV curriculum for Lawyers.
Thursday, 22 January 2015	9:00 – Kvinna till Kvinna	Alexi Mashavarianistr 1 (former Aragvistr 1).	
	10:00 – <u>Nino Kvitaishvili, Tea Qarchava, Nino Tsandishvili.</u>	Ministry of Education and Science	UNFPA review of textbooks
	11:00 –Maka Meshveliani	NDI, 3 Tabukashvilist. Tbilisi	
	11:30 – <u>Ekaterine Aghdgomelashvili; Natia Gvianishvili</u>	WISG - Women's Initiatives Supporting Group (WISG) – NGO, Tbilisi. Bakhtrioni st.12a.	UN women indirect stakeholder. Output 2.1 National laws and policies on domestic violence improved in line with international commitments
	12:30 - <u>Medea Badashvili</u> , Study on Balancing Work and Family Consultant	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze st. Medea Badashvili	Output 1.3 Study on Balancing Work and Family

<p>13:00–<u>Charita Jashi</u>, Caucasus Development Group, NGO;<u>Lika Nadaraia</u>, Women Political Recourse Center, NGO;<u>Tsovinar Nazarova</u>, Peoples Harmonious Development Society, NGO</p>	<p>International advisory centre for education of women (IACEW), Tbilisi. 4 Abashidze str.</p>	<p>Output 1.2 Project: Facilitate strengthened coordination between CSOs working on Gender issues. Partnered with IACEW to implement project: Facilitate strengthened coordination between CSOs working on Gender issues</p>
<p>14:00 –<u>Keti Khutsishvili</u></p>	<p>European Union Delegation, Tbilisi. 38 Nino Chkheidzest.</p>	
<p>14:30 - <u>Natia Partskhaladze</u></p>	<p>Georgian Association of Social Workers, Tbilisi. 44 Kazbegi ave.</p>	<p>Output 2.2. Elaboration of concept on the role of social workers in relation to combating DV.</p>
<p>16:00 –<u>Maia Kvirikashvili</u>, Head of the Human Rights Protection Unit of the Chief Prosecutor’s Office of Georgia; <u>Sophie Jiadze</u>, Head of the Professional Development and Career Management Center of the Chief Prosecutor’s Office of Georgia</p>	<p>#24, Gorgasali Street, Tbilisi, 0114</p>	<p>Output 2.2 DV training of prosecutors</p>
<p>17:30 – <u>Eka Mazmishvili</u>, Director of the Marjanishvili State Drama Theatre</p>	<p>8 Marjanishvilist.</p>	<p>Output 2.3 DV awareness raising</p>
<p>17:30- <u>Eka Gejadze</u>, Program Coordinator, Women’s fund Georgia</p>	<p>8, Sergo Zakariadze Str., entrance 4</p>	

Friday, 23 January 2015	10:00 – 13:00 UNJP debriefing	4, Abashidze str. Tbilisi	
	15:00 Niels Scott (UN RR) and Erika Kvapilova (UN Women Resident Representative)		
	16:00 Swedish Embassy, Eva Smedberg and Helena Sancho		
Thursday, 5 February 2015	11:00 – 12:00 - Ketii Miminaishvili, Social and Gender assessment Director, Millennium Challenge Account	52, Dimitri Uznadze str , Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia, Tbilisi, Georgia	UN partner organization
Friday, 6 Feb- ruary 2015	14:00 - 15:00 - Ketevan Chkheidze – Gender consultant for Asian Development Bank (ADB) - Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan	34 Rustaveli ave, Prospero’s Books Tbilisi, Georgia	UN partner organization
Saturday, 7 February 2015	12.00 – 13.00 - Women’s Initiative Group members	Katheti Kvareli municipality, village Eniseli Eniseli centre	Output 1.3.: Local women empowered economically and politically through better opportunities for income generation and political participation.
Saturday, 7 February 2015	14.00 – 15.00 - Women’s Initiative Group “Tsisartkela” members	Lagodekhi Municipality, Village Vardisubali Var- disubani centre	Output 1.3.: Local women empowered economically and politically through better opportunities for income generation and political participation.
Saturday, 7 February 2015	15.15 – 16.30 - Heretiskari community centre members	Lagodekhi Municipality, Village Heretiskari Heretiskari centre	
Friday, 20	10:00 - 11:30 - Ninia Macharashvili and Sopo Mo-	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4	Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted

February 2015	siashvili: Awareness raising campaign "Daddy, Read me a Book"	Abashidze st.	through an enabling sociocultural environment
Friday, 20 February 2015	11:30 - 13:00 Ana Mosiashvili: Winner of the Small Grants Competition	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze st.	Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling sociocultural environment
Friday, 20 February 2015	13:00 - 14:00 Medea Khmelidze: youth participating in the Youth Policy formulation.	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze st.	Output 3.1 Enhanced capacity of policy makers to integrate Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH&R) into the Population policies and national development frameworks with particular focus on Youth
Saturday , 21 February 2015	12:00 - 13:30 Salome Kandelaki, Mariam Maisuradze, Koka Kapanadze: South Caucasus Youth Forum, National Youth Forums	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze st.	Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling sociocultural environment
Monday, 23 February 2015	12:00 - 12:45 Elene Rusetskaya, Mamuka Gachechiladze, Women's Information Center, MTM Training Sessions	Tbilisi, Tsinamdzgvrivili #40, WIC office	Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling sociocultural environment
Monday, 23 February 2015	15:00 - 16:00 Gela Mtvlishvili, Winner of the Small Grants Competition	Tbilisi. UNJP office, 4 Abashidze st.	Output 3.3 Gender Equality and SRH&R promoted through an enabling sociocultural environment
Monday, 23 February 2015	17:00 - 17:45 Lia Gigauri, Deputy Minister of Education and Science of Georgia,	Tbilisi, Ministry of Education and Science , Uznadze 52	Output 3.1 Enhanced capacity of policy makers to integrate Gender Equality and Sexual and Reproductive Health & Rights (SRH&R) into the Population policies and national development frameworks with particular focus on Youth

