



**POST PROJECT EVALUATION  
FOR THE  
UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND**

**UNDEF Funded Project / UDF-13-574-GEO  
Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia**

**Date: 22 November 2017**

# Table of Contents

## Contents

I.	OVERALL ASSESSMENT .....	1
II.	PROJECT CONTEXT.....	2
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	5
IV.	EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	6
	(i) Relevance .....	6
	(ii) Effectiveness.....	8
	(iii) Efficiency.....	14
	(iv) Impact .....	16
	(v) Sustainability .....	16
	(vi) UNDEF added value .....	19
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	20
VI.	LESSONS LEARNED .....	21

**Acknowledgements**

The Evaluator would like to thank the Iare Pekhit Team, particularly Khatuna Gvelesiani, for the time and energy devoted to this process. Thanks, are also due to all of the interviewees, including the government officials, civil society leaders and UN officials.

**Disclaimer**

The views expressed in this report are those of the Evaluator. They do not represent those of UNDEF or any of the institutions referred to in the report

**Authors**

This report was written by Kristen Sample

## I. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

From 1 December 2014 to 31 December 2016, Iare Pekhit implemented the project “Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia” in Tbilisi and three other Georgian municipalities -- Batumi, Kutaisi and Rustavi. The project was generated by UNDEF itself, which approached the embryonic Iare Pekhit group and asked it to design the initiative as a response to the asymmetrical power balance between cars and humans in many post-Soviet cities. The total project budget was USD \$150,000 including 5% set aside for external monitoring and evaluation costs. The project objective was “To create a systematic long-term approach and corresponding tools to effectively impact pedestrian strategy development and state accountability to pedestrian policy development and execution.”

The aimed to achieve the following two outcomes:

- Strengthened civil society platform focusing on public space issues through better collaboration; and
- Increased long-term commitment of urban policy makers to effectively respond to pedestrian-specific issues through sustainable strategies

By the project close date, the project had achieved a number of key results including:

- Input into legislation (approved in 2017)-- that included a number of regulations focused on driver and pedestrian safety- through a series of public events, civic pressure and meetings with officials
- 325 members registered in the Pedestrian Association;
- 23 civil society organizations (CSO's) registered as Pedestrian Association members;
- 22 Georgian urban artists supporting the Pedestrian Association with 13 projects designed;
- Strategy and Fundraising Plan for the Association
- Nine public discussions held on pedestrian rights, public transport, and urban spaces.

The project focus was timely and relevant. The project approach was innovative and agile in adapting to shifts in the context. The project achieved its objectives and was cost-efficient and well managed. The project faces sustainability challenges, but the project approach and grantee could potentially adapt and tailor their work to both international donors and other interested stakeholders. UNDEF's flexible approach, initiative in generating project ideas and willingness to generate a project in partnership with a largely unproven CSO in response to a particular need are valuable assets in the context of this project.

For Iare Pekhit, the evaluation's key recommendations include:

- Ensure that future projects explicitly consider and raise awareness regarding the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups and establish partnerships with women's organizations and CSO's representing other marginalized communities;
- Consider developing formal partnerships with research organizations or think tanks, particularly those specialized in related topics such as public transportation;

- Further develop internal instruments for enhanced outreach and decision making including the member database, streamlined periodic communication with members, and analysis of member feedback;
- Consider revenue generating mechanisms including: a) membership fees; b) services fees; and c) private sector support; and
- Build on project success to develop spin-off products that can be presented to international donors;

For UNDEF, the evaluation's key recommendations include:

- Continue taking chances on nascent and unproven CSO's;
- Continue identifying critical democracy needs and working with CSO's to generate project ideas; and
- Facilitate contacts for CSOs with relevant agencies within the UN System, particularly in support of analysis, outreach and networks that meet the needs of vulnerable groups.

Lessons learned that could be applied to other projects in this context include:

- *The perfect is the enemy of the good.* Compromise is often a necessary element of successful advocacy processes. Imperfect legislation can be better than no legislation, particularly when amendments can be introduced later.
- *Seeing is believing:* Innovative techniques based on demonstration and experiential learning can be powerful tools for awareness raising.
- *There is value in courting controversy:* Strategies seen as controversial can generate more media buzz and can capture public attention.
- *Narrow v. broad:* Finding solutions to complex problems may require specialized CSO's to partner with organizations with complementary themes and skillsets.
- *Creating coalitions is easier than maintaining them:* Broad-based coalitions hold promise, but also pitfalls in terms of communication and cohesion.
- *Advocacy doesn't end with passage of law:* Getting a law passed is only the beginning. Monitoring and further advocacy may be needed to ensure the law is implemented.
- *Sustainability is a constant struggle:* A CSO's search for sustainability is never-ending. Every new project should include the "seeds" (innovative strategies) of future sustainability. Additionally, since securing funds from a specific international donor can take months or years, CSOs should continue fundraising and cultivating donors even in relatively "flush" times.

## II. PROJECT CONTEXT

### *Development and democracy context*

Since its independence from the Soviet Union a quarter century ago, Georgia has undergone a period of profound reforms in pursuit of economic development, state capacity building and democratic governance. Classified by the World Bank as a lower middle-income

country<sup>1</sup>, Georgia's gross domestic product is currently \$3,810<sup>2</sup> and its poverty rate (in 2014) stood at 32.2%, down from 42.6% in 2004<sup>3</sup>. In 2016, the Georgia-European Union Association agreement entered into force, bringing with it a number of requirements that Georgia must fulfill in terms of democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

On the democratic governance side, Georgia is often seen as a “success story in an authoritarian neighborhood,<sup>4</sup>” with an open and competitive political environment and elections—including at the national level since 2012 and most recently seen at the municipal level in October 2017—that have been characterized as well-administered and respectful of fundamental freedoms<sup>5</sup>.

The context is not exempt of challenges however. Social inclusion represents a critical need in Georgia, particularly given the country's multiple schisms across ethnic, religious, rural/urban, gender and dis/ability lines. Economic development has not brought equal benefits to all of its citizens. There is evidence of systematic discrepancies across social groups, indicating that not all citizens enjoy the same opportunities<sup>6</sup>.

Democratic culture in Georgia is still nascent. Though corruption has decreased considerably over the last decades, Georgia still stands at 44<sup>th</sup> out of 176 countries according to the Transparency International Index<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, social and political accountability traditions and mechanisms are still evolving and politicians have often been found to prioritize the interests of elite business enterprises over citizen interests. This dynamic is illustrated perhaps most clearly by the Panorama construction project, currently designed as the largest real estate development in Georgian history, including a luxury hotel, golf course and business centre. The Panorama project violates numerous historic, cultural and environmental regulations and was met with protests and some negative (domestic and international) press coverage. Nonetheless, the project continues to move forward—allegedly due to pressure from the former Prime Minister (and country's richest man)<sup>8</sup>.

The issue of “public spaces” is one that touches on questions of the quality of democratic governance as well as social inclusion. Tbilisi and other Georgian cities have developed according to the preferences of a smaller and more affluent group—in this case, the owners of private cars—rather than the needs of the broader public who would benefit from public transportation and pedestrian access. Public transportation funding and usage have

---

<sup>1</sup> World Bank, 2017, “New Country Classifications”: <https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-country-classifications-income-level-2017-2018>

<sup>2</sup> See World Bank Georgia Data Catalogue <https://data.worldbank.org/country/georgia>

<sup>3</sup> World Bank Group, 2016, “Recent Trends and Drivers of Poverty Reduction”

<sup>4</sup> De Waal, Carnegie Endowment

<sup>5</sup> See reports by Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/georgia/297546> and <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/georgia/351616>

<sup>6</sup> World Bank, Social Inclusion, p. 7

<sup>7</sup> For more details, see Transparency International Georgia webpage: <https://www.transparency.org/country/GEO>

<sup>8</sup> Zhvania, Irakli, Open Democracy

decreased considerably in recent decades. Prior to independence, Tbilisi had a fleet of 900 buses, while the current figure is only 500 – in spite of the increase in population<sup>9</sup>. Private car ownership implies a series of negative externalities. In addition to a high accident rate—the national rate is 2.5 times above the EU average<sup>10</sup>—Tbilisi’s reliance on car ownership implies externalities in terms of air pollution, loss of cultural heritage buildings, public recreation and obesity. In spite of these problems, national and city officials have not invested in models of sustainable urban planning that would include features such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and green spaces.

This burden falls most heavily on certain groups. For instance, there are an estimated 342,000 persons living with disabilities (PWDs) in Georgia<sup>11</sup>. For them, barriers to physical access to public spaces and infrastructure can impede the achievement of basic and fundamental activities ranging from grocery shopping to attending school to gaining employment<sup>12</sup>. Additionally, women—who depend on public transportation at a higher rate and disproportionately assume responsibility for care of children and the elderly- are more exposed to the roadway dangers as they seek to cross streets or otherwise safely reach their destinations.

### **The project objective**

From 1 December 2014 – 31 December 2016, Iare Pekhit implemented the project “Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia” in Tbilisi and three other municipalities (Batumi, Kutaisi, Rustavi). The total budget was USD \$150,000 including 5% set aside for external monitoring and evaluation costs.

The project objective was “To create a systematic long-term approach and corresponding tools to effectively impact pedestrian strategy development and state accountability to pedestrian policy development and execution.”

The project sought to achieve two outcomes:

- ✓ Strengthened civil society platform focusing on public space issues through better collaboration; and
- ✓ Increased long-term commitment of urban policy makers to effectively respond to pedestrian-specific issues through sustainable strategies

By the project close date, Iare Pekhit had achieved a number of key results including:

- Input into legislation (later approved in 2017)-- that included a number of regulations focused on driver and pedestrian safety- through a series of public events, civic pressure and meetings with officials.
- 325 members registered in the Pedestrian Association on the website<sup>13</sup>;
- 23 CSOs registered as Pedestrian Association members;

---

<sup>9</sup> Interview with IP staff

<sup>10</sup> Interview with Ekaterine Laliashvili, Chair of the Board at the Alliance for Safe Roads

<sup>11</sup> World Bank Social Inclusion, p. 23

<sup>12</sup> World Bank Social Inclusion, p.49

<sup>13</sup> By November 2017, the number of registered members had increased to approximately 400.

- 22 Georgian urban artists supporting the Pedestrian Association with 13 projects designed;
- Strategic and Fundraising Plan created by the Association
- Nine public discussions held to discuss pedestrian rights, public transport, and urban spaces, including one film screening on Colombia's transformative transportation

## **Intervention rationale**

Iare Pekhiti was founded in 2012 with the mission of raising awareness on pedestrian safety and pedestrian rights. Within a broader framework of public accountability and social inclusion, IP focused on issues including: sidewalk quality and access, crosswalk safety, street and subway sanitation, public space management and (architectural) cultural heritage.

UNDEF played a critical role in the genesis of this project. During a mission to Georgia, the UNDEF Executive Director identified the need for the project as well as Iare Pekhiti as the most appropriate project applicant. During a meeting in Tbilisi, the UNDEF Executive Director suggested that IP develop a project proposal for UNDEF consideration. Though IP had worked on pedestrian rights/access previously, their efforts had been primarily limited to small-scale photography and other art projects aimed at raising awareness and promoting activism. Prior to UNDEF funding, IP had an annual budget of approximately \$20,000 through small grant funding from the Swiss Embassy and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), but had never had the funds available to focus on legal issues or develop a membership base.

## **III. METHODOLOGY**

An independent expert conducted the present evaluation, according to the guidelines of UNDEF's Operational Manual. After reading and analyzing the project documents and other relevant literature, the Evaluator prepared the Launch Note describing the analytical methodology, techniques, and instruments used during the evaluation mission. The evaluation was conducted according to the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and UNDEF value added.

The Evaluator developed semi-structured interview and focus group protocols to guide questioning and discussions around the questions included in the Launch Note. Prior to each interview and focus group, the Evaluator explained the purpose of the meeting and provided assurances of respondent anonymity. The report paraphrases all quotes and protects the anonymity of respondent institutions. An (independent) interpreter was used for any interviewees not fluent in English.

Prior to the field mission, the Evaluator spoke via skype with current Iare Pekhiti Director Khatuna Gvelesiani and conducted a skype interview with the former Iare Pekhiti Executive Director Elene Margvelashvili. The field visit took place from 6-10 November, 2017. The visit initiated with in-depth interviews of members of the Iare Pekhiti team. The Evaluator also conducted interviews with partner organizations, external experts, officials from the municipal and national governments and UNDP. A focus group was conducted with Iare Pekhiti volunteers. Although most of the fieldwork took place in Tbilisi, the Evaluator also

vised Rustavi for interviews and to view public art supported by the project. Through these meetings, the Evaluator collected a broad array of perspectives around the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. Annex 3 contains the complete list of interviews and focus groups.

In the interests of transparency and accountability, it is important to note several methodological limitations in this evaluation report:

- Although the UNDEF guidance includes “impact” as an evaluation criteria, the lack of a control group against which to measure outcomes in a counterfactual scenario precludes statements about program “impact.” Rather, this report constitutes a “performance” evaluation in which actual Iare Pekhit performance is measured against stated objectives and best practices.
- The Evaluator needed to rely upon Iare Pekhit to facilitate contact with interviewees and focus group participants. Although the Evaluator proposed the list of contacts for interviews, Iare Pekhit managed access to interviewees and focus groups participants. This dynamic, while necessary to reach relevant stakeholders, may potentially have led to selection bias. It should be noted, however, that Iare Pekhit did not prevent interviews with any particular organizations and, in fact, facilitated far better access than had the Evaluator reached out to potential interviewees on her own.
- An additional limitation is courtesy bias, whereby interviewees or survey respondents who have benefitted from Iare Pekhit assistance are hesitant to speak negatively of the assistance. The Evaluator sought to overcome this bias by triangulation across multiple data sources, asking follow-up questions during interviews, and providing assurance at the start of meetings to indicate that findings would be confidential and without implications for the respondent. Iare Pekhit staff were not present during the interviews and focus groups.

## IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### *(i) Relevance*

*1. Project objectives were relevant to the needs of target communities, as well as the democratic context in terms of:*

a). The project met a significant need. Stakeholders were unanimous in confirming the relevance of this project in the Georgian context. The core target beneficiaries were the pedestrian population, who lacked safe access around the city and whose perspectives were not taken into account in the decision-making process. Tbilisi—and other Georgian citizens—are currently organized around the needs of drivers with little consideration for the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and even users of public transport. This orientation brings with it a series of negative externalities related to environmental sustainability, public health, and tourism and economic development.

b). The issue of pedestrian rights is an “uncrowded space” in the Georgian civil society landscape. Stakeholders confirmed that Iare Pekhit’s efforts did not duplicate the work of other CSOs or government agencies. There are other organizations dealing with road safety,

though urban planning/development is generally neglected by Georgian CSOs. Iare Pekhit's focus on pedestrian rights was described as a particularly unique "niche."

c) The IP approach was viewed as "fresh" yet appropriate. After a long history of conflicts and protests, Tbilisi residents—particularly young people— are largely apathetic and suffering from "activism fatigue". In this context, IP's atypical creative use of art, humour and positive messaging as well as its human-centric focus were described by stakeholders as "fun", "interactive," a "breath of fresh air" and "cool" and appealing to young people. Even stakeholders representing more mainstream institutions asserted that IP had demonstrated an ability to take risks without producing a backlash or becoming counter-productive.

d). The project's original geographic targeting strategy (Tbilisi and six secondary cities) was overly ambitious. Initially, the project was designed to cover Tbilisi as well as six other municipalities. Once the project got underway however, IP staff determined it would be better to deepen the level of engagement in Tbilisi. Stakeholders saw this shift as sound given that the challenges to pedestrian rights are far more acute in Tbilisi in terms of car ownership rates, congestion, and pollution. Furthermore the amount of project funding and IP's own limited capacity and regional networks made geographic expansion unrealistic. In the end, geographic outreach was limited to an art project in Rustavi and a coordinated event (flash-mob style) commemorating International Road Safety Day on November 20 in four cities.

e). IP was able to adapt its programming to the shifting political context. In addition to the (justified) reduction in the geographic scope, IP also proved adept at adapting its work and approach to emerging opportunities or challenges. For instance, the original project proposal had included the development and drafting of legislation. However, when the Ministry of the Interior (MoI) launched a bill, IP determined that it would make more sense to engage in and influence the MOI's proposal rather than seek to push their own initiative. IP engaged in a dual-pronged strategy during the advocacy process that included both constructive and frequent dialogue with the MoI on the content of the law as well as civic activism to pressure parliament on approval of the legislation.

Another example is the "Panorama" project, which only emerged after the UNDEF proposal was submitted. Experts and CSOs saw this construction project as epitomizing the worst tendencies of Georgia's post-Soviet oligarchic development. Civil society groups identified a numerous negative externalities associated with the initiative in terms of cultural heritage damage, pollution, green spaces, democratic culture (lack of transparency), and pedestrian access. IP decided to make the fight against Panorama a key component of its broader advocacy efforts and became one of the most active participants in the coalition- (ERTAD)— that formed to block this initiative, providing support in terms of citizen mobilization, press releases, legal orientation and printing. Numerous stakeholders highlighted that Georgian CSOs have limited experience and culture in the development of broad-based, cross-sectoral coalitions. Though ERTAD has not been able to stop Panorama, the experience did expand IP's networks and provide valuable experience in civil society coordination.

*(ii) Effectiveness*

1. Based on a strategy of stakeholder collaboration, awareness raising and advocacy, the project achieved important results on each of the two inter-linked project outcomes:

The project achieved its proposed results as detailed in the following table with outcome-level targets, baselines and results for the two-year period. The below demonstrates that targets were met. Additional detail is provided in narrative form for each of the two outcomes.

Outcome 1: A civil society platform focusing on public space issues is strengthened through better collaboration	
Target 1.1: Pedestrian Association created and 500 members registered in 18 months	Result 1.1: 325 = 65%
Target 1.2: 20% of all registered members to represent different civil society	Result 1.2: Total membership is 325, including up to 60 civil society representatives
Target 1.3: 50 professionals: including urban planners, architects, transport system experts, public space managers, legislation professionals, lawyers, IT specialists, environmentalists, urban artists etc.	Result 1.3: 18 professionals registered in the Association; It is thought that more than 50 professionals have registered, though the IP member database is not yet fully operational for efficient tracking by profession.
Target 1.4: Up to 20 artists selected for the team (15 projects designed)	Result 1.4: 22 artists selected for the project, 13 art installations designed;
Target 1.5: A thorough 50 page report, printed initially in 200 copies, distributed to stakeholders, addressing all goals and strategic points included in the association's strategy	Result 1.5: With UNDEF approval, printing of the legal analysis was replaced with seven videos produced from events such as Ugly Walks, public dialogues, meetings with partner organizations and decision-makers etc.
Outcome 2: Long-term commitment of urban policy makers to effectively respond to pedestrian-specific issues through sustainable strategies is increased.	
Target 2.1: Pedestrian-specific laws, regulations, policies assessed and new law proposal and recommendations developed	Result 2.1: Law was passed in 2017 and included a number of significant improvements such as prohibiting parking in zebras, drivers ceding way pedestrians in zebras, contactless patrolling systems, and use of smart cameras.
Target 2.2: A minimum of 300 audience members throughout the 10 sessions held (Up to 3000 online viewers)	Result 2.2: 124 people registered at 9 public sessions; (registration was voluntary). Iare Pekhit's youtube page

	videos have amounted to 17,000 views in total.
Target 2.3: 30 policymakers, public officials, state authorities involved in dialogue	Result 2.3: 10 public officials attended public dialogues as “key stakeholders”. Additionally there were working meetings with other public officials

*a): Outcome 1: Civil society platform:*

This was the most time- and resource-intensive of the two outcomes. In order to develop a mobilized civil society platform, IP efforts included: a) awareness raising events; b) communication activities; c) coalition building; and d) the creation of a membership-based Pedestrian Association. Though it is impossible to measure or attribute the direct impact of IP’s public awareness efforts, there are a few key indicators of success. First and foremost, passage of the Road Safety Law in 2017 was at least, in part, due to public pressure. Additionally, stakeholders noted that urban planning issues, generally, and pedestrian rights, specifically, featured in the 2017 municipal campaign and were highlighted by all candidates in their rhetoric and platforms—a clear departure from previous local elections.

*Citizen Activism Events*

Much of the project focused on raising public awareness and citizen mobilization in favour of pedestrian rights, including:

- IP organized “Care for the City” public art installations that included different forms of artwork. Whenever possible—and contingent on City approval—the installations were located in parks and included public launches, such as picnics or concerts. The objective was to highlight the importance of public spaces, while at the same time communicating key messages related to environmental sustainability, mobility rights, etc. One of the most controversial art projects also created the biggest media buzz. #IAMNOTWELL was displayed on a wall in large pink letters – and widely disseminated via social media—to communicate Tbilisi’s dire situation. Many stakeholders asserted that these events were highly innovative and effective in garnering media coverage and opening minds. However one stakeholder noted that despite IP’s efforts to make the events as inclusive as possible—attendance was generally limited to “the same 50-100 people who are part of the same circle.”
- The “Die In” organized in front of Parliament in November 2016 was a particularly high profile event. IP protesters laid down on the zebra crosswalk with a coffin to communicate the life and death nature of pedestrian rights. This activity was mentioned by nearly all stakeholders as especially effective in generating media (and the Parliament’s) attention.
- IP organized six public dialogues, some of which included film screenings. These events were typically held in restaurants or the conference centres of partner organizations (such as universities or CSOs) and were largely attended by young people. The events often featured guest speakers.

- “Ugly Walks” were designed by IP with support from a Board member and have the potential to become one of the organization’s signature products. The tours go beyond simply exhibiting some of Tbilisi’s least attractive features to provide background on the (misguided) political decisions behind each of the problems. Three tours were conducted during the project period and received significant national and international press coverage. When presented at an international conference in Prague, the Ugly Walk was chosen as the most innovative idea. The Ugly Walk concept has since been adapted and implemented by a CSO in Kiev, Ukraine.

### *Communication*

In conjunction with its awareness raising events, IP had an active mainstream media presence, including TV, radio and print media<sup>14</sup>. The IP Director had a public broadcasting show that she would use to feature project events and themes. Other staff, board members and artists also participated frequently in interviews and talk shows.

IP also cultivated an active presence in social media, particularly on Facebook. IP created approximately seven videos chronicling activities and highlighting project messages. These videos were typically five minutes long and relied on positive messaging. By project close, IP had more than 17,000 views of its videos and more than 6,000 likes on Facebook.

Stakeholders spoke positively of IP’s communication strategies. Given the organization’s small size and limited staffing, the level of media coverage and profile was seen as significant. Several interviewees described the IP brand as “cool” and “creative” and communicating a sense of openness and approachability that was particularly effective with young people.

While the project’s external communication was largely seen as effective, “internal” communication with PA members and volunteers continues to be a challenge. IP had identified the development of outreach and engagement of members—perhaps through a simple periodic bulletin-- as one of its priorities for the coming months.

---

<sup>14</sup> Media coverage included all major TV channels (Rustavi 2, Imedi TV1, Imedi TV2, GDS and Maestro), as well as radio (Radio Liberty) and newspapers/magazines (Netgazeti, Gargar, and Liberali). Coverage also extended beyond Georgia to include Opendemocracy, BBC Russia, and Calvert Journal.



*Die – In Protest in front of Parliament,  
November 2016*

### *Coalition building*

IP staff showed great commitment to working in partnership with other civil society organizations. In the words of one staff member, “no organization can do much alone. To get politicians to pay attention, you have to work with others.” To this end, IP coordinated its advocacy activities with organizations like the Alliance for Safe Road. The organizations had complementary priorities and strengths. While the Alliance concentrated on road safety, IP maintained its focus on pedestrian access. At the same time, the Alliance had strong connections with policy makers, while IP could contribute its broader, grassroots network. On other occasions, IP coordinated with groups, such as Guerrilla Gardeners, to maximize its presence at activist events, particularly protests. In the words of one partner interviewee, “We brought our people to their events and they loaned us their people for ours.”

IP also devoted considerable effort to the ERTAD coalition formed to oppose the Panorama project. While ERTAD eventually broke down, the coalition was able to suspend (at least temporarily) Panorama and IP learned some valuable lessons in terms of creating and maintaining inter-organizational advocacy networks.

### *Pedestrian Association*

After months of analysis and development investigating various options and extensive consultations with Board members, IP legally registered the Pedestrian Association (PA) in 2016. Members include CSOs/social movements as well as individuals. With the assistance of the project-funded lawyer, IP developed a formal “charter” for the PA and Memoranda of Understanding for organizational members. During the course of the project, PA membership grew from 0 to 325 through active recruitment efforts that included registration at public art projects, debates, film screenings or on-line. Member contact information and interests are registered in IP’s database. Of the 325 registered members, approximately 50 (at project’s end) have registered as volunteers and provided assistance in tasks such as transport, art installation set-up, event promotion, and printing.

PA board members were selected based on interest, commitment and potential for contributions. IP staff appreciated board members’ willingness to dedicate their “time and status” to the organization. During the project period, some of the assistance provided by

board members included design/delivery of the Ugly Walks, design/delivery of a walkability audit for Tbilisi City Hall, political analysis and proposal development.

In late 2016- November 2017, a U.S. Embassy grant (“Access”) provided IP with institutional strengthening support that included internal reflection and strategy development workshops. Through this process, IP decided to merge with the Pedestrian Association into a single organizational structure and board for greater efficiencies and cost savings.

One of IP’s key challenges is to organize and galvanize its membership on a continuing basis. This year has been primarily focused on internal organization with limited funding for activities. Nonetheless, even during these “quieter” periods while IP engages in strategy development and fundraising, it would be important to maintain communication with members through low-cost efforts such as periodic emailed bulletins or issue updates. IP also has a “create action” site on its website that could be used to facilitate connections between members with shared interests. IP has also received “feedback forms” from members that require analysis and follow-up to understand member priorities and potential for supporting.

*b) Outcome 2: Long-term commitment of urban policy makers to effectively respond to pedestrian-specific issues*

Culminating a long process of dialogue, consultation and pressure, the Road Safety Law was passed in early 2017. The Law includes a number of significant advances including a 100-point scoring system for traffic violations, contactless patrolling, the use of smart cameras, prohibitions against parking on ramps, and rules for ceding to pedestrians in crosswalks. The original draft law also included additional restrictions on parking, however these were eliminated due to the City’s current parking contract. Although the Law was not everything IP and other advocates had hoped for, there is a general sense that the reform is an improvement and will have positive effects. Already during the Law’s first quarter of implementation (July- September 2017), the MoI reported a 15% decrease in road accidents as compared with the same period in 2016.

IP carried out a deep review of the legal aspects related to pedestrian rights and access, analyzing and identifying gaps in the Georgian legal framework. Throughout 2015 and 2016, IP participated in a consultation group—made up of a few CSOs and experts—convened by the Ministry of the Interior to analyze and provide input on the draft legislation. IP also participated in meetings with parliamentarians. Concurrently, IP engaged in the civic activism and media activities described above to shape public opinion. One instance where this dual-pronged strategy paid dividends was in reacting to a proposal from an MP that the new law eliminate fines for cars parked on sidewalks. As soon as IP learned of this suggestion, the organization vigorously denounced the idea in the media while at the same time working closely with the MoI and other advocacy groups to ensure a united front against this proposal.

Though attribution is difficult to determine, stakeholders do believe that IP contributed to the advocacy process in at least two ways: a) countering any attempts to further weaken the law (e.g. above mentioned proposal to eliminate fines for parking on sidewalks); and b)

pressuring MP's to pass the law through activism and media coverage.

In addition to supporting the Road Safety Law, IP also engaged City Hall through participation in urban planning events and through the project's public art projects. The process for securing permits was particularly onerous, taking months in some cases and requiring numerous meetings. In the end, permits were granted on seven occasions and rejected once. According to staff, IP was the first CSO in Tbilisi to request and receive municipal permits for public art work installations. Over the course of the project, it appears that municipal authorities began to understand and gain trust in the process. IP believes that their example may have paved the way for other CSOs to benefit from more institutionalized permit request/approval processes.

In 2016, IP competed in and won a call for proposals issued by City Hall with its design for a "walkability audit" designed to identify obstacles to pedestrian access. With a small grant from the City of Tbilisi, IP implemented the walkability audit in one neighborhood with the assistance of university volunteers and under the technical supervision of the Board Chair. This audit was seen in City Hall as relevant, high quality and an example of the type of collaborative relationship municipal officials would like to have with civil society, although unfortunately the City has not yet taken advantage of the findings given the 2017 municipal election campaign.

The entrance of new City Hall administration represents a challenge and opportunity for IP. Turnover is a constant problem in Georgian public administration. IP had a number of key contacts in City Council and City government who will leave the local government. On a positive note, the incoming Mayor campaigned on a platform that prioritized public transportation and environmental sustainability. IP will need to leverage these promises throughout the end of 2017 and into early 2018 by presenting viable proposals as well as promoting innovative initiatives such as the walkability audit.

In addition to relationship building with City Hall, further advocacy is also merited for improving the Road Safety Law on at least three counts. First, IP can work with partners to ensure that the law is further improved through amendments on pending issues, for instance, on mandatory car seats and stricter rules on parking. Secondly, IP will need to pressure Parliament and City Hall to ensure budget allocations on related infrastructure improvements including the installation of smart cameras and painting of zebras. Finally, IP will also need to ensure political will for enforcement of the law by the Police and other agencies as well as standardized reporting on indicators including accidents, violations and fines.

IP's unique and specialized "brand" leaves it well-positioned as a voice for Tbilisi pedestrians. At the same time, stakeholders recognized that progress on pedestrian rights is unlikely without greater incentives for and investment in public transportation. Given these inter-linkages and the need for holistic solutions, IP will need to partner with organizations specialized in public transportation. As IP's strengths do not lie in research, the organization would also benefit from alliances with think tanks or research institutes to ensure that proposals are evidence-based.

## *2. The project fulfilled its intended outputs*

The project proposal included four outputs across the two outcomes. One output (passage of the Road Safety Law) was achieved just after project close. Another (creation of an artist group) was achieved by the end of 2016, although it has not been sustained post-project. The other two outputs were achieved, though in slightly lower numbers than originally anticipated. That is, the Pedestrian Association was created, though the membership total (325 at project close) was lower than the output target (500), and the number of public dialogues (nine) was slightly below the target (10).



*Ugly Walk Cultural Heritage Tour*

*3. The project did not include evidence-based analysis of the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups and did not conduct proactive outreach to organizations representing vulnerable groups*

The issue of pedestrian rights is highly relevant to vulnerable groups, particularly women, children, PWD's, the elderly and the poor. Yet overall in Tbilisi there is a lack of analysis and awareness regarding the specific mobility and transport needs of these groups. In fact, one of the (external) experts interviewed for this evaluation asserted that there are no gender differences associated with mobility in Tbilisi. This understanding is clearly refuted however by the statistic (provided by City Hall) that women account for 80% of users of public transportation. Nonetheless, beyond that data point, there is a general lack of sex-disaggregated information related to mobility. Georgia has a number of women's organizations engaged in political and economic empowerment, but they were not involved in recent discussions regarding urban planning and mobility. There are fewer Georgian CSOs representing the needs of the other vulnerable groups.

On the positive side, women accounted for approximately 60% of IP volunteers and staff expressed interest and commitment to actively engaging vulnerable groups in the future.

*(iii) Efficiency*

*1. The project was cost efficient*

For the overall budget cost of \$142,500, IP was able to achieve its project outcomes. Wherever possible, IP staff sought cost savings, including the use of interns and a volunteer network, cost-sharing with other CSO's, use of public spaces, and private sector (in-kind) donations.

*2. Internal project management encountered a few challenges, but worked overall*

Prior to the UNDEF funding, IP’s annual budget was only about \$20,000. Though IP had never managed a similar amount of funding, there were no reported financial or administrative irregularities. The recruitment of a Project Coordinator with experience with international NGOs was a helpful addition to the management team. At some points, there was confusion regarding the roles and responsibilities of IP staff versus the newly created PA Board. During late 2016 and early 2017, both sides worked together however to develop IP’s new structure and there is consensus on the recent decision to merge the PA and IP Boards.



**Green Cover Public Art Installation**

*3. Project implementation included deviations from the original budget, but all were clearly justified*  
The project requested and received a six-month no cost extension on July 13, 2016 due to delays in the advocacy component. Overall project spending (\$142,500) was consistent with the total approved budget. There were a few programmatic deviations between the intended and actual targets. The number of public dialogues was decreased from ten to nine, but the design and implementation of an original and potentially signature product, the Ugly Walk, compensated for the reduction of one dialogue event. Additionally, the original project included the publication of an analysis of the legal framework around pedestrian rights. Following consultation with stakeholders however, IP decided to disseminate the legal analysis as a working document to key partner organizations and invest the publication budget in the production of videos, seen as a more appropriate tool for reaching a wider audience.

*4. The project’s monitoring and evaluation system allowed for reporting and accountability, though attribution related to advocacy is difficult to gauge.*  
The output measures included in the project were sufficiently concrete, quantifiable and linked to project outcomes. At the outcome level however, democracy projects are notoriously difficult to measure. In the case of the IP project, the objective related to advocacy work presents attribution challenges. While it may be possible to demonstrate that the law has changed and that IP carried out a number of events and meetings related to the law, it is not possible to determine IP’s level of influence.

*5. IP developed and employed internal instruments for feedback and membership registration*  
IP proactively sought to improve the quality of its public art component through the use of feedback forms—administered to the artists—and the conduction of a focus group. IP also used a feedback form for the Ugly Walk activities. Input provided through these means

helped IP make adjustments and improvements. Additionally, IP put in place an on-line and paper registration for prospective members and volunteers. Though the form is useful for compiling names and contact information, IP lacks a user-friendly software that will allow sorting by demographic characteristics, area of residence, profession or interest.

#### *(iv) Impact*

##### *1. The project has the potential to improve pedestrian rights in the long-term*

Though the project concluded too recently to assess long-term impact, stakeholders were optimistic that the Law would have an impact on road safety, as demonstrated by the recent decrease in accident rates. Stakeholders also believed that the Law would improve pedestrian access, though monitoring on enforcement and infrastructure improvements will be needed. At the same time, stakeholders sensed a tangible shift in the culture and public opinion regarding pedestrian rights as evidenced, for instance, by its inclusion in debates and policy proposals by municipal candidates.

##### *2. The project could influence the strategies of other CSOs*

It is also possible that IP's activist model could serve as a positive example for other Georgian civil society groups. Work with City Hall on public art installations may highlight the benefits of using public space for awareness raising activities, while also making it easier for other CSOs to gain municipal permits. At the same time, the IP membership model may prove appealing to other groups interested in broad-based civic engagement.

##### *3. The project has catalytic potential beyond Tbilisi*

Though the problem is most acute in Tbilisi, stakeholders believed that the IP activism and awareness raising model could be replicated in other cities. Additionally, the Ugly Walks proved to be a model with resonance outside of Georgia, as evidenced by its recognition at an international conference and its replication in Kiev.

#### *(v) Sustainability*

##### *1. Since the end of UNDEF funding, IP has been forced to reduce the scope of its activities*

Without UNDEF funding, IP's 2017 budget is significantly reduced to small grants. Staffing was cut back from seven (one full-time and six part-time) to three part-time people. IP has participated in some call for proposal competitions, but has not had success in securing project funds thus far.

However, IP has received institutional strengthening assistance through the U.S. Embassy "Access" institutional strengthening grant and invitations for the IP Director and one Board member to participate in the Department of State's International Visitor Program for a three-week tour of US cities. These activities have allowed IP to focus 2017 efforts on rethinking the organizational mission, structure and strategy for increased impact and sustainability. As part of this process, IP has decided to merge its structure and board with the member-based Pedestrian Association.

Maintaining momentum and ensuring financial sustainability is a common challenge for CSOs. IP has developed a number of project proposals over the last year and will likely continue to do so. There are different directions that IP could take in the future. As a small organization, it would be important to prioritize, focus and build on its assets or successful models. Few (if any) donors include pedestrian rights within their priorities, but the below programming models could be framed and tailored to specific donors’:

- *Participatory democracy in neighborhoods:* IP could complement its general awareness raising work with efforts focused on mobilizing around tangible, immediate needs. This would take place in the context of the new Road Safety Law, empowering citizens to mobilize for fulfillment of the Law’s infrastructure commitments. For instance, IP could assist citizens in identifying and publicizing dangerous intersections and push for a municipal response. This model could build on “fixmystreet” citizen experiences and is also consistent with IP’s current interest in improving its membership database to allow ‘sorting’ and leveraging its members and volunteers along neighborhood or district lines. Drawing on that membership/volunteer pool, IP could designate and develop neighborhood “facilitators” or “organizers.” Or perhaps, IP could partner with a university to develop a formalized internship program that includes training/support for “student organizers”. IP is also hoping to secure funding to develop a toolkit that could be used to develop the capacity of interested neighborhood groups.
- *Transparency/national-level good governance:* IP could develop its watchdog capacity to carefully monitor implementation of the Road Safety Law. Georgia is an Open Government Partnership (OGP) signatory (and Tbilisi is one of only 15 subnational OGP partners worldwide), yet information on road safety, traffic violations and revenues from fines is exceedingly hard to access. Two of IP’s Board members (a Transparency International Program Manager and a GIS specialist) would be uniquely suited to assist IP in advocating for, tracking and reporting on user-friendly official data and “blackspot” mapping of particularly dangerous districts. (Ideally, this data and mapping could feed into the district-based organizing mentioned above.) Along the same lines, IP could consider monitoring the legal process after a case, particularly in terms of identification and prosecution of the “guilty” driver (as appropriate). This focus on what happens after an accident would be consistent with the IP Director’s interest in highlighting the human cost of accidents.
- *Local Government:* IP’s walkability audit is a novel and promising model that could be expanded relatively inexpensively with the help of local volunteers. IP could consider analyzing or even ranking districts by walkability criteria along the lines of a walk score<sup>15</sup>. However, IP could go beyond issuing a single measure to: a. promote some healthy walkability competition between districts; and b. provide technical advice to districts to improve their walkability scores.

---

<sup>15</sup> Vanderbilt, Tom, Slate Magazine

- *Gender or Social Inclusion:* Mobility in Tbilisi is most definitely a gendered issue. Women are the majority of public transit users and have different needs as pedestrians. Yet there is a general lack of available data and public awareness related to the current situation of gender injustice. The situation of PWD's is also dire. IP could build alliances with research organizations and women's or PWD organizations to raise awareness and engage in advocacy. (Related to the above transparency point, it would also be important to ensure that OGP data is sex-disaggregated.)
- *Education:* A number of stakeholders stressed that sustainable change will depend on influencing the mindsets of Georgians at the earliest stage possible. Though it was not a focus of the UNDEF project, IP did carry out an awareness raising activity in a primary school with students aged 13-14. According to IP staff and a Board member, the students showed great interest in the issues of pedestrian rights, public transportation and urban planning. The MoI, Ministry of Education and the Alliance for Safe Roads have also developed educational materials on "10 tips for road safety" for primary school children. Developing an educational program for school age children would represent a departure from IP's current model but might be warranted provided there is stakeholder demand and Ministry commitment for ownership, scale-up and sustainability.

In addition to developing and framing programming models for international donors, IP might pursue some level revenue generation through one- or a combination-- of the following innovative options:

- *Membership Fees:* During the 2016-2017 Access Institutional Strengthening process, IP made the decision to merge its organizational structure (including the Board) with the Pedestrian Association. IP currently has about 400 registered members. One possibility for the long-term would be the establishment of a member 'fee' or 'contribution' system. As this would be a first for a non-profit in Georgia however, it would be important to conduct surveys and "willingness to pay" analyses first.
- *Contracting for services:* City Hall's funding of the "walkability audit" was a first for IP and quite possibly for the City. Through creative thinking and persuasion, perhaps IP could try pitching other types of services/models that City Hall or the government might be willing to fund. Perhaps this could be done in conjunction with the Tbilisi "Masterplan" process in the event that this initiative moves forward. Also along these lines, IP could package, promote and (partially) monetize the Ugly Walks to interested private groups.
- *Private sector support:* During the UNDEF grant period, IP received some "in-kind" donations from local businesses, such as food or venue space for events. Corporate social responsibility is a nascent concept in Georgia and there is little tradition of

private sector funding for CSOs. Guerrilla Gardening<sup>16</sup> receives some donations from nurseries for its tree planting, but there are few additional examples. Corporate ownership is opaque and it is difficult to know who really owns private businesses. With this in mind, IP would need to develop an outreach and funding model that doesn't jeopardize its institutional principles. One interviewee mentioned the need to establish a privately supported fund that is independently managed and includes a firewall between funders and grantees. (Perhaps along the lines of a community foundation.) This would be a positive development, but it will not happen in the short-term and would require significant time and energy to develop and promote.

*(vi) UNDEF added value*

*1. UNDEF's flexible and practical approach is highly appropriate given the innovative and experimental nature of the project*

IP staff were appreciative of UNDEF's willingness to approve changes in the budget and project targets as long as they were clearly explained. The requested adjustments were justifiable in order to take advantage of shifts in the political context.

*2. UNDEF's willingness to take initiative in co-creation of project ideas, particularly with an unproven, CSO start-up, like Iare Pekhit, is a rare and valuable contribution within the donor community.*

As explained above, UNDEF took the initiative in identifying a critical need in Georgia and in finding a potential project applicant. UNDEF's outreach to Iare Pekhit and the resulting project represented a critical opportunity in IP's history and institutional development. Prior to the UNDEF funding, IP's largest annual budget was \$20,000. With UNDEF support however, IP staff were able to pursue multiple objectives over a longer period, as previously funding had been restricted to specific one-off activities completed within the span of a few months. The ability to pursue dual objectives (awareness raising and advocacy) within one project allowed IP to address the project in a more holistic and integrated manner. IP staff asserted that the longer period, flexible funding and reporting process helped them to increase institutional capacity, build its membership base and gain credibility with activists and decision makers. At the same time, IP staff also reflected that it would have been useful to include some activities- such as an internal workshop—in the UNDEF project that allowed for reflection, strategy development and institutional strengthening.

---

<sup>16</sup> Guerrilla Gardening has developed as an international social movement focused on promoting green spaces and environmental awareness through gardening on land that is abandoned or perceived to be neglected by its legal owner. For more information, see: <http://www.guerrillagardening.org/>

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion	Recommendation
<i>Design:</i> The project's intervention was timely, unique, appropriate to the local context and responsive in the face of emerging opportunities and challenges	n/a
<i>Awareness raising:</i> Through a range of strategies including art installations, public dialogues, Ugly Walks, and media outreach, the project was effective in raising public awareness on the issue of pedestrian rights.	n/a
<i>Advocacy:</i> The project seems to have contributed to the content and passage of the Road Safety Law	
<i>Social Inclusion:</i> The project is likely to benefit vulnerable groups though the project lacked disaggregation of these differentiated needs (particularly in terms of gender) and outreach to relevant groups	Ensure that future projects explicitly consider and raise awareness regarding the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups and establish partnerships with women's organizations and CSOs representing other marginalized communities.
<i>Partnerships:</i> The project established partnerships with key civil society organizations and State actors	Given the complex and inter-linked nature of urban planning, consider developing formal partnerships with research organizations or think tanks specialized in related topics—particularly public transportation
<i>Management:</i> The project was cost-efficient and well-managed; a no-cost extension and budget deviations were well justified	
<i>Information systems:</i> Project monitoring and evaluation complied with UNDEF requirements. Internal instruments for feedback and member registration were positive steps though additional progress is needed to ensure utility for decision making and member mobilization.	IPs nascent internal instruments should be further developed. In particular, an improved database is needed for registration/sorting of members based on demographic, geographic and professional criteria. Even during this period of fundraising and internal organization, IP should conduct regular outreach with members through a simple bulletin or updates on issue of interest. Feedback forms are a good start for improving quality, but would also benefit from a simple database for aggregation and analysis.
<i>Impact:</i> The project is catalytic for pedestrian rights in the long-term, to positively influence other CSOs and with some potential for replication in other countries.	

<p><i>Sustainability:</i> As is often the case for democracy projects, sustainability is a challenge. The project’s membership model and use of volunteers are good measures. In addition, IP could build on its experience to tailor adapted “models” that are likely to be attractive to donors.</p>	<p>There are a number of measures IP could consider for greater sustainability including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening the membership model;</li> <li>• Exploring options for charging fees for services; and</li> <li>• Pursue (carefully) private sector support.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, IP should conduct a simple donor mapping and build on its successful products to develop and market tailored programming models to prospective donors. IP’s future programming could potentially be framed in a number of directions including: participatory democracy at the neighborhood level; local governance; good governance/transparency; social inclusion; and education.</p>
<p><i>UNDEF value added:</i> The agency’s flexibility was appropriate and its willingness to bet on a nascent and unproven CSO start-up was a sound decision.</p>	<p>Continue to take initiative in generating new project ideas. Continue to take chances with new CSOs. Facilitate contacts between UNDEF-funded CSOs and relevant UN agencies, which would include in this case, UNDP, UN Women, UNICEF, and WHO.</p>

## VI. LESSONS LEARNED

The IP project presents a number of useful lessons learned, including:

a) *UNDEF’s initiative and risk taking pays off:* As explained above, this project came about thanks to UNDEF’s proactive steps in identifying a problem and a CSO applicant. Quite notably, the CSO had limited experience managing cooperation funds and complex projects. UNDEF’s support allowed this start-up CSO to build on its niche activist brand to expand its scope and networks and develop advocacy capacity.

b) *The perfect is the enemy of the good.* IP originally sought to develop and mobilize on behalf of legislation that it had developed and considered to be fully comprehensive, addressing all key needs related to pedestrian access. It soon became apparent however that the Ministry of the Interior was set to present its own draft legislation. Although the MoI legislation failed to address some key issues—particularly an overhaul of the parking system—IP opted to work in coalition with the MoI and others rather than risk competing bills.

c) *Seeing is believing:* IP gained insights on the importance of a demonstration effect. While research and speeches have their place in raising awareness, IP found that the Ugly Walks proved to be particularly innovative and impactful. Through these tours, participants were able to witness firsthand the deleterious effects of municipal improvisation and opaque policy making. Ugly Walks even enjoy international success, with a Ukrainian CSO replicating these experiences in Kiev.

d) *There is value in courting controversy:* Two of the project’s most controversial activities – “I Am Not Well” and the “Die In” in front of the Parliament— was particularly effective in terms of generating media attention. In the words of an IP staff member, “we had to go to extreme lengths to get the law passed.”

*e) Narrow v. broad:* One of IP's advantages is its very specific and unique focus on pedestrian rights. At the same time, Tbilisi is unlikely to make progress on pedestrian access without addressing public transportation deficiencies. IP will need to manage the tension between staying specialized and niche versus developing holistic solutions. This might best be achieved through partnerships with organizations with specialized skillsets, such as urban policy think tanks or research institutes.

*f) Creating coalitions is easier than maintaining them:* The ERTAD experience demonstrated both the promise and the pitfalls of broad-based coalitions. Though ERTAD's numbers and energy had strong potential as a collective pressure group, in the end, member organizations were too dissimilar in ideology and strategy to permit concerted efforts in the long-term.

*g) Advocacy doesn't end with passage of law:* The slogan that IP developed in 2016-- "pass the law, enforce the law, respect the law" -- underscores the idea that advocacy work did not end with Parliament's approval of the Road Safety Law. Rather, IP and other allies will need to invest considerable effort in ensuring that the law is enforced by police and other authorities and that the necessary budget allocations are made for infrastructure improvements.

*h) Sustainability is a constant struggle:* A CSO's search for sustainability never ends. Every new project should include the "seeds" (innovative strategies) of future sustainability. Additionally, since securing funds from a specific international donor can take months or years -- to research their interests, build/cultivate relationships, develop concept notes, draft full proposals -- CSOs need to have at least one staff person looking ahead and partially dedicated to fundraising and donor relations even in relatively "flush" times.

## ANNEXES

### *Annex 1: Evaluation Questions*

Per the Launch Note of 24 October, the evaluation was to address the following questions:

#### *Relevance:*

- Whether the objectives of the project were in line with the needs and priorities for democratic development given the context?
- Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented in order to better reflect the needs, priorities and contexts?

#### *Effectiveness:*

- To what extent were project objectives achieved?
- To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged? If there were deviations, what was the reason and result?
- Were the project activities adequate to make progress toward the project objectives? Were any outputs not achieved and if so, why?

#### *Efficiency:*

- Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs?
- Did institutional arrangements promote cost-effectiveness and accountability?
- Was the monitoring and evaluation system conducive to accountability, decision making and learning?
- Did budget design and implementation facilitate achievement of objectives?

#### *Impact:*

- To what extent has/have the realization of the project objective(s) and project outcomes had an impact on the specific problem the project aimed to address?
- Have the targeted beneficiaries experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative?
- To what extent has the project caused changes and effects, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization? Is the project likely to have a catalytic effect? How? Why? Examples?

#### *Sustainability:*

- To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact?
- Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?

#### *UNDEF's value added:*

- To what extent did UNDEF funding provide value added (in terms of best practices or areas of improvement) to work that was already up and running?
- How distinct were the UNDEF-funded activities from the other activities undertaken by IP?
- How was the UNDEF brand used to develop new partnerships and negotiate with stakeholders?

***Annex 2: Documents Reviewed:***

Demytrie, Rayhan, 20 October, 2017, "The Brit Campaigning by Bike in Tbilisi," BBC News

De Waal, Thomas, 31 July, 2017, "Open Georgia, Closed Georgia" Carnegie Endowment for Democracy <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/72681>

Iare Pekhit, 2016, "Strategy and Fundraising Plan"

Iare Pekhit, n.d., "Ugly Walk: Evaluations"

Iare Pekhit, n.d., "Updated Strategy- ACCESS"

Iare Pekhit, n.d., "Walkability Checklist"

Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 3 February, 2017, "Georgia, Parliamentary Elections, 8 and 30 October 2016: Final Report"

Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 22 October, 2017, "International Election Observation Mission: Preliminary Conclusions"

The Economist, 29 September, 2017, "Roads Are Becoming More Deadly in Developing Countries"

United Nations Democracy Fund, 4 November 2014, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Project Proposal"

United Nations Democracy Fund, 31 December 2015, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Mid-term Progress Report"

United Nations Democracy Fund, 31 November 2016, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Final Narrative Report"

United Nations Democracy Fund, 9 March 2017, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Financial Utilization Report."

United Nations Democracy Fund, 9 March 2017, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Independent Auditors' Report on Compliance"

United Nations Democracy Fund, 31 May 2017, "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Video" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZWOnReGjyMg>

United Nations Democracy Fund, 2017, "Post Project Evaluations for the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF): Operational Manual"

United Nations Democracy Fund, n.d., "Advancing Pedestrian Rights in Georgia: Project Management Notes"

Urushadze, Erekle, 20 November 2013, "Overview of Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Georgi" Transparency International

Vanderbilt, Tom, 12 April 2012, "What's Your Walk Score?" Slate Magazine

World Bank Group, 17 August, 2016, "Georgia: Recent Trends and Drivers of Poverty Reduction"

World Bank, Georgia Data Catalogue, consulted 12 November, 2017:  
<https://data.worldbank.org/country/georgia>

World Bank, 7 January 2017, "New Country Classifications by Income Level: 2017-2018"  
<https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-country-classifications-income-level-2017-2018>

World Bank, 2017. "Social Exclusion and Inclusion in Georgia : A Country Social Analysis." World Bank, Washington, DC. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28317> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO."

Zhavanaia, Iraklia, 20 October, 2016 "Tbilisi's Panorama Project Is Urban Boosterism at its Worst" Open Democracy

### *Annex 3: Persons Interviewed*

6 November 2017	
Arrival, international consultant	1:15 am
Kick-off and Internal Interviews	Khatuna Gvelesiani (Director), Marika Arevadze (ex Legal Advisor), Inge Snip (ex Community Builder), Mariam Tsikaridze (ex Curator), Irina Rurua (Intern)
Interview, Giorgi Magradze	Artist, winner of IP's first public art competition
7 November 2017	
Interview, Joseph Aleksander Smith	Journalist, former candidate City Council, organizer of Women's March
Interview Archil Barbakadze and Mamuka Salukvadze	City Institute
Interview, Nina Khatiskatsi	Deputy Mayor, Tbilisi
Focus Group	5 IP Volunteers
Interview, Elene Khundadze	Tbilisi Transport Department
8 November 2017	
Travel	8:30 am drive to Rustavi
Marika Piroshmanashvili	Rustavi City Hall
View art installation	Rustavi
Travel	10:30 am drive to Tbilisi
Valeri Lomuashvili	Head of Reforms, Ministry of the Interior
Erekle Urushadze	Transparency International Project Manager and IP Board member
Aleko Elisashvili	Tbilisi City Council member
9 November 2017	
Eka Laliashvili	Board Chair, Alliance for Safe Roads
Irakli Zhvania	Architect, IP Board member

Giorgi Kankia	GIS Expert, Board member
Nata Peradze	Guerrilla Gardening leader
10 November 2017	
Khatuna Gvlesiani	Debriefing
Shombi Shaw	UNDP Deputy Res Rep

#### ***Annex 4: Acronyms***

CSO	Civil society organization
IP	<i>Iare Pekhit</i>
MoI	Ministry of the Interior
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OGP	Open government partnership
PA	Pedestrian Association
PWD	Person with disability
UNDEF	United Nations Democracy Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme